## Math, Actuarial and Statistics Students' Union



## Introduction

MASSU, the Math, Actuarial and Statistics Students' Union, represents the interests of, organizes events for, and sells old tests to, and generally works to improve life for all students in math, applied math, actuarial sciences and statistics. Come see us in University College, Room 48 (basement) or contact us by email: massu@math.utoronto.ca

MASSU Executive

## ACT 240H1F MATHEMATICS OF INVESTMENT \& CREDIT

Instructor(s): S. Broverman
Enr: 182 Resp: 96 Retake: 80\%

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Presents | 1 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 30 | 35 | 21 | 5.6 |
| Explains | 1 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 20 | 42 | 26 | 5.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 2 | 3 | 22 | 34 | 23 | 14 | 5.2 |
| Teaching | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 36 | 34 | 22 | 5.7 |
| Workload | 3 | 4 | 6 | 56 | 19 | 8 | 1 | 4.2 |
| Difficulty | 2 | 1 | 6 | 40 | 29 | 16 | 3 | 4.6 |
| Learn Exp | 1 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 31 | 21 | 9 | 5.0 |

Students felt that Broverman was clear and thorough. Many complimented his use of effective examples to illustrate concepts. Some students felt his lecture notes were a little disorganized. Students felt there was not enough time given for tests.

Instructor(s): L. Florence

| Resp: 64 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $93 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Enr: 116 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |  |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 54 | 29 | 6.1 |  |  |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 46 | 30 | 6.0 |  |  |
| Communicates | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 19 | 40 | 27 | 5.8 |  |  |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 47 | 39 | 6.2 |  |  |
| Workload | 3 | 3 | 9 | 69 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 4.0 |  |  |
| Difficulty | 1 | 3 | 15 | 50 | 19 | 9 | 0 | 4.1 |  |  |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 2 | 4 | 23 | 30 | 26 | 13 | 5.1 |  |  |

Students were generally positive about the instructor, describing Florence as helpful. Some students complained that the website was not updated regularly enough.

ACT 245H1S FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF ACTUARIAL SCIENCE Instructor(s): S. Homayouni
Enr: 107 Resp: 61 Retake: 30\%

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Presents | 11 | 11 | 24 | 14 | 22 | 13 | 1 | 3.7 |
| Explains | 9 | 18 | 8 | 32 | 16 | 13 | 4 | 3.7 |
| Communicates | 11 | 3 | 13 | 27 | 21 | 21 | 1 | 4.1 |
| Teaching | 14 | 9 | 11 | 22 | 18 | 21 | 1 | 3.9 |
| Workload | 3 | 0 | 8 | 50 | 20 | 11 | 6 | 4.4 |
| Difficulty | 1 | 1 | 3 | 33 | 27 | 23 | 8 | 4.9 |
| Learn Exp | 11 | 16 | 16 | 40 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 3.4 |

Many students felt the instructor was not well-organized and that the exams did not reflect the material taught. However, the instructor was responsive to students' needs and comments.

## ACT 247H1S INTRODUCTORY LIFE CONTINGENCIES

Instructor(s): S. Jaimungal
Enr: 116 Resp: 60 Retake: 67\%

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 15 | 55 | 18 | 5.8 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 20 | 47 | 30 | 6.1 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 22 | 44 | 27 | 5.9 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 55 | 28 | 6.1 |
| Workload | 0 | 1 | 3 | 61 | 21 | 10 | 1 | 4.4 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 5 | 44 | 32 | 15 | 3 | 4.7 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 43 | 26 | 4 | 5.1 |

Jaimungal did an outstanding job in teaching the course and was a very good instructor. He related the theory in the course to real life examples.

## ACT 348H1F ADVANCED LIFE CONTINGENCIES

Instructor(s): S. Broverman

| Enr: 95 | Resp: 47 |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $71 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 12 | 23 | 51 | 6.1 |  |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 18 | 59 | 6.2 |  |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 15 | 26 | 42 | 5.9 |  |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 28 | 54 | 6.3 |  |
| Workload | 0 | 4 | 0 | 19 | 34 | 23 | 17 | 5.3 |  |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 31 | 24 | 22 | 5.4 |  |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 3 | 35 | 25 | 9 | 25 | 5.2 |  |

Those who commented felt that Broverman was a very good teacher. Several felt he was one of the best teachers at UofT.

## ACT 349H1S TOPICS IN ACTUARIAL MATHEMATICS

Instructor(s): L. Florence
Enr: 72 Resp: $60 \quad$ Retake: 70\%

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Presents | 1 | 1 | 7 | 30 | 26 | 21 | 10 | 4.9 |
| Explains | 1 | 0 | 10 | 23 | 33 | 21 | 8 | 4.9 |
| Communicates | 0 | 1 | 5 | 22 | 29 | 31 | 8 | 5.1 |
| Teaching | 0 | 1 | 1 | 23 | 32 | 25 | 14 | 5.2 |
| Workload | 1 | 1 | 21 | 58 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 3.9 |
| Difficulty | 1 | 0 | 8 | 72 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 4.1 |
| Learn Exp | 2 | 4 | 4 | 40 | 28 | 19 | 0 | 4.5 |

Florence was generally well-organized and fair. Some students asked for more lecture time for the material.

## ACT 370H1F ASSET AND LIABILITY MANAGEMENT

Instructor(s): S. Jaimunga

| Enr: 77 | Resp: 66 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Metake: $56 \%$ |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 4 | 18 | 31 | 30 | 15 | 5.3 |
| Explains | 1 | 6 | 10 | 22 | 27 | 21 | 10 | 4.7 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 33 | 30 | 22 | 5.6 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 27 | 37 | 10 | 5.3 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 28 | 29 | 6 | 5.1 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 3 | 23 | 32 | 28 | 12 | 5.2 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 2 | 6 | 44 | 26 | 15 | 4 | 4.6 |

Opinion on the instructor was mixed. Many students were positive and found Jaimungal approachable, while others complained about his organization and the difficulty of assignments.

## ACT 451H1F RISK THEORY

Instructor(s): S. Lin

| Resp: 45 |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $66 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Enr: 74 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 2 | 0 | 2 | 26 | 24 | 28 | 15 | 5.2 |
| Explains | 2 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 33 | 24 | 24 | 5.5 |
| Communicates | 2 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 22 | 40 | 17 | 5.5 |
| Teaching | 2 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 32 | 37 | 16 | 5.5 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 4 | 29 | 34 | 25 | 6 | 5.0 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 36 | 27 | 11 | 5.2 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 3 | 32 | 29 | 22 | 12 | 5.1 |

In general, students claimed Lin was very good overall. He was said to have well-written notes and fair tests, and was approachable.

ACT 455H1S ADVANCED TOPICS IN ACTUARIAL MATHEMATICS
Instructor(s): S. Broverman

| Enr: 69 | Resp: 58 |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $75 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |
| Presents | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 15 | 31 | 43 | 6.1 |  |
| Explains | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 16 | 26 | 50 | 6.1 |  |
| Communicates | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 17 | 31 | 40 | 6.0 |  |
| Teaching | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 33 | 50 | 6.2 |  |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 7 | 44 | 27 | 16 | 3 | 4.6 |  |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 1 | 30 | 34 | 23 | 9 | 5.1 |  |
| Learn Exp | 2 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 30 | 19 | 26 | 5.4 |  |

The instructor was described as having excellent organization in terms of the lecture notes and presentations.

ACT 460H1F ESTIMATION OF SURVIVAL \& LOSS MODELS
Instructor(s): S. Lin

| Resp: 38 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Enr: 50 | Retake: $75 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 2 | 21 | 36 | 26 | 13 | 5.3 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 47 | 21 | 13 | 5.3 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 47 | 15 | 10 | 5.1 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 42 | 26 | 15 | 5.4 |
| Workload | 0 | 6 | 3 | 63 | 18 | 6 | 3 | 4.2 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 5 | 58 | 20 | 11 | 2 | 4.5 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 25 | 25 | 17 | 5.3 |

ACT 466H1S CREDIBILITY THEORY \& LOSS MODELS
Instructor(s): S. Broverman

| Enr: 65 | Resp: 46 |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $85 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |
| Presents | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 15 | 31 | 45 | 6.1 |  |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 24 | 15 | 57 | 6.3 |  |
| Communicates | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 15 | 28 | 44 | 6.0 |  |
| Teaching | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 31 | 56 | 6.4 |  |


| Workload | 0 | 0 | 4 | 54 | 14 | 21 | 4 | 4.7 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 2 | 28 | 35 | 26 | 7 | 5.1 |
| Learn Exp | 2 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 30 | 19 | 16 | 5.1 |

The instructor was excellent.
ACT 471H1S ACTUARIAL APPLICATIONS OF FINANCE
Instructor(s): R. Stapleford

| Enr: 68 | Resp: 50 |  |  |  |  | Retake: $58 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 6 | 22 | 36 | 24 | 10 | 5.1 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 12 | 38 | 30 | 14 | 4 | 4.6 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 36 | 26 | 16 | 5.4 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 4 | 27 | 31 | 29 | 8 | 5.1 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 2 | 40 | 32 | 10 | 14 | 4.9 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 2 | 48 | 28 | 16 | 4 | 4.7 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 2 | 52 | 25 | 15 | 5 | 4.7 |

A majority of students enjoyed Stapleford's lectures and praised him for making a dry topic interesting. However, students felt the exams were difficult and that not enough examples were used in presenting the course material. In addition, some complained about the high amount of reading required.

