

CHEMISTRY STUDENTS' UNION

6	12.011 ±4,2	16	32.06 ±2,4,6
4470* 4100*	C	717.75 388.36	S
2.62	1s ² s ² p ² Carbon	2.07	[Ne]3s ² p ⁴ Sulfur

92	238.029 6,5,4,3
4407 1405	U
18.90	[Rn]5f ⁶ d ³ 7s ² Uranium

Introduction

The Chemistry Students' Union (CSU) is a student run organization acting as the representative voice for all undergraduate students enrolled in a chemistry course. We hold social and academic events which strive to bring together students who share an interest in the discipline. If you want to get involved, please contact us at csu@chem.utoronto.ca or check out our website www.chem.utoronto.ca/students/csui.

CSU Executive

CHM 138H1F Introductory Organic Chemistry I

Instructor(s): M. Winnik; J. Chin

Enr: 349	Resp: 239		Retake: 72%					
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Winnik:								
Presents	0	0	3	8	27	38	21	5.6
Explains	0	2	1	11	21	44	18	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	3	17	33	44	6.2
Teaching	0	0	1	7	19	42	28	5.39
Chin:								
Presents	1	1	4	16	26	33	16	5.3
Explains	0	2	8	18	29	27	14	5.1
Communicates	1	2	6	15	26	30	17	5.2
Teaching	0	2	3	14	27	36	15	5.4
Course:								
Workload	1	0	0	34	36	20	6	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	26	40	25	5	5.0
Learn Exp	0	1	0	30	25	32	8	5.1

Most students felt that Winnik was funny, likeable and put forth great enthusiasm in teaching. Some students expressed discomfort regarding the constant switching between powerpoint and overhead notes, and also that the course became rushed near the end. Numerous students felt that the lab material should have related more closely to the lectures and that the lab text did not reflect its value.

Most students felt that Chin was approachable, interesting and was able to convey the material clearly. Some students felt that he could have interacted with the students more. Issues regarding the lab included the lack of relevancy between the labs and the lectures. Several students mentioned that the test was too lengthy for the time provided and also the course material did not reflect its complexity.

Instructor(s): S. Browning

Enr: 349	Resp: 224		Retake: 73%					
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	3	14	41	40	6.2

Explains	0	0	0	6	17	38	36	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	2	6	32	58	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	1	12	38	46	6.3
Workload	0	0	1	35	33	22	5	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	30	36	24	6	5.0
Learn Exp	0	2	2	29	23	36	6	5.1

Most students found the material to be presented in a well-organized and interesting manner. Students felt that Browning was very enthusiastic and helpful. Some however, felt that the course would have benefitted from the use of more examples in the lectures. It was also felt that a more relevant lab textbook would have been helpful.

Instructor(s): M. Winnik; J. Chin

Enr: 436	Resp: 326		Retake: 65%					
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Winnik:								
Presents	0	0	3	13	31	33	18	5.5
Explains	0	0	3	11	26	35	23	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	7	17	30	43	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	7	25	37	27	5.8
Chin:								
Presents	0	2	3	20	29	31	12	5.2
Explains	0	1	7	16	31	29	12	5.1
Communicates	3	2	8	23	29	21	11	4.8
Teaching	0	1	7	16	30	30	13	5.2
Course:								
Workload	0	0	0	38	32	20	8	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	2	35	33	19	9	5.0
Learn Exp	1	0	2	26	31	27	10	5.1

Students thought that Winnik was a good instructor who presented the lectures with amazing enthusiasm. A few students thought that the lectures would have been more understandable if he had paced himself. A few complaints were received about the length of the test.

Students appreciated Chin's effort but thought the lectures would improve greatly if more enthusiasm was shown. A few students felt that the notes could have been organized better, and that the pace of the lectures could have been faster.

Instructor(s): S. Browning

Enr: 436	Resp: 317		Retake: 68%					
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	1	17	37	43	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	3	16	37	41	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	2	10	29	57	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	1	13	36	47	6.3
Workload	0	0	0	39	27	22	9	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	1	36	33	19	9	5.0
Learn Exp	1	0	2	29	28	24	12	5.1

Browning was a favourite amongst the students. His enthusiasm towards chemistry and teaching inspired many. The complaints from students were mostly directed towards the labs and its lack of relevance to the course material and also the apathy of the co-ordinators. Some students felt that the tests were too lengthy for the time allotted. Also, the lecture material did not reflect the complexity of the tests.