## STA 107H1F AN INTRODUCTION TO PROBABILITY AND MODELLING

Instructor(s): R. Craiu
Enr: 105

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Presents | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 31 | 43 | 15 | 5.6 |
| Explains | 0 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 18 | 46 | 22 | 5.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 26 | 36 | 17 | 5.5 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 25 | 48 | 23 | 5.9 |
| Workload | 3 | 8 | 24 | 52 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 3.6 |
| Difficulty | 1 | 1 | 9 | 50 | 21 | 12 | 1 | 4.3 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 4 | 4 | 46 | 20 | 16 | 8 | 4.7 |

Students thought the instructor lectured well and found the class material reasonable. Some students would have liked more assignments and others didn't like the textbook. Overall, the comments were positive and the course was recommended.

STA 220H1F THE PRACTICE OF STATISTICS I
Instructor(s): A. Vukov

| Retake: $49 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Enr: 198 | Resp: 119 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 5 | 16 | 33 | 31 | 11 | 5.3 |
| Explains | 0 | 1 | 2 | 27 | 30 | 23 | 14 | 5.2 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 32 | 27 | 20 | 5.4 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 31 | 32 | 16 | 5.4 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 7 | 46 | 26 | 13 | 5 | 4.6 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 10 | 60 | 22 | 0 | 4 | 4.2 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 3 | 5 | 48 | 29 | 8 | 4 | 4.5 |

Vukov was identified as a good communicator who was enthusiastic about the course material. Some complained that he spoke too quickly and that lecture notes should be posted online. Some, but not all, students found Vukov's lectures well-organized; real life examples illustrated with videos were much appreciated. Many felt the minitab assignments were too time consuming and that cquest technology was difficult to use.

Instructor(s):H. Moshonov

| Enr: 178 | Resp: 107 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 14 | 36 | 43 | 6.2 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 19 | 39 | 34 | 6.0 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 35 | 48 | 6.2 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 38 | 42 | 6.2 |
| Workload | 1 | 2 | 3 | 48 | 26 | 14 | 6 | 4.6 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ASSU ANTI-CALENDAR |  |  |  |  | 141 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Difficulty | 1 | 0 | 11 | 57 | 15 | 11 | 5 | 4.4 | Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 29 | 52 | 6.3 |
| Learn Exp | 1 | 1 | 3 | 41 | 33 | 18 | 0 | 4.6 | Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 20 | 36 | 36 | 6.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Workload | 0 | 3 | 13 | 64 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 4.0 |
| Mosho | d |  | al | s an | xcel | tin |  | tures | Difficulty | 0 | 1 | 8 | 56 | 24 | 5 | 1 | 4.3 |
| were intere | well | gan | d | d en | usia | ic, | th | notes | Learn Exp | 0 | 2 | 2 | 42 | 21 | 23 | 7 | 4.8 |

Students were extremely positive about the course, finding Montgomery enthusiastic. Many students commented that Montgomery's sense of humour made a potentially boring class enjoyable. Some students complained that the notes were disorganized

## STA 255H1S STATISTICAL THEORY

Instructor(s): N. Montgomery

| Enr: 116 | Resp: 57 |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: 30\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 8 | 14 | 28 | 33 | 15 | 5.3 |
| Explains | 1 | 5 | 5 | 17 | 22 | 31 | 15 | 5.1 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 24 | 31 | 31 | 5.8 |
| Teaching | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 36 | 22 | 29 | 5.7 |
| Workload | 0 | 1 | 5 | 47 | 30 | 9 | 5 | 4.6 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 3 | 33 | 24 | 14 | 24 | 5.2 |
| Learn Exp | 4 | 2 | 18 | 44 | 18 | 9 | 2 | 4.1 |

Most praised Montgomery for his ability to communicate and explain difficult concepts as well as his enthusiasm and good sense of humour. Many felt the material was very difficult. The value of tutorials was questionable, and some commerce students felt they'd be better off in a different course.

## STA 257H1F PROBABILITY AND STATISTICS I

Instructor(s): P. McDunnough

| Enr: 269 | Resp: 172 |  |  |  |  | Retake: 44\% |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 4 | 7 | 11 | 22 | 27 | 21 | 4 | 4.4 |
| Explains | 5 | 4 | 11 | 26 | 29 | 15 | 6 | 4.4 |
| Communicates | 2 | 2 | 12 | 24 | 22 | 24 | 11 | 4.8 |
| Teaching | 3 | 6 | 7 | 21 | 28 | 26 | 7 | 4.8 |
| Workload | 0 | 1 | 2 | 45 | 29 | 13 | 7 | 4.8 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 1 | 1 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 15 | 5.4 |
| Learn Exp | 4 | 10 | 10 | 34 | 24 | 10 | 4 | 4.1 |

As the course material could be very complex, students expected more examples and clear explanations from the instructor, but they did not get these. Students had mixed feelings about McDunnough overall as an instructor.

## STA 257H1S PROBABILITY AND STATISTICS I

Instructor(s): P. McDunnough

| Resp: 56 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $35 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Enr: 114 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |  |
| Presents | 0 | 3 | 20 | 33 | 27 | 9 | 5 | 4.4 |  |  |
| Explains | 1 | 5 | 16 | 35 | 22 | 13 | 3 | 4.3 |  |  |
| Communicates | 3 | 5 | 11 | 18 | 43 | 9 | 7 | 4.5 |  |  |
| Teaching | 1 | 1 | 11 | 28 | 41 | 9 | 5 | 4.6 |  |  |
| Workload | 3 | 1 | 3 | 35 | 30 | 22 | 1 | 4.6 |  |  |
| Difficulty | 1 | 0 | 1 | 21 | 21 | 23 | 29 | 5.5 |  |  |
| Learn Exp | 6 | 10 | 14 | 45 | 12 | 8 | 2 | 3.8 |  |  |

Most felt the textbook was utterly useless and that the instructor was not organized. Some felt the instructor was not able to make the course material accessible to students and used too few examples in explaining difficult concepts. Some mentioned exams were significantly more difficult than assignments, but that the instructor used a fair grading policy. Students suggested making lecture notes available on the web.

Instructor(s): N. Montgomery

| Enr: 183 | Resp: 108 |  |  |  |  | Retake: $61 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 4 | 16 | 24 | 27 | 25 | 5.5 |
| Explains | 0 | 2 | 3 | 14 | 29 | 26 | 21 | 5.4 |

## STA 261H1S PROBABILITY AND STATISTICS II

Instructor(s): J. Rosenthal

| Enr: 178 | Resp: 99 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: 54\% |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |  |
| Presents | 0 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 29 | 24 | 32 | 5.7 |  |  |
| Explains | 0 | 2 | 2 | 14 | 21 | 30 | 28 | 5.6 |  |  |
| Communicates | 0 | 2 | 1 | 15 | 22 | 28 | 30 | 5.7 |  |  |
| Teaching | 0 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 25 | 32 | 28 | 5.7 |  |  |
| Workload | 0 | 3 | 5 | 51 | 22 | 12 | 4 | 4.5 |  |  |
| Difficulty | 0 | 1 | 2 | 33 | 35 | 13 | 14 | 5.0 |  |  |
| Learn Exp | 2 | 1 | 5 | 32 | 28 | 21 | 8 | 4.8 |  |  |

Rosenthal was very organized and understanding. Many students commented on his excellent ability to teach, but complained about the textbook and poor state of the tutors.

## STAT302H1F REGRESSION ANALYSIS

Instructor(s): A. Gibbs

| Resp: 93 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $41 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Enr: 137 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |  |
| Presents | 1 | 1 | 14 | 22 | 24 | 22 | 12 | 4.9 |  |  |
| Explains | 0 | 3 | 15 | 22 | 25 | 17 | 14 | 4.8 |  |  |
| Communicates | 0 | 3 | 10 | 26 | 26 | 19 | 14 | 4.9 |  |  |
| Teaching | 2 | 1 | 13 | 26 | 21 | 26 | 9 | 4.8 |  |  |
| Workload | 0 | 1 | 3 | 36 | 26 | 19 | 13 | 5.0 |  |  |
| Difficulty | 1 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 31 | 18 | 9 | 4.9 |  |  |
| Learn Exp | 3 | 4 | 17 | 33 | 23 | 12 | 4 | 4.3 |  |  |

Students held mixed opinions about the difficulty of the course material; however, a large majority claimed the tests contained more difficult material that perhaps did not correspond well with course material.

Most students felt Gibbs was well-organized and lectured well, but spoke too quickly. Gibbs was easy to contact outside of the classes.

## STA 322H1S DESIGN OF SAMPLE SURVEYS

Instructor(s): D. Banjevic

| Enr: 74 | Resp: 44 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $56 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |  |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 12 | 24 | 29 | 31 | 2 | 4.9 |  |  |
| Explains | 2 | 2 | 7 | 26 | 36 | 14 | 9 | 4.8 |  |  |
| Communicates | 4 | 2 | 9 | 26 | 40 | 14 | 2 | 4.5 |  |  |
| Teaching | 4 | 0 | 4 | 27 | 41 | 13 | 6 | 4.7 |  |  |
| Workload | 0 | 4 | 9 | 53 | 18 | 9 | 4 | 4.3 |  |  |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 6 | 65 | 11 | 11 | 4 | 4.4 |  |  |
| Learn Exp | 3 | 3 | 6 | 64 | 16 | 3 | 3 | 4.1 |  |  |

Several students complained that the tests were too long.
STA 332H1S EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN
Instructor(s): R. Craiu

| Resp: 54 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $38 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Enr: 80 | 1 | 3 | 16 | 22 | 28 | 18 | 7 | 4.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Presents | 3 | 7 | 15 | 28 | 35 | 5 | 3 | 4.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explains | 0 | 5 | 7 | 28 | 34 | 15 | 7 | 4.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Communicates | 5 | 1 | 5 | 28 | 30 | 24 | 3 | 4.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching | 1 | 1 | 1 | 60 | 20 | 11 | 1 | 4.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 3 | 28 | 30 | 28 | 9 | 5.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Difficulty | 10 | 5 | 7 | 48 | 25 | 2 | 0 | 3.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Students felt the material was difficult and too compressed for a half credit course. The instructor did a fair job of teaching and was responsive to questions.

STA 347H1F PROBABILITY
Instructor(s): B. De Sousa

| Retake: $77 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Resp: 94 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Enr: 152 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 21 | 30 | 46 | 6.2 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 18 | 35 | 42 | 6.1 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 30 | 56 | 6.4 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 39 | 47 | 6.3 |
| Workload | 0 | 1 | 2 | 22 | 31 | 37 | 4 | 5.2 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 1 | 1 | 21 | 35 | 26 | 14 | 5.3 |
| Learn Exp | 1 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 40 | 20 | 20 | 5.3 |

Students were extremely positive about the instructor finding De Sousa enthusiastic and approachable. Students found the course difficult and the workload heavy.

## STA 352Y1Y INTRODUCTION TO MATHEMATICAL STATISTICS

Instructor(s): D. Fraser

| Resp: 36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $67 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Enr: 52 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |  |
| Presents | 0 | 5 | 8 | 25 | 25 | 19 | 16 | 4.9 |  |  |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 16 | 22 | 30 | 16 | 13 | 4.9 |  |  |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 5 | 19 | 33 | 13 | 27 | 5.4 |  |  |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 11 | 19 | 22 | 13 | 33 | 5.4 |  |  |
| Workload | 0 | 2 | 5 | 58 | 13 | 13 | 5 | 4.5 |  |  |
| Difficulty | 0 | 2 | 0 | 27 | 36 | 25 | 8 | 5.1 |  |  |
| Learn Exp | 3 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 30 | 19 | 15 | 4.9 |  |  |

Fraser showed an excellent knowledge of the material and presented it in a very friendly manner.

STA 410H1S STATISTICAL COMPUTATION
Instructor(s): R. Neal

| Enr: 26 | Resp: 13 |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $90 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 33 | 33 | 16 | 5.5 |  |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 8 | 16 | 25 | 16 | 33 | 5.5 |  |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 33 | 8 | 50 | 6.0 |  |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 8 | 25 | 50 | 6.1 |  |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 30 | 15 | 7 | 4.8 |  |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 15 | 38 | 7 | 5.2 |  |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 12 | 25 | 50 | 6.1 |  |

Most of the students enjoyed the course as well as Neal's teaching style. Some mentioned more office hours and organization would have been helpful

## STA 429H1F ADVANCED STATISTICS FOR THE LIFE AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Instructor(s): K. Knight

| Enr: 6 | Resp: 6 |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $80 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 16 | 16 | 33 | 5.5 |  |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 33 | 16 | 16 | 5.2 |  |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 5.0 |  |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 50 | 16 | 5.5 |  |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 16 | 16 | 0 | 4.5 |  |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 4.2 |  |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 40 | 40 | 0 | 5.2 |  |

## STA 447H1S STOCHASTIC PROCESSES

Instructor(s): P. McDunnough

| Enr: 33 | Resp: 24 |  |  |  |  | Retake: 35\% |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 8 | 34 | 30 | 21 | 4 | 4.8 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 4 | 43 | 21 | 26 | 4 | 4.8 |


| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 34 | 30 | 17 | 5.4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 34 | 30 | 17 | 5.4 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 4 | 30 | 30 | 26 | 8 | 5.0 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 13 | 52 | 26 | 6.0 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 14 | 35 | 42 | 7 | 0 | 4.4 |

The material was interesting but difficult. McDunnough was entertaining.

## STA 450H1S TOPICS IN STATISTICS

Instructor(s): N. Reid

| Enr: 13 | Resp: 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Retake: $57 \%$ |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 42 | 28 | 14 | 5.4 |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 28 | 42 | 0 | 5.1 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 5.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 28 | 42 | 0 | 5.9 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 28 | 28 | 5 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 28 | 42 | 0 | 5.1 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 42 | 28 | 6.0 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 50 | 0 | 5.5 |

STA 457H1S TIME SERIES ANALYSIS
Instructor(s): M. Powojowski

| Enr: 95 | Resp: 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Meake: $35 \%$ |
| Presents | 9 | 14 | 23 | 9 | 23 | 19 | 0 | 3.8 |
| Explains | 9 | 9 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 9 | 0 | 3.7 |
| Communicates | 9 | 4 | 28 | 14 | 23 | 19 | 0 | 4.0 |
| Teaching | 9 | 4 | 9 | 28 | 19 | 19 | 9 | 4.4 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 50 | 10 | 5.4 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5 | 15 | 35 | 30 | 5.6 |
| Learn Exp | 8 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 8 | 33 | 0 | 4.0 |

Some students praised the instructor for his marking and sense of humour. But others commented that he needed to be more prepared before coming to lectures and also show more enthusiasm for the material.

APM 236H1F APPLICATIONS OF LINEAR PROGRAMMING
Instructor(s): P. Kergin

| Enr: 69 | Resp: 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Metake: 88\% |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 22 | 55 | 11 | 5.6 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 18 | 62 | 11 | 5.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 7 | 14 | 33 | 37 | 7 | 5.2 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 29 | 37 | 22 | 5.7 |
| Workload | 3 | 0 | 11 | 81 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3.8 |
| Difficulty | 3 | 0 | 18 | 66 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 3.8 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 22 | 5 | 0 | 4.3 |

In general, students were positive about the instructor, and thought he was well-organized. However, there were some complaints about the difficulty of the tests or the disparity in difficulty between them.