Instructor(s): K. Quinlan

Enr: 288	Resp: 181		Retake: 69%					
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	1	2	11	35	47	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	5	10	41	42	6.2
Communicates	0	0	1	2	14	34	47	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	2	10	40	45	6.3
Workload	0	0	2	32	28	24	10	5.0
Difficulty	0	1	4	35	30	23	5	4.9
Learn Exp	0	1	3	31	24	25	13	5.1

16 CHEMISTRY

Students thought Quinlan to be kind, helpful and well-prepared. She guided students well through material that was very challenging. The labs were uninteresting and irrelevant to the course material. Students complained that the lab co-ordinator was unapproachable.

CHM 138H1S Introductory Organic Chemistry I

Instructor(s): M. Winnik; S. Browning

Enr: 343	Resp: 134							Retake: 83%	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
<u>Winnik:</u>									
Presents	0	0	0	3	21	42	31		6.0
Explains	0	0	0	5	17	38	37		6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	3	17	37	41		6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	2	21	42	32		6.0
<u>Browning:</u>									
Presents	0	0	2	3	21	45	28		5.9
Explains	0	0	2	11	28	35	22		5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	4	18	37	39		6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	6	23	45	23		5.8
<u>Course:</u>									
Workload	0	2	0	38	39	14	4		4.8
Difficulty	0	1	2	42	34	15	4		4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	26	40	25	7		5.1

Students thought that both instructors conveyed the material effectively and enthusiastically. Their powerpoint presentations were organized, clear and helpful - these were also available before lectures allowing students to clarify the material and ask questions in class. Both teachers were also friendly, approachable and humorous.

Instructor(s): M. Nitz

Enr: 343	Resp: 118							Retake: 85%	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	0	0	9	26	43	20		5.8
Explains	0	0	0	5	24	41	28		5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	6	32	39	21		5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	6	21	45	25		5.9
Workload	0	0	1	40	36	14	6		4.8
Difficulty	0	0	3	43	33	13	5		4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	32	31	28	6		5.1

Students found Nitz to be a good instructor especially since it was his first year teaching. They found Nitz's slides to be good study tools and applauded his examples which helped illustrate the course's content. He was approachable, patient with students' questions, and funny, making this class an enjoyable experience.

Instructor(s): S. Browning; M. Winnik

Enr: 459	Resp: 318							Retake: 75%	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
<u>Browning:</u>									
Presents	0	0	2	11	24	39	21		5.6
Explains	1	0	5	13	24	37	17		5.4
Communicates	0	0	2	5	17	38	35		6.0
Teaching	0	0	1	9	22	35	28		5.7
<u>Winnik:</u>									
Presents	0	0	0	7	24	38	28		5.9
Explains	0	0	0	5	22	35	34		5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	4	17	35	40		6.1
Teaching	0	0	1	6	17	41	32		6.0
<u>Course:</u>									
Workload	0	1	2	45	33	12	4		4.7
Difficulty	1	1	3	44	32	13	3		4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	1	32	36	20	7		4.9

Browning and Winnik paced and organized their lectures well. Their instruction was clear, funny and informative. Students appreciated the use of powerpoint presentations and their advance posting. They also liked the way the instructors answered questions - very "comprehensible"

and thorough. Winnik provided ample examples and good diagrams; Browning needed to show more examples so students could understand the material better. Overall, students recommended taking the course because it was fun and interesting.

Instructor(s): M. Nitz

Enr: 459	Resp: 302							Retake: 75%	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	0	1	10	30	36	20		5.6
Explains	0	1	2	10	25	32	28		5.7
Communicates	0	0	3	13	30	37	14		5.4
Teaching	0	0	1	9	27	36	24		5.7
Workload	0	1	2	46	31	13	3		4.6
Difficulty	2	1	3	45	31	12	3		4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	2	30	39	19	7		4.9

Nitz was very good at explaining concepts clearly and helping students out with any of their concerns. He was nervous in the beginning as he was new, but greatly improved as the course progressed. He instituted review sessions before the exam, which students found very useful. His professionalism, passion for teaching and in-depth knowledge of the material was evident throughout his teaching.