## APM 346H1F DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS

Instructor(s): V. Jurdjevic

| Enr: 90 | Resp: 46 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Retake: $52 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 2 | 2 | 13 | 31 | 33 | 11 | 6 | 4.5 |
| Explains | 4 | 8 | 6 | 28 | 24 | 17 | 8 | 4.5 |
| Communicates | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 17 | 46 | 22 | 5.6 |
| Teaching | 6 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 40 | 31 | 6 | 5.0 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 9 | 46 | 32 | 9 | 2 | 4.5 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 11 | 31 | 29 | 20 | 6 | 4.8 |
| Learn Exp | 5 | 2 | 8 | 32 | 23 | 23 | 2 | 4.5 |

Students were generally positive about Jurdjevic and found him enthusiastic about the material. Many complained that he was some-
times disorganized. Many felt that tutorials would have been helpful, as well as quicker feedback on work.

## APM 351Y1Y PARTIAL DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS

Instructor(s): C. Davis

| Enr: 8 | Resp: 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Retake: $40 \%$ |
| Presents | 16 | 0 | 50 | 16 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 3.2 |
| Explains | 16 | 16 | 33 | 16 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 3.0 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 16 | 6.2 |
| Teaching | 16 | 0 | 16 | 33 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 3.7 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 33 | 16 | 3 | 0 | 16 | 4.5 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 28 | 28 | 14 | 5.0 |
| Learn Exp | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 0 | 3.5 |

Students were generally dissatisfied with the course.
APM 362H1S NONLINEAR OPTIMIZATION
Instructor(s): N. Derzko

| Resp: 15 |  |  |  |  | Retake: $61 \%$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Enr: 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 6 | 0 | 33 | 33 | 26 | 0 | 4.7 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 6 | 33 | 33 | 20 | 6 | 4.9 |
| Communicates | 6 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 40 | 13 | 5.2 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 6 | 13 | 26 | 46 | 6 | 5.3 |
| Workload | 0 | 6 | 20 | 46 | 6 | 20 | 0 | 4.1 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 6 | 53 | 6 | 33 | 0 | 4.7 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 9 | 36 | 27 | 27 | 0 | 4.7 |

There was a general agreement that the instructor taught the course well, and that he was helpful, approachable and enthusiastic. There was concern about the difficulty of the text however.

## APM 421H1F MATHEMATICAL FOUNDATIONS OF QUANTUM

Instructor(s): R. Jerrard

| Enr: 14 | Resp: 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $37 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |  |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 0 | 5.0 |  |  |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 22 | 33 | 33 | 11 | 0 | 4.3 |  |  |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 33 | 22 | 11 | 5.1 |  |  |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 55 | 22 | 11 | 5.3 |  |  |
| Workload | 0 | 11 | 22 | 33 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 3.9 |  |  |
| Difficulty | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 33 | 33 | 5.6 |  |  |
| Learn Exp | 12 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 12 | 12 | 0 | 4.0 |  |  |

Students felt that Jerrard was a good instructor, but many did not find the material interesting. Students felt that the material was taught quickly, and thought that a better and more relevant textbook and more concrete examples would have been helpful.

## APM 461H1F COMBINATORICAL METHODS

Instructor(s): E. Menelsohn
Enr: 6
Resp: 5
Retake: 100\%

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 5.3 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 33 | 6.3 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 66 | 6.7 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 33 | 6.3 |
| Workload | 33 | 0 | 33 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.7 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 4.7 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 50 | 6.0 |

MAT123H1S CALCULUS AND LINEAR ALGEBRA FOR COMMERCE (A) Instructor(s): P. Kergin

| Enr: 60 | Resp: 23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Metake: 23\% |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 17 | 8 | 30 | 13 | 30 | 5.3 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 4 | 30 | 13 | 17 | 34 | 5.5 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 17 | 21 | 30 | 17 | 13 | 4.9 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 8 | 21 | 17 | 30 | 21 | 5.3 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 4 | 34 | 17 | 39 | 4 | 5.0 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 4 | 21 | 26 | 43 | 4 | 5.2 |
| Learn Exp | 8 | 0 | 8 | 58 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 4.2 |

Kergin was generally well regarded by his students, though some felt the lectures were too dry and slow-paced.

MAT 125H1S CALCULUS I (A)
Instructor(s): A. Lam
Enr: 48
Resp: 23

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 13 | 78 | 6.7 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 21 | 69 | 6.6 |
| Communicates | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 13 | 78 | 6.7 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 17 | 73 | 6.6 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 34 | 21 | 4 | 4.9 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 26 | 34 | 13 | 5.3 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 50 | 6.0 |

Students agreed that Lam was an excellent instructor, and appreciated in particular, his teaching style and enthusiasm.

## MAT 133Y1Y CALCULUS AND LINEAR ALGEBRA FOR COMMERCE

 Instructor(s): P. Kergin| Resp: 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Enr: 113 | Retake: 31\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 4 | 8 | 26 | 30 | 17 | 13 | 4.9 |
| Explains | 8 | 0 | 17 | 13 | 30 | 21 | 8 | 4.6 |
| Communicates | 8 | 0 | 8 | 34 | 17 | 17 | 13 | 4.6 |
| Teaching | 4 | 0 | 18 | 22 | 36 | 13 | 4 | 4.5 |
| Workload | 0 | 4 | 4 | 37 | 20 | 25 | 8 | 4.8 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 4 | 4 | 13 | 31 | 22 | 22 | 5.3 |
| Learn Exp | 4 | 13 | 9 | 40 | 18 | 9 | 4 | 4.0 |

More difficult examples should have been given in class. The material itself was said to be rather dull.

Instructor(s): A. Igelfeld
Enr: 73

$$
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Retake: 44\%

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Presents | 0 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 25 | 27 | 12 | 5.0 |
| Explains | 0 | 7 | 10 | 22 | 27 | 20 | 12 | 4.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 35 | 22 | 25 | 5.5 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 10 | 7 | 27 | 32 | 22 | 5.5 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 20 | 33 | 7 | 5.1 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 2 | 28 | 35 | 17 | 15 | 5.2 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 3 | 3 | 33 | 25 | 25 | 7 | 4.9 |

Igelfeld was described as a very knowledgeable instructor who was enthusiastic and able to explain concepts clearly.

Instructor(s): A. Igelfeld

| Enr: 100 | Resp: 36 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $61 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |  |
| Presents | 0 | 2 | 2 | 31 | 31 | 22 | 8 | 4.9 |  |  |
| Explains | 0 | 5 | 2 | 20 | 28 | 22 | 20 | 5.2 |  |  |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 22 | 31 | 28 | 5.7 |  |  |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 2 | 22 | 25 | 27 | 22 | 5.4 |  |  |


| Workload | 0 | 2 | 0 | 38 | 33 | 22 | 2 | 4.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Difficulty | 0 | 2 | 5 | 31 | 25 | 25 | 8 | 4.9 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 6 | 35 | 22 | 22 | 12 | 5.0 |

Many students praised Igelfeld's enthusiasm and teaching style, though some felt his lectures were a bit disorganized.

Instructor(s): J. Tate

| Enr: 129 | Resp: 119 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $44 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |  |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 29 | 57 | 6.4 |  |  |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 27 | 58 | 6.4 |  |  |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 21 | 38 | 27 | 5.7 |  |  |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 33 | 53 | 6.4 |  |  |
| Workload | 0 | 1 | 4 | 30 | 24 | 31 | 8 | 5.0 |  |  |
| Difficulty | 0 | 1 | 4 | 30 | 25 | 21 | 15 | 5.0 |  |  |
| Learn Exp | 2 | 0 | 8 | 35 | 33 | 16 | 4 | 4.6 |  |  |

Comments about the instructor were favourable, and she was well liked by students.

Instructor(s): J. Tate

| Enr: 54 | Resp: 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $53 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |  |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 17 | 78 | 6.8 |  |  |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 14 | 78 | 6.7 |  |  |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 32 | 50 | 6.2 |  |  |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 25 | 71 | 6.6 |  |  |
| Workload | 3 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 17 | 25 | 14 | 5.0 |  |  |
| Difficulty | 3 | 0 | 10 | 35 | 10 | 21 | 17 | 4.9 |  |  |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 4 | 27 | 40 | 9 | 18 | 5.1 |  |  |

Tate was praised for her ability to explain concepts clearly. The students loved her.

## MAT 135Y1Y CALCULUS I

Instructor(s): E. Le Blanc

| Enr: 220 | Resp: 84 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $48 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |  |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 20 | 45 | 25 | 5.9 |  |  |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 21 | 32 | 34 | 5.9 |  |  |
| Communicates | 0 | 1 | 5 | 20 | 26 | 24 | 22 | 5.4 |  |  |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 20 | 46 | 22 | 5.8 |  |  |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 35 | 22 | 10 | 5.1 |  |  |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 1 | 23 | 37 | 20 | 16 | 5.3 |  |  |
| Learn Exp | 3 | 3 | 5 | 48 | 20 | 13 | 6 | 4.4 |  |  |

Students felt that Le Blanc was a good instructor who was approachable, friendly and understanding.

Students had mixed opinions about the course with the majority believing it was fast paced and difficult.

Instructor(s): B. R.Yahaghi

| Resp: 27 |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: 62\% |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Enr: 68 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 3 | 11 | 14 | 29 | 33 | 7 | 5.0 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18 | 37 | 29 | 11 | 5.3 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18 | 37 | 40 | 6.1 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 3 | 25 | 33 | 25 | 11 | 5.1 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 1 | 55 | 18 | 14 | 0 | 4.4 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 7 | 44 | 29 | 7 | 11 | 4.7 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 4 | 0 | 59 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 4.3 |

Students found the instructor enthusiastic about the course material and this was reflected in the lectures. They found that he was helpful and approachable.

Instructor(s): E. Le Blanc

| Enr: 135 | Resp: 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

Students agreed that Le Blanc was a good instructor and in particular, appreciated his careful presentations of the material.

Instructor(s): A. Lam

| Enr: 185 | Resp: 147 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: 60\% |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |  |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 81 | 6.8 |  |  |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 82 | 6.8 |  |  |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 84 | 6.8 |  |  |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 82 | 6.8 |  |  |
| Workload | 0 | 1 | 2 | 37 | 35 | 15 | 7 | 4.9 |  |  |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 30 | 31 | 9 | 5.2 |  |  |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 1 | 23 | 22 | 32 | 18 | 5.4 |  |  |

Students overwhelmingly sung praises for the instructor and found that his sense of humour lightened what would otherwise be heavy material. Many students found that because of Lam's reputation, the class became quite crowded.

Instructor(s): T. Bloom

| Enr: 183 | Resp: 123 |  |  |  |  | Retake: 55\% |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 21 | 41 | 21 | 5.7 |  |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 20 | 39 | 27 | 5.8 |  |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 35 | 30 | 12 | 5.3 |  |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 18 | 44 | 25 | 5.8 |  |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 34 | 17 | 5 | 4.8 |  |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 33 | 28 | 12 | 5.3 |  |
| Learn Exp | 2 | 2 | 3 | 56 | 20 | 11 | 3 | 4.4 |  |

Students found that Bloom effectively communicated with the class. Some students found the tests difficult and tricky.

Instructor(s): M. Quintanilla

| Enr: 149 | Resp: 70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Metake: $45 \%$ |
| Presents | 2 | 1 | 10 | 37 | 27 | 12 | 8 | 4.6 |
| Explains | 1 | 2 | 10 | 22 | 34 | 21 | 7 | 4.8 |
| Communicates | 2 | 1 | 18 | 35 | 28 | 10 | 2 | 4.3 |
| Teaching | 2 | 2 | 8 | 31 | 34 | 14 | 4 | 4.5 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 44 | 14 | 8 | 5.0 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 41 | 22 | 15 | 5.3 |
| Learn Exp | 3 | 5 | 15 | 54 | 10 | 8 | 3 | 4.0 |

Students found that the instructor had difficulties communicating during the lectures, making it difficult to understand.

Instructor(s): X. Kang

| Resp: 69 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: 44\% |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Enr: 205 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |  |
| Presents | 2 | 5 | 11 | 28 | 33 | 10 | 7 | 4.4 |  |  |
| Explains | 8 | 5 | 17 | 18 | 26 | 17 | 5 | 4.2 |  |  |
| Communicates | 4 | 5 | 13 | 36 | 28 | 7 | 4 | 4.2 |  |  |
| Teaching | 7 | 4 | 10 | 27 | 37 | 7 | 5 | 4.3 |  |  |
| Workload | 0 | 1 | 2 | 40 | 37 | 10 | 7 | 4.7 |  |  |
| Difficulty | 1 | 1 | 1 | 33 | 26 | 20 | 15 | 5.4 |  |  |
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Some students had difficulties understanding the lectures. Many found the examples used in the lectures to be unhelpful. Also, the tutorials were remarked to be useless, with weekly quizzes being arduous.

Instructor(s): A. Lam

| Enr: 189 | Resp: 147 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Retake: $72 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 16 | 79 | 6.7 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 23 | 74 | 6.7 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 86 | 6.9 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 80 | 6.8 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 2 | 44 | 32 | 18 | 2 | 4.7 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 2 | 34 | 33 | 21 | 6 | 4.9 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 4 | 27 | 24 | 27 | 16 | 5.3 |

Students overwhelmingly found the instructor to be absolutely outstanding! Lam was very accountable to his students' needs. Students found tests to be difficult, but felt that Lam prepared them well.

## MAT 137Y1Y CALCULUS!

Instructor(s): G. Leuschke

| Retake: $48 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Enr: 95 | Resp: 55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 26 | 34 | 32 | 5.9 |  |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 40 | 40 | 6.2 |  |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 23 | 69 | 6.0 |  |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 38 | 44 | 6.2 |  |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 22 | 36 | 32 | 5.9 |  |
| Difficulty | 0 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 24 | 34 | 26 | 5.7 |  |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 4 | 21 | 30 | 41 | 2 | 5.2 |  |

Leuschke was thought by students to be a very good instructor, and in particular, his enthusiasm and sense of humour were well appreciated.

Instructor(s): S. Uppal
Enr: 143
Resp: 71
Retake: 59\%

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 28 | 54 | 6.3 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 14 | 32 | 45 | 6.1 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 32 | 28 | 26 | 5.7 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 14 | 42 | 39 | 6.2 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 14 | 40 | 40 | 6.1 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 23 | 43 | 21 | 5.7 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 1 | 4 | 16 | 29 | 29 | 19 | 5.4 |

Uppal was very well liked and considered an effective lecturer. Students felt he was well-prepared, knowledgeable and helpful.

Instructor(s): P. Rosenthal

| Resp: 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: 39\% |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Enr: 62 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |  |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 3 | 17 | 34 | 34 | 10 | 5.3 |  |  |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 10 | 21 | 17 | 32 | 17 | 5.2 |  |  |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 31 | 17 | 31 | 5.6 |  |  |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 41 | 17 | 5.6 |  |  |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 13 | 34 | 41 | 6.1 |  |  |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 20 | 44 | 24 | 5.8 |  |  |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 12 | 24 | 24 | 28 | 12 | 5.0 |  |  |

Students were pleased with the instructor, but found the course structure to be problematic. Students found the weekly problem sets to be far too frequent and too much work.

Instructor(s): V. Blomer

| Enr: 31 | Resp: 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $73 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |  |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 27 | 50 | 13 | 5.7 |  |  |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 27 | 31 | 27 | 5.7 |  |  |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 18 | 36 | 40 | 6.1 |  |  |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 18 | 50 | 18 | 5.7 |  |  |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 40 | 40 | 6.2 |  |  |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 59 | 22 | 6.0 |  |  |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 57 | 10 | 19 | 5.0 |  |  |

Students found the instructor to be friendly, helpful and approachable, noting that he made the lectures enjoyable. Some students found the assignments to be too difficult.

| Instructor(s): C. Consani |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Enr: 45 | Resp: 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 46 | 15 | 7 | 4.8 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 53 | 7 | 23 | 7 | 7 | 4.1 |
| Communicates | 0 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 23 | 38 | 15 | 5.2 |
| Teaching | 0 | 7 | 38 | 15 | 15 | 23 | 0 | 4.1 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 30 | 38 | 5.9 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 25 | 33 | 33 | 5.9 |
| Learn Exp | 9 | 0 | 9 | 36 | 9 | 9 | 27 | 4.7 |

Students found the instructor to be helpful overall. However, students found the weekly problem sets to be far too much work.

Instructor(s): D. Miller

| Enr: 51 | Resp: 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $27 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |  |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 36 | 26 | 21 | 5.5 |  |  |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 47 | 36 | 10 | 5.5 |  |  |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 26 | 47 | 21 | 5.8 |  |  |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 63 | 5 | 5.7 |  |  |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 44 | 44 | 6.2 |  |  |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 33 | 38 | 6.1 |  |  |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 11 | 5 | 47 | 23 | 11 | 0 | 4.2 |  |  |

Students found Miller to be enthusiastic, approachable and organized. There were complaints about the difficulty of the problem sets and tests.