CHM 139H1F Chemistry: Physical Principles

Instructor(s): C. Goh; S. Browning

Enr: 396	Resp: 130							Retake: 47%	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
<u>Goh:</u>									
Presents	3	4	7	23	39	16	5		4.6
Explains	3	3	10	28	32	14	4		4.5
Communicates	1	1	3	17	36	28	9		5.1
Teaching	2	1	12	23	36	16	7		4.7
<u>Browning:</u>									
Presents	1	0	0	14	41	29	12		5.3
Explains	0	1	3	13	36	30	13		5.3
Communicates	0	0	1	7	24	40	24		5.7
Teaching	1	0	4	10	39	23	16		5.3
<u>Course:</u>									
Workload	0	0	1	39	37	12	8		4.9
Difficulty	0	0	1	33	31	20	12		5.1
Learn Exp	2	1	10	46	23	10	2		4.3

Some students felt that the practice problems did not reflect the complexity of the test questions. It was also felt that the labs could have corresponded better with the lectures. Goh was thought to be very enthusiastic but, at times, somewhat confusing and disorganized.

Students felt that Browning was very enthusiastic.

Instructor(s): S. Browning; C. Goh

Enr: 387	Resp: 129							Retake: 55%	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
<u>Browning:</u>									
Presents	1	0	3	15	29	36	12		5.3
Explains	0	1	2	15	35	28	15		5.3
Communicates	0	0	3	7	23	40	24		5.7
Teaching	0	2	2	20	34	28	11		5.2
<u>Goh:</u>									
Presents	0	0	4	30	30	20	11		5.0
Explains	0	3	5	21	35	25	8		5.0
Communicates	0	1	3	11	27	38	16		5.5
Teaching	0	2	4	17	35	29	10		5.2
<u>Course:</u>									
Workload	0	0	2	48	20	20	7		4.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	28	38	20	11		5.1
Learn Exp	2	4	5	41	28	12	3		4.4

CHM 139H1S Chemistry: Physical Principles

Instructor(s): K. Quinlan; R. Miller

Enr: 352

Resp: 164

Retake: 58%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Quinlan:</u>								
Presents	0	0	1	7	19	47	22	5.8
Explains	0	1	2	10	18	41	25	5.7
Communicates	0	0	2	10	31	35	18	5.5
Teaching	0	1	0	11	23	41	20	5.6
<u>Miller:</u>								
Presents	0	0	1	14	30	36	15	5.4
Explains	0	0	5	14	29	32	16	5.4
Communicates	0	0	1	4	17	42	33	6.0
Teaching	1	0	0	11	27	43	14	5.5
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	0	39	33	17	9	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	2	34	34	22	5	4.9
Learn Exp	1	2	2	42	26	18	5	4.7

Students found the demonstrations from both instructors helpful and interesting as these "created a correlation between the lecture material and the laboratory experience." Both teachers made the class enjoyable, and very informative. Miller and Quinlan were approachable, enthusiastic and effective. Some students thought that more mathematical examples would have been beneficial.

Instructor(s): K. Quinlan; R. Miller

Enr: 304

Resp: 154

Retake: 67%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Quinlan:</u>								
Presents	0	0	2	9	17	34	34	5.9
Explains	0	0	1	8	22	33	33	5.9
Communicates	0	0	3	11	26	35	24	5.7
Teaching	0	1	2	9	19	39	26	5.7
<u>Miller:</u>								
Presents	0	1	5	17	23	28	24	5.4
Explains	0	0	5	17	19	27	28	5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	4	11	28	55	6.3
Teaching	0	0	1	14	21	34	27	5.7
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	0	39	35	19	4	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	1	33	37	21	5	4.9
Learn Exp	0	1	2	48	23	16	6	4.7

Students certainly viewed Quinlan and Miller's demonstrations very positively as these linked lecture material with laboratory work. Both instructors taught effectively - very clear explanations and sufficient examples were provided. They were also enthusiastic, organized and helpful. Their slides were helpful in structuring the lectures.