Instructor(s): R. Wendt
Enr: 43

$$
\text { Resp: } 18
$$

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 5 | 44 | 22 | 27 | 0 | 4.7 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 5 | 22 | 27 | 44 | 0 | 5.1 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 38 | 33 | 0 | 5.1 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 5 | 27 | 33 | 33 | 0 | 4.9 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 41 | 47 | 6.2 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 47 | 41 | 6.2 |
| Learn Exp | 14 | 7 | 21 | 14 | 21 | 21 | 0 | 3.9 |

Most comments pertained to the difficulty and length of the problem sets, and the difficulty of the material. Also, students took issue with the policy of not marking the entire problem set.

## MAT 157Y1Y ANALYSIS I

Instructor(s): D. Bar-Natan
Enr: 85

$$
\text { Resp: } 52 \quad \text { Retake: } 86 \%
$$

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 42 | 53 | 6.5 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 29 | 53 | 6.4 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 31 | 65 | 6.6 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 27 | 68 | 6.6 |


| Workload | 0 | 0 | 6 | 36 | 25 | 17 | 14 | 5.0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 20 | 43 | 25 | 5.8 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 22 | 58 | 6.4 |

Students found Bar-Natan an enthusiastic and humorous lecturer. Students would recommend this course to those interested in pursuing math in upper years.

## MAT 223H1F LINEAR ALGEBRA I

Instructor(s): R. Stanczak

| Enr: 119 | Resp: 99 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $45 \%$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |
| Presents | 1 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 23 | 44 | 19 | 5.7 |  |
| Explains | 1 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 25 | 39 | 20 | 5.6 |  |
| Communicates | 3 | 0 | 4 | 15 | 27 | 28 | 21 | 5.3 |  |
| Teaching | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 29 | 35 | 23 | 5.7 |  |
| Workload | 1 | 1 | 5 | 52 | 22 | 11 | 5 | 4.5 |  |
| Difficulty | 0 | 2 | 3 | 37 | 28 | 20 | 8 | 4.9 |  |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 4 | 8 | 46 | 22 | 12 | 5 | 4.5 |  |

Students were very positive about the instructor, finding him wellorganized and enthusiastic. Students found he made difficult concepts easy to understand. Some students complained he was hard to understand at times, but most found the marks useful.

Instructor(s): B. Robin
Enr: 124 Resp: 56 Retake: 47\%

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Presents | 1 | 0 | 8 | 33 | 23 | 21 | 10 | 4.8 |
| Explains | 1 | 1 | 8 | 30 | 35 | 12 | 8 | 4.7 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 47 | 23 | 12 | 5.3 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 5 | 14 | 45 | 23 | 10 | 5.2 |
| Workload | 0 | 1 | 1 | 50 | 34 | 5 | 5 | 4.6 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 1 | 0 | 25 | 34 | 27 | 10 | 5.2 |
| Learn Exp | 4 | 6 | 4 | 46 | 23 | 14 | 0 | 4.2 |

Many students found that the instructor lectured too fast, and many felt his lecturing skills could be improved. Robin was a good instructor nonetheless. Many students complained that tutorials were not helpful.

## MAT 223H1S LINEAR ALGEBRA I

Instructor(s): E. Servat

| Resp: 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: 33\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Enr: 64 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |  |  |  |  |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 14 | 21 | 50 | 7 | 7 | 4.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 7 | 35 | 42 | 7 | 7 | 4.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 28 | 42 | 21 | 0 | 7 | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 7 | 46 | 38 | 0 | 7 | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 35 | 7 | 0 | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 42 | 35 | 0 | 5.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 7 | 15 | 61 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |  |

Instructor(s): A. Savage

| Resp: 43 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $53 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Enr: 92 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |  |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 53 | 37 | 6.3 |  |  |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 23 | 37 | 32 | 6.0 |  |  |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 30 | 39 | 25 | 5.9 |  |  |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 50 | 38 | 6.2 |  |  |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 13 | 32 | 34 | 11 | 6 | 4.7 |  |  |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 7 | 21 | 40 | 14 | 16 | 5.1 |  |  |
| Learn Exp | 2 | 0 | 8 | 36 | 30 | 13 | 8 | 4.7 |  |  |

Savage was well-prepared and enthusiastic. Some students found his use of examples very helpful, though others would have preferred more high level examples instead of mechanical ones from the textbook. There were also complaints about the quality of tutorials.

| Instructor(s): R. Stanczak |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Enr: 158 | Resp: 65 |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: 47\% |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 1 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 25 | 41 | 20 | 5.6 |
| Explains | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 19 | 40 | 30 | 5.8 |
| Communicates | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 19 | 33 | 38 | 5.9 |
| Teaching | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 12 | 48 | 29 | 5.9 |
| Workload | 0 | 1 | 4 | 42 | 31 | 11 | 7 | 4.7 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 1 | 31 | 34 | 19 | 12 | 5.1 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 3 | 11 | 26 | 30 | 16 | 11 | 4.8 |

Students felt Stanczak was a very good instructor, especially considering the length of the lectures and the dryness of the material.

| Instructor(s): P. Dukes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Enr: 87 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Retake: $50 \%$ |
|  | Resp: 37 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Presents | 0 | 2 | 2 | 16 | 40 | 27 | 10 | 5.2 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 40 | 32 | 5 | 5.2 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 54 | 29 | 6.1 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 27 | 54 | 10 | 5.6 |
| Workload | 2 | 2 | 0 | 35 | 37 | 16 | 5 | 4.7 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 32 | 24 | 16 | 5.3 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 9 | 45 | 36 | 4 | 4 | 4.5 |

Students found Dukes to be good. However, they found the tutorials to be useless and the tests to be unfair.

MAT 224H1F LINEAR ALGEBRA II
Instructor(s): R. Stanczak

| Resp: 35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Enr: 65 | Retake: $50 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18 | 15 | 51 | 12 | 5.5 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 22 | 45 | 22 | 5.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 22 | 45 | 22 | 5.8 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 11 | 70 | 8 | 5.8 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 3 | 39 | 24 | 15 | 18 | 5.1 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 39 | 15 | 21 | 5.3 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 31 | 21 | 10 | 5.1 |

Students found notes on the chalkboard difficult to follow, and felt that there were too many examples given. However, many students thought the instructor was good. There were many complaints about the effectiveness of the TAs and tutorials.

## MAT 224H1S LINEAR ALGEBRA II

Instructor(s): S. Homayouni

| Resp: 17 |  |  |  |  | Retake: 64\% |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Enr: 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 12 | 12 | 37 | 25 | 12 | 5.1 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 20 | 33 | 26 | 6 | 13 | 4.6 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 41 | 17 | 23 | 5.4 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 31 | 37 | 18 | 5.6 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 35 | 29 | 0 | 4.9 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 41 | 41 | 5 | 5.4 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 13 | 6 | 60 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 4.1 |

Students found the instructor to be good overall. However, they found the course marking scheme to be unfair and the tutorials to be useless.

Instructor(s): R. Stanczak

| Enr: 88 | Resp: 43 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $52 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |  |
| Presents | 0 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 28 | 33 | 19 | 5.4 |  |  |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 2 | 19 | 23 | 33 | 21 | 5.5 |  |  |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 30 | 33 | 21 | 5.6 |  |  |


|  | ASSU ANTI-CALENDAR |  |  |  |  |  |  | 147 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Teaching | 0 | 2 | 2 | 19 | 23 | 33 | 19 | 5.4 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 2 | 24 | 53 | 12 | 7 | 5.0 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 4 | 24 | 31 | 24 | 14 | 5.2 |
| Learn Exp | 3 | 0 | 15 | 42 | 27 | 9 | 3 | 4.3 |

Students found the test to be too difficult, but enjoyed the instructor. They also found the tutorials to be useless. Some students remarked that a recent review of the MAT 223 was needed to understand this course.

## MAT 235Y1Y CALCULUS II

Instructor(s): S. Uppal

| Resp: 86 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Enr: 138 | Retake: $75 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 15 | 45 | 32 | 6.0 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 20 | 46 | 25 | 5.9 |
| Communicates | 2 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 32 | 33 | 15 | 5.3 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 25 | 41 | 26 | 5.9 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 10 | 51 | 25 | 8 | 4 | 4.5 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 1 | 3 | 38 | 36 | 15 | 5 | 4.8 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 38 | 12 | 4 | 4.8 |

Uppal was described as a well-prepared and organized lecturer who explained concepts clearly and with great detail in a relaxed environment. Uppal was available for help outside lecture hours and addresses students' questions well. His notes were thought to be effective and helpful.

The exams were considered straightforward by many, though a few students expressed concerns with the level of difficulty of them. Several students suggested scheduling a tutorial for this particular course.

## MAT 237Y1Y MULTIVARIABLE CALCULUS

Instructor(s): R. Stanzcak

| Resp: 40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $61 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Enr: 71 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |  |
| Presents | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 31 | 45 | 17 | 5.7 |  |  |
| Explains | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 22 | 40 | 31 | 5.9 |  |  |
| Communicates | 2 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 23 | 38 | 23 | 5.6 |  |  |
| Teaching | 3 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 27 | 42 | 21 | 5.7 |  |  |
| Workload | 0 | 2 | 2 | 32 | 41 | 5 | 14 | 4.9 |  |  |
| Difficulty | 0 | 3 | 3 | 24 | 42 | 3 | 24 | 5.1 |  |  |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 4 | 0 | 45 | 27 | 18 | 4 | 4.7 |  |  |

Stanczak was described as a good lecturer who was well-organized and gave excellent examples in class.

A few students asked for more and better review material before exams.

MAT 244H1F INTRODUCTION TO ORDINARY DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS Instructor(s): S. Homayouni

| Resp: 67 |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: 72\% |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Enr: 113 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 20 | 34 | 32 | 5.8 |
| Explains | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 20 | 31 | 37 | 5.9 |
| Communicates | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 16 | 40 | 40 | 6.1 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 14 | 39 | 37 | 6.0 |
| Workload | 0 | 1 | 4 | 60 | 26 | 6 | 0 | 4.3 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 10 | 59 | 20 | 9 | 0 | 4.3 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 2 | 0 | 32 | 34 | 26 | 6 | 5.0 |

In general, students felt the instructor performed well and elaborated on the material with interesting examples. Also, many felt that Homayouni went the distance to really make sure that students were getting the full amount of material from the course. Some wished that the office hours could have been held later in the day, and a few felt that the tests were too long.


MAT 244H1S INTRODUCTION TO ORDINARY DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS Instructor(s): A. Tamasan
Enr: 114 Resp: 48 Retake: 76\%

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Presents | 0 | 2 | 11 | 27 | 34 | 18 | 4 | 4.7 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 6 | 20 | 32 | 30 | 9 | 5.1 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 4 | 23 | 41 | 16 | 13 | 5.1 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 25 | 44 | 9 | 5.4 |
| Workload | 2 | 4 | 4 | 59 | 14 | 7 | 7 | 4.3 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 11 | 11 | 45 | 16 | 7 | 7 | 4.2 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 3 | 50 | 19 | 23 | 3 | 4.7 |

Tamasan was said to be enthusiastic and approachable, as well as knowledgeable. Students appreciated the short breaks every hour, since the course was scheduled as a 3 hour block. Tamasan provided extra aid to students during office hours as well. However, most felt the lectures were not well-organized and criticized the instructor's penmanship and blackboard flow. In addition, some felt the problem sets were too lengthy and the midterm was too short. Students suggested administering the exam at the beginning of the lecture.

## MAT 246Y1Y CONCEPTS IN ABSTRACT MATHEMATICS

Instructor(s): J. Korman

| Resp: 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $60 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Enr: 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 28 | 21 | 35 | 5.8 |  |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 57 | 7 | 21 | 5.3 |  |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 26 | 46 | 20 | 5.8 |  |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 40 | 26 | 5.9 |  |
| Workload | 0 | 6 | 33 | 46 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 3.8 |  |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 6 | 40 | 26 | 20 | 6 | 4.8 |  |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 7 | 38 | 7 | 30 | 15 | 5.1 |  |

Students generally enjoyed Korman's lectures, saying he answered students' questions well, and was friendly and approachable. Some students would have preferred more homework exercises as well as defined guidelines for exams.

Instructor(s): P. Rosenthal

| Resp: 65 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Enr: 82 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 1 | 21 | 25 | 31 | 20 | 5.5 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 3 | 29 | 12 | 37 | 17 | 5.4 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 19 | 33 | 33 | 5.9 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 21 | 40 | 26 | 5.8 |
| Workload | 0 | 4 | 14 | 60 | 12 | 3 | 4 | 4.1 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 3 | 31 | 34 | 16 | 14 | 5.1 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 2 | 2 | 28 | 32 | 22 | 14 | 5.1 |

Many thought Rosenthal was knowledgeable and approachable. Some thought the assessment to be fair, while others would have liked longer problem sets and more exercises.

Many expressed concern about the lack of a course textbook and would have appreciated the posting of answers to problem sets and tests on the course website.

## MAT 257Y1Y ANALYSIS II

Instructor(s): J. Arthur

| Enr: 42 | Resp: 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Retake: $88 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 23 | 60 | 6.4 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 23 | 13 | 60 | 6.3 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 20 | 76 | 6.7 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 30 | 66 | 6.6 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 13 | 23 | 20 | 20 | 23 | 5.2 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 20 | 66 | 6.5 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 14 | 22 | 55 | 6.3 |

Students felt Arthur was an excellent instructor. Students were very impressed with his ability with one comment claiming, "Arthur could math his way out of a paper bag!" [ED NOTE: Obviously not an English Major!]

MAT 267H1S ADVANCED ORDINARY DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS I Instructor(s): A. Khovanskii

| Resp: 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: 52\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |  |  |  |  |
| Enr: 37 | 0 | 21 | 26 | 15 | 31 | 5 | 0 | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 15 | 36 | 26 | 21 | 0 | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 5 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 15 | 5.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Communicates | 5 | 5 | 10 | 31 | 21 | 15 | 10 | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching | 5 | 5 | 15 | 42 | 26 | 5 | 0 | 3.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Workload | 5 | 5 | 10 | 47 | 26 | 5 | 0 | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Difficulty | 5 | 5 | 23 | 35 | 17 | 11 | 0 | 3.9 |  |  |  |  |  |

Students felt the material was disorganized and lacked rigour. Some students felt Khovanskii did a reasonable job with difficult to teach material.

## MAT 301H1F GROUPS AND SYMMETRIES

Instructor(s): H. Bursztyn

| Resp: 38 |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $82 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Enr: 48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 59 | 27 | 6.1 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 21 | 45 | 21 | 5.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 21 | 43 | 29 | 6.0 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 54 | 27 | 6.1 |
| Workload | 0 | 2 | 10 | 37 | 27 | 18 | 2 | 4.6 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 8 | 8 | 40 | 35 | 2 | 5 | 4.3 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 3 | 31 | 44 | 17 | 3 | 4.9 |

Students who responded felt that Bursztyn was enthusiastic about the material, and that he covered it well. Many felt that the material was very easy, though it was well distributed between the homework and the quizzes.

Instructor(s): K.H. Lee

| Enr: 39 | Resp: 16 |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: 50\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 6 | 25 | 18 | 31 | 18 | 5.3 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 12 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 12 | 5.0 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 12 | 43 | 25 | 5.8 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 31 | 37 | 12 | 5.4 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 43 | 6 | 6 | 4.8 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 12 | 37 | 25 | 18 | 6 | 4.7 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 10 | 0 | 50 | 10 | 20 | 10 | 4.6 |

Students felt the need for more examples related to the tests and exam.

## MAT 302H1S POLYNOMIAL EQUATIONS AND FIELDS

Instructor(s): F. Murnaghan

| Resp: 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $86 \%$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Enr: 34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 28 | 35 | 21 | 5.6 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 35 | 42 | 14 | 5.6 |
| Communicates | 0 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 42 | 28 | 7 | 5.0 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 14 | 64 | 14 | 5.9 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 20 | 20 | 13 | 5.0 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 40 | 13 | 6 | 4.9 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 41 | 8 | 0 | 4.6 |

Students felt the instructor was very good. Some students felt the material was difficult and a few felt that the course notes required better labeling.

## MAT 309H1F INTRODUCTION TO MATHEMATICAL LOGIC

Instructor(s): F. Tall

| Resp: 21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $90 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Enr: 26 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |  |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 20 | 45 | 15 | 5.3 |  |  |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 20 | 25 | 20 | 25 | 10 | 4.8 |  |  |
| Communicates | 0 | 5 | 5 | 15 | 10 | 50 | 15 | 5.4 |  |  |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 4 | 14 | 19 | 42 | 19 | 5.6 |  |  |
| Workload | 0 | 4 | 19 | 57 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 4.9 |  |  |
| Difficulty | 0 | 4 | 9 | 47 | 14 | 23 | 0 | 4.4 |  |  |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 23 | 11 | 11 | 4.8 |  |  |

Students found the instructor to be very clear and precise, but some felt the need for him to go faster and follow the textbook more closely. They also commented that more examples and practice questions would be helpful.