Instructor(s): M. Staikova; K. Quinlan

Enr: 251

Resp: 48

Retake: 45%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Staikova:</u>								
Presents	0	2	6	21	30	26	13	5.1
Explains	2	6	26	11	22	20	11	4.5
Communicates	2	6	17	28	34	6	4	4.2
Teaching	4	2	10	27	31	19	4	4.6
<u>Quinlan:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	2	23	38	36	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	4	10	42	42	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	8	17	36	38	6.0
Teaching	0	0	2	6	12	40	38	6.1
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	4	0	42	25	17	10	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	6	42	21	19	10	4.9
Learn Exp	2	0	15	41	23	15	2	4.4

Students thought of Quinlan as an effective, enthusiastic and caring

instructor. She provided ample examples to illustrate the concepts clearly. She made good use of the overhead projector by showing students how to solve problems in stages. Staikova was engaging and patient in answering students' questions, but was a little unclear at times. Students found the labs long and tedious. They claimed that the often felt "rushed" to complete the reports.

CHM 151Y1Y Chemistry: The Molecular Science

Instructor(s): R. Kluger; P. Brumer

Enr: 75

Resp: 47

Retake: 50%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Kluger:</u>								
Presents	0	0	2	23	25	38	10	5.3
Explains	4	0	6	25	34	21	8	4.8
Communicates	2	0	4	8	39	26	19	5.4
Teaching	2	2	2	12	36	31	12	5.3
<u>Brumer:</u>								
Presents	6	8	13	28	32	10	0	4.0
Explains	2	4	13	30	19	23	6	4.6
Communicates	2	0	6	11	20	33	26	5.5
Teaching	2	6	10	19	23	26	10	4.8
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	2	38	26	20	13	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	2	8	42	26	20	5.5
Learn Exp	0	5	5	28	30	23	7	4.8

Students found Kluger to be enthusiastic and well-organized with good lecture notes. He made the difficult material interesting, and easier to understand; however, students felt the exam was extremely difficult.'

Brumer was very enthusiastic about the course material. He expressed genuine interest in the students. People enjoyed the physical section, but felt that a true/false test wasn't the best method to evaluate their knowledge.

Instructor(s): R. Morris

Enr: 75

Resp: 45

Retake: 50%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	17	46	20	15	5.3
Explains	0	0	8	17	28	26	17	5.3
Communicates	4	6	18	20	18	15	15	4.5
Teaching	0	0	4	26	33	28	6	5.1
Workload	0	0	2	39	27	13	16	5.0
Difficulty	0	2	0	11	39	27	18	5.5
Learn Exp	0	2	5	26	29	26	8	5.0

Morris was enthusiastic about chemistry, and tried to transmit this to the class. Students wished that required readings had been assigned to better help them study the material.

CHM 217H1F Introduction to Analytical Chemistry

Instructor(s): D. Stone

Enr: 59

Resp: 41

Retake: 68%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	2	19	26	34	17	5.4
Explains	0	0	2	24	39	21	12	5.2
Communicates	0	0	0	9	17	41	31	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	14	17	43	24	5.8
Workload	2	0	2	45	20	25	5	4.8
Difficulty	2	0	2	57	25	12	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	3	37	25	25	9	5.0

Students felt that Stone was very helpful and approachable in both labs and classes. The course material was explained clearly and effectively. Many students thought the labs were time consuming but very helpful. Some students felt tutorials were not very useful.

18 CHEMISTRY

CHM 220H1F Physical Chemistry for Life Sciences

Instructor(s): G. Scholes

	Enr: 495							Mean
	Resp: 350				Retake: 20%			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	13	13	25	28	12	4	1	3.3
Explains	7	11	20	28	21	7	3	3.8
Communicates	9	8	15	26	28	7	4	4.0
Teaching	8	9	15	32	20	9	3	3.9
Workload	1	2	5	60	20	7	1	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	3	35	35	15	9	4.9
Learn Exp	12	13	17	42	8	3	1	3.4

Although most students considered Scholes a "nice guy", they found him to be somewhat disorganized. The second test was too long and did not reflect the course work. The textbook chosen was too advanced for this course. Students also complained that it was too difficult to read the instructor's overheads. This problem was made worse because the lecture material was not available online.

CHM 221H1S Physical Chemistry: The Molecular Viewpoint

Instructor(s): S. Whittington

	Enr: 55							Mean
	Resp: 36				Retake: 36%			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	2	2	8	37	34	14	5.4
Explains	0	2	2	14	20	42	17	5.5
Communicates	0	2	2	5	20	42	25	5.7
Teaching	0	2	0	2	31	37	25	5.8
Workload	0	0	5	54	22	14	2	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	2	29	23	29	14	5.2
Learn Exp	0	0	4	50	31	13	0	4.5

Students found Whittington to be amazing. He was lucid in explaining very difficult concepts. The problem sets were generally found challenging, but were good preparation for the test.

Students found the reliance on mathematical concepts challenging, and felt that second year calculus should have been a co-requisite.

CHM 225Y1Y Introduction to Physical Chemistry

Instructor(s): S. Whittington

	Enr: 93							Mean
	Resp: 67				Retake: 45%			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	3	16	28	25	25	5.5
Explains	0	3	5	18	31	20	21	5.2
Communicates	0	0	1	8	27	28	33	5.8
Teaching	0	0	3	5	26	38	26	5.8
Workload	0	3	4	46	27	13	4	4.6
Difficulty	1	1	0	21	28	21	25	5.4
Learn Exp	5	1	3	33	35	7	11	4.6

The problem sets were generally difficult, but were a useful tool in preparing for the tests. Students found the instructor very helpful and he explained the concepts clearly.

CHM 238Y1Y Introduction to Inorganic Chemistry

Instructor(s): J. Powell

	Enr: 106							Mean
	Resp: 82				Retake: 42%			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	15	12	19	20	20	8	2	3.6
Explains	8	5	14	25	21	17	6	4.3
Communicates	3	1	7	23	29	22	6	4.6
Teaching	7	10	17	16	29	12	5	4.1
Workload	1	0	3	21	21	18	33	5.5
Difficulty	1	1	1	21	27	20	26	5.4
Learn Exp	5	3	7	33	21	19	7	4.5

Powell's lectures were disorganized at times. The midterm tests did not reflect the material learned in class, and the standards for grading was too high. Though Powell was enthusiastic, he was unable

to communicate the goals of the course effectively for all students.

Instructor(s): I. Manners; S. Browning

	Enr: 106							Mean
	Resp: 83				Retake: 49%			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<u>Manners:</u>								
Presents	0	0	6	16	28	32	16	5.4
Explains	0	1	0	21	32	31	13	5.3
Communicates	0	2	11	20	32	23	10	4.9
Teaching	1	0	1	20	33	28	14	5.3
<u>Browning:</u>								
Presents	0	0	1	7	20	38	32	5.9
Explains	0	0	1	8	33	32	24	5.7
Communicates	0	1	0	9	15	34	39	6.0
Teaching	1	0	0	11	26	32	28	5.7
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	1	0	0	25	24	27	21	5.4
Difficulty	1	0	2	22	32	20	20	5.3
Learn Exp	1	3	9	32	25	16	11	4.7

Students found the lab work arduous, but informative and useful. Both teachers were organized, approachable and clear. Browning was very enthusiastic and creative with his presentations. He made the slides available before class so students were able to use these well. Manners structured his lectures efficiently, but he spoke very softly so it was difficult for students to hear what he was discussing. He was a bit dry in his presentation of the material - he wrote on the board mostly facing away from students.

CHM 247H1F Introductory Organic Chemistry II

Instructor(s): A. Dicks

	Enr: 331							Mean
	Resp: 247				Retake: 61%			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	1	5	24	67	6.6
Explains	0	0	0	2	9	31	55	6.4
Communicates	0	0	0	3	9	30	56	6.4
Teaching	0	0	1	2	8	24	63	6.5
Workload	0	0	1	31	27	26	12	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	2	29	30	21	16	5.2
Learn Exp	0	1	3	21	31	28	12	5.2

There was an overwhelming appreciation for Dicks' ability as an instructor. He demonstrated the ability to explain concepts clearly, which was supplemented by organized notes. Tests were found increasingly difficult. Students must be prepared to memorize structures, reactions, and mechanisms which lay at the foundation of organic chemistry.

CHM 247H1S Introductory Organic Chemistry II

Instructor(s): A. Dicks; S. Skonieczny

	Enr: 380							Mean
	Resp: 250				Retake: 47%			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<u>Dicks:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	2	9	37	51	6.4
Explains	0	0	0	5	16	39	38	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	5	12	31	49	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	4	9	40	45	6.3
<u>Skonieczny:</u>								
Presents	0	0	6	17	34	29	10	5.1
Explains	1	0	8	19	30	29	11	5.1
Communicates	1	0	2	14	33	26	21	5.4
Teaching	0	1	3	16	31	31	14	5.3
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	2	24	28	27	17	5.3
Difficulty	0	0	1	17	29	31	19	5.5
Learn Exp	1	3	8	41	33	9	4	4.5

Dicks was widely praised by students for his engaging lectures, multicoloured notes and helpfulness outside of class.