## MAT 315H1S INTRODUCTION TO NUMBER THEORY

Instructor(s): F. Murnaghan

| Resp: 21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $54 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Enr: 71 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |  |
| Presents | 4 | 4 | 8 | 24 | 32 | 20 | 8 | 4.7 |  |  |
| Explains | 4 | 4 | 12 | 28 | 20 | 20 | 12 | 4.6 |  |  |
| Communicates | 4 | 0 | 12 | 28 | 36 | 16 | 4 | 4.6 |  |  |
| Teaching | 4 | 0 | 8 | 28 | 40 | 16 | 4 | 4.6 |  |  |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 4 | 20 | 40 | 24 | 12 | 5.2 |  |  |
| Difficulty | 0 | 4 | 0 | 24 | 36 | 24 | 12 | 5.1 |  |  |
| Learn Exp | 4 | 9 | 14 | 38 | 14 | 19 | 0 | 4.0 |  |  |

Overall, students felt Murnaghan was a good lecturer. Students found Murnaghan to be very approachable and quite helpful. Some students expressed concern about the difficulty of the material.

MAT 327H1F INTRODUCTION TO TOPOLOGY
Instructor(s): R. McCann

| Enr: 31 | Resp: 21 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: 84\% |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |  |
| Presents | 0 | 5 | 11 | 11 | 50 | 5 | 16 | 4.9 |  |  |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 10 | 26 | 31 | 10 | 21 | 5.1 |  |  |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 10 | 30 | 45 | 6.1 |  |  |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 30 | 35 | 25 | 5.7 |  |  |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 38 | 23 | 33 | 5.9 |  |  |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 23 | 47 | 23 | 5.9 |  |  |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 5 | 0 | 29 | 17 | 17 | 29 | 5.3 |  |  |

The class was taught using the Moore method where students are expected to present theorems. Most students found the method interesting and McCann great. However, some students thought that more time could be spent on lecturing and providing more motivation for the material being discussed. The overall feeling was that the class was worthwhile and valuable.

## MAT 334H1S COMPLEX VARIABLES

Instructor(s): D. Slepcev

| Resp: 52 |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $65 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Enr: 114 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 1 | 0 | 21 | 29 | 27 | 19 | 5.4 |
| Explains | 0 | 2 | 6 | 24 | 32 | 26 | 10 | 5.0 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 32 | 32 | 14 | 5.4 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 7 | 19 | 21 | 40 | 11 | 5.63 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 44 | 16 | 6 | 5.0 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 4 | 39 | 29 | 20 | 6 | 4.9 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 5 | 5 | 37 | 22 | 25 | 2 | 4.7 |

Students felt that this course was interesting and well taught. Slepcev expressed interest in the material, which was occasionally a little dry. Some students complained about a lack of sufficient examples and a poor textbook.

## MAT 335H1S CHAOS, FRACTALS AND DYNAMICS

Instructor(s): D. Burbulla

| Enr: 59 | Resp: 25 |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $90 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |
| Presents | 0 | 4 | 4 | 16 | 40 | 8 | 28 | 5.3 |  |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 12 | 16 | 32 | 16 | 24 | 5.2 |  |
| Communicates | 0 | 8 | 0 | 20 | 36 | 20 | 16 | 5.1 |  |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 36 | 28 | 20 | 5.5 |  |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 16 | 58 | 20 | 4 | 0 | 4.1 |  |
| Difficulty | 0 | 4 | 4 | 54 | 25 | 12 | 0 | 4.4 |  |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 5 | 0 | 17 | 41 | 35 | 0 | 5.0 |  |

Students generally liked Burbulla, appreciating his clear, straightforward teaching style. The problem sets were found to be helpful, though opinions were mixed concerning the textbook.

## MAT 344H1S INTRODUCTION TO COMBINATORICS

Instructor(s): P. Garfield

| Enr: 91 | Resp: 47 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Retake: $93 \%$ |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 17 | 34 | 40 | 6.0 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 17 | 25 | 46 | 6.1 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 14 | 27 | 48 | 6.2 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 40 | 44 | 6.2 |
| Workload | 2 | 6 | 17 | 57 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 3.9 |
| Difficulty | 2 | 4 | 23 | 53 | 12 | 2 | 2 | 3.9 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 2 | 33 | 27 | 30 | 5 | 5.0 |

Students thought Garfield was an entertaining and effective lecturer. Some felt he followed the textbook too closely and would have preferred more challenging material. Also, the quizzes took too much time away from lectures.

## MAT 347Y1Y GROUPS, RINGS AND FIELDS

Instructor(s): A. del Junco
Enr: 16
Resp: 8
Retake: 71\%

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 25 | 50 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 4.2 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 12 | 25 | 50 | 0 | 12 | 4.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 37 | 25 | 0 | 4.9 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 71 | 0 | 14 | 5.1 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 12 | 37 | 25 | 5.6 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 62 | 12 | 5.6 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 40 | 20 | 20 | 5.2 |

Students liked the course, but thought the course work to be too time consuming and computational in nature.

## MAT 354H1F COMPLEX ANALYSIS I

Instructor(s): E. Bierstone

| Enr: 31 | Resp: 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $94 \%$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 15 | 73 | 6.6 |  |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 26 | 52 | 6.2 |  |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 31 | 52 | 6.2 |  |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 26 | 63 | 6.5 |  |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 44 | 11 | 22 | 5.3 |  |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 11 | 50 | 22 | 5.8 |  |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 13 | 26 | 40 | 5.9 |  |

Students felt the course was awesome, the instructor incredible and the lectures amazing. They were concerned about the difficulty of the midterm and problem sets.


MAT 363H1S INTRODUCTION TO DIFFERENTIAL GEOMETRY
Instructor(s): E. Meinrenken
Enr: 29

$$
\text { Resp: } 17
$$

Retake: 86\%

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 29 | 52 | 6.4 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 23 | 52 | 6.3 |
| Communicates | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 17 | 47 | 23 | 5.6 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 64 | 23 | 6.1 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 12 | 81 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3.9 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 18 | 68 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 4.4 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 40 | 13 | 6 | 4.9 |

Students thought Meinrenken to be a very good instructor, and particularly appreciated the organization and structure of his lectures.

## MAT 365H1S CLASSICAL GEOMETRIES

Instructor(s): A. Khovanskii
Enr: 12

$$
\text { Resp: } 7
$$

Retake: 100\%

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 42 | 42 | 6.1 |
| Explains | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 57 | 6.0 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 7.0 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 14 | 71 | 6.6 |
| Workload | 0 | 28 | 42 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.0 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 14 | 57 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.1 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 20 | 60 | 6.2 |

Students praised the instructor, particularly for his enthusiasm and approachability. Some students stated that it was one of the best classes they had ever taken.

## MAT 391H1S HISTORY OF MATHEMATICS AFTER 1700

Instructor(s): C. Fraser

| Enr: 79 | Resp: 46 |  |  |  |  |  | Retake: $70 \%$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |  |
| Presents | 0 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 28 | 32 | 19 | 5.3 |  |
| Explains | 0 | 2 | 4 | 17 | 26 | 31 | 17 | 5.3 |  |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 4 | 17 | 20 | 28 | 28 | 5.6 |  |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 26 | 32 | 23 | 5.6 |  |
| Workload | 0 | 4 | 4 | 64 | 17 | 6 | 2 | 4.2 |  |
| Difficulty | 0 | 4 | 2 | 65 | 15 | 8 | 4 | 4.3 |  |
| Learn Exp | 5 | 5 | 0 | 36 | 13 | 25 | 13 | 4.8 |  |

The grading was too harsh, and the test was too difficult. However, Fraser was a good lecturer. He knew his material well and was able to convey the concepts to his students clearly. He also injected humour into his lectures.

## MAT 454H1S COMPLEX ANALYSIS II

Instructor(s): T. Bloom
Enr: 22

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 28 | 6.3 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 28 | 6.3 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 57 | 6.6 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 42 | 6.4 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 4.5 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 28 | 14 | 14 | 5.0 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 57 | 14 | 5.9 |

Students thought highly of the instructor, and found the course to be "excellent".