Students felt that Skonieczny delivered effective lectures but that his notes were often difficult to read and should have been posted online.

The main complaint from students was that tests were too difficult and too long for the time allotted.

Instructor(s): A. Dicks; S. Skonieczny

Enr: 338		Resp: 158					Retake: 52%		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
<u>Dicks:</u>									
Presents	0	0	0	3	12	39	42	6.2	
Explains	0	1	0	5	21	39	32	5.9	
Communicates	0	0	1	3	16	35	43	6.1	
Teaching	0	0	1	5	14	35	41	6.1	
<u>Skonieczny:</u>									
Presents	2	1	7	21	33	23	9	4.9	
Explains	0	1	9	21	27	26	11	5.0	
Communicates	1	1	9	20	26	24	14	5.0	
Teaching	1	2	5	18	33	26	11	5.0	
<u>Course:</u>									
Workload	0	0	1	23	31	26	16	5.3	
Difficulty	0	0	0	17	36	22	21	5.4	
Learn Exp	3	2	6	38	26	17	4	4.5	

Students thought that Dicks was a well-organized instructor. He was very generous in offering extra help and was a credit to an otherwise difficult and frustrating course.

Skonieczny was very helpful in offering extra office hours for students, although many found his lectures to be somewhat unorganized.

Many students felt that there was not enough time allowed for tests. The course material was difficult and there was too much emphasis on memorization. Students also complained that there was too much lecture material for a half year course, and because the tests were short, they did not provide a fair assessment of the students' understanding of the material.

Instructor(s): M. Lautens

Enr: 70		Resp: 38					Retake: 33%		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	0	13	31	44	10	5.5	
Explains	0	0	2	13	31	39	13	5.5	
Communicates	0	2	0	18	34	31	13	5.3	
Teaching	0	0	0	18	32	40	8	5.4	
Workload	2	2	0	24	35	16	18	5.1	
Difficulty	2	0	2	15	21	23	34	5.6	
Learn Exp	3	3	6	54	19	9	3	4.3	

Lautens explained concepts very well. He was also very effective at answering students' questions.

CHM 249H1S Organic Chemistry

Instructor(s): R. Batey

Enr: 38		Resp: 27					Retake: 84%		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	0	11	18	29	40	6.0	
Explains	0	0	3	7	14	22	51	6.1	
Communicates	0	0	0	7	11	33	48	6.2	
Teaching	0	0	0	7	11	29	51	6.3	
Workload	0	0	3	22	51	14	7	5.0	
Difficulty	0	0	3	37	33	18	7	4.9	
Learn Exp	0	0	9	13	22	22	31	5.5	

Batey was extremely enthusiastic and made the course material manageable. He provided "real life examples of where the compounds occur, effectively linking the course with live situations." His willingness to help students was much appreciated. Though the workload was high, students still enjoyed their experience with Batey.

CHM 310H1S Environmental Chemistry

Instructor(s): S. Mabury

Enr: 133		Resp: 74					Retake: 56%		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	6	6	17	24	26	13	4	4.1	
Explains	1	2	9	24	34	17	9	4.8	
Communicates	0	0	1	4	12	38	43	6.2	
Teaching	0	0	8	11	29	38	12	5.4	
Workload	0	0	4	38	33	19	4	4.8	
Difficulty	0	0	1	28	45	19	5	5.0	
Learn Exp	1	3	6	39	31	13	3	4.5	

Students found Mabury to be an enthusiastic, knowledgeable lecturer, but found his pace to be too fast. It would have been helpful to have more explanation of the lecture notes.

CHM 317H1S Introduction to Instrumental Methods of Analysis

Instructor(s): M. Thompson

Enr: 40		Resp: 17					Retake: 76%		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	17	23	17	23	17	5.0	
Explains	0	0	11	17	17	29	23	5.4	
Communicates	0	0	5	5	29	17	41	5.8	
Teaching	0	0	5	17	23	17	35	5.6	
Workload	0	0	0	56	31	12	0	4.6	
Difficulty	0	0	0	64	35	0	0	4.4	
Learn Exp	7	0	7	21	21	21	21	5.0	

Thompson was enthusiastic, knowledgeable and made himself available to students. Some students thought the course was focussed too much on the textbook.

CHM 325H1S Materials Chemistry

Instructor(s): I. Manners; K. Landskron

Enr: 71		Resp: 45					Retake: 70%		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
<u>Manners:</u>									
Presents	0	0	0	9	22	38	29	5.9	
Explains	0	0	0	6	25	37	30	5.9	
Communicates	0	0	2	0	32	32	32	5.9	
Teaching	0	0	0	8	15	42	33	6.0	
<u>Landskron:</u>									
Presents	7	14	14	33	11	14	4	3.9	
Explains	18	9	131	11	22	6	0	3.3	
Communicates	14	14	19	19	21	7	4	3.6	
Teaching	18	13	20	20	20	6	0	3.3	
<u>Course:</u>									
Workload	6	8	28	51	4	0	0	3.4	
Difficulty	2	13	13	62	4	2	2	3.7	
Learn Exp	7	10	0	35	28	10	7	4.3	

Manners was a well-organized, enthusiastic and knowledgeable instructor, who developed an excellent rapport with students.

Landskron's inability to explain concepts clearly made it difficult for students to do well in the course. However, students did find him very approachable and enthusiastic, and were confident his lecturing skills will approve with experience.

CHM 326H1F Introductory Quantum Mechanics and Spectroscopy

Instructor(s): D. Lidar

Enr: 23		Resp: 19					Retake: 53%		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	5	11	23	35	23	5.6	
Explains	0	0	11	5	47	17	17	5.2	
Communicates	0	0	0	29	35	17	17	5.2	
Teaching	0	0	0	41	29	17	11	5.0	
Workload	0	0	0	11	35	35	17	5.6	
Difficulty	0	0	0	5	23	41	29	5.9	

20 CHEMISTRY

Learn Exp 0 7 0 38 38 0 15 4.7

Students felt that this course had a heavy workload and that the test was extremely long.

CHM 328H1S Modern Physical Chemistry

Instructor(s): R. Kapral

	Enr: 12				Resp: 10			Retake: 55%		Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
Presents	0	0	10	10	0	40	40		5.9	
Explains	0	0	10	10	10	40	30		5.7	
Communicates	10	0	10	0	20	30	30		5.3	
Teaching	0	0	10	0	0	50	40		6.1	
Workload	0	0	0	22	33	44	0		5.2	
Difficulty	0	0	0	22	0	77	0		5.6	
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	28	28	42		6.1	

Some students wanted the lecture material to be better integrated with the applications, by using actual examples and their connections to derived equations. Some students felt the labs were poorly organized.

CHM 338H1F Intermediate Inorganic Chemistry

Instructor(s): J. Powell

	Enr: 39			Resp: 29			Retake: 53%		Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	0	20	17	31	6	24		5.0
Explains	0	0	6	20	20	31	20		5.4
Communicates	0	0	3	3	20	34	37		6.0
Teaching	3	0	6	10	24	27	27		5.4
Workload	0	0	0	6	17	31	44		6.1
Difficulty	0	0	0	13	41	27	17		5.5
Learn Exp	0	3	3	26	30	19	15		5.0

Students liked how Powell photocopied lecture notes for everyone, however, sometimes the notes were a little unorganized. Problem sets required a lot of effort but were worth only 5% each. Some students found the marking was too harsh.

Most students thought the workload and the extra readings for the labs should have made the labs worth more.

CHM 345H1S Modern Organic Synthesis

Instructor(s): R. Batey

	Enr: 34				Resp: 27			Retake: 33%		Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
Presents	0	0	7	26	50	3	11		4.8	
Explains	0	0	0	14	55	14	14		5.3	
Communicates	0	0	3	26	30	23	15		5.2	
Teaching	0	0	0	23	26	42	7		5.3	
Workload	0	0	0	48	14	29	7		5.0	
Difficulty	0	0	0	18	33	29	18		5.5	
Learn Exp	5	5	15	36	15	5	15		4.3	

Students deemed the course interesting, but difficult. The tests were challenging - students wished they were given more time to write them. The textbook was not helpful in explaining concepts so students found it "useless". Batey was an organized, knowledgeable and enthusiastic instructor. He was always available for help or consultation.

CHM 346H1S Modern Organic Synthesis

Instructor(s): R. Batey

	Enr: 34				Resp: 25			Retake: 70%		Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
Presents	0	0	0	0	48	44	8		5.6	
Explains	0	0	0	8	40	24	28		5.7	
Communicates	0	0	0	8	20	60	12		5.8	
Teaching	0	0	0	0	40	36	24		5.8	
Workload	0	0	0	25	20	29	25		5.5	
Difficulty	0	0	0	24	36	24	16		5.3	

Learn Exp 0 0 0 35 23 17 23 5.3

Batey was a well-liked instructor who was organized and accommodating. Some students felt that the courses structure of two term tests and weekly labs was too heavy while an equal number felt the challenge was rewarding.

CHM 347H1F Organic Chemistry of Biological Compounds

Instructor(s): R. Kluger

	Enr: 119				Resp: 60			Retake: 70%		Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
Presents	3	3	11	22	28	25	5		4.7	
Explains	5	6	13	20	27	18	6		4.4	
Communicates	0	5	1	6	16	35	33		5.8	
Teaching	3	3	6	22	22	30	11		4.9	
Workload	1	1	10	61	18	5	1		4.2	
Difficulty	0	1	5	55	25	6	5		4.5	
Learn Exp	0	2	4	26	46	17	2		4.8	

Students' opinions were divided. While many praised Kluger's enthusiasm, others felt he was unapproachable and avoided answering questions. The instructor often went off on tangents during lectures. Some thought these tangents were irrelevant, but others appreciated learning the background information.

CHM 348H1F Organic Reaction Mechanisms

Instructor(s): A. Yudin

	Enr: 72			Resp: 58			Retake: 90%		Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	1	1	12	13	43	27		5.8
Explains	0	0	1	5	15	34	43		6.1
Communicates	0	0	1	3	5	37	51		6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	3	16	35	44		6.2
Workload	0	1	5	67	18	3	3		4.3
Difficulty	0	3	1	72	17	3	1		4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	2	24	28	28	15		5.3

Yudin explained the lecture material clearly and effectively by using a lot of examples. He always spent the first 10 minutes to review the material and never rushed through it. Students thought that Yudin had a great sense of humour and his lectures were very entertaining. The feedback feature at the end of every 2 classes was very thoughtful and useful. A few students complained that the lab was too crowded and too much work. However, some students thought the lab was too easy for a 3rd year course.

CHM 379H1S Biomolecular Chemistry

Instructor(s): D. Zamble

	Enr: 37				Resp: 27			Retake: 92%		Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
Presents	0	0	0	3	11	40	44		6.3	
Explains	0	0	3	0	22	29	44		6.1	
Communicates	0	0	0	0	3	37	59		6.6	
Teaching	0	0	0	0	11	37	51		6.4	
Workload	0	0	3	48	33	11	3		4.6	
Difficulty	0	0	0	55	29	14	0		4.6	
Learn Exp	0	0	0	13	22	22	40		5.9	

Students considered Zamble very enthusiastic, knowledgeable, understanding, and approachable. Many students felt she was the best instructor they'd had. The course was considered a very valuable learning experience in biological chemistry and an excellent lab course.

CHM 414H1F Developing Techniques in Analytical Chemistry

Instructor(s): M. Thompson

	Enr: 22				Resp: 20			Retake: 94%		Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
Presents	0	0	0	0	35	58	5		5.7	

Explains	0	0	0	0	29	58	11	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	47	52	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	0	17	35	47	6.3
Workload	0	0	0	82	11	5	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	70	23	5	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	40	40	20	0	4.8

Thompson was a very good instructor who was always available for individual consultation. A few students complained that there was too much required readings.

CHM 415H1S Atmospheric Chemistry

Instructor(s): J. Abbott

Enr: 32	Resp: 23							Retake: 95%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	6	4	26	30	39	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	4	4	43	47	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	13	34	52	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	0	4	52	43	6.4
Workload	0	0	4	52	28	9	4	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	5	60	25	0	10	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	5	42	31	21	5.7

Abbott was very well-liked by students. They found him to be approachable, eloquent, organized and enthusiastic. He was always willing to give extra help. Students overwhelmingly felt the class was superb.

CHM 416H1S Separation Science

Instructor(s): D. Stone

Enr: 18	Resp: 17							Retake: 50%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	6	12	12	56	12	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	12	12	68	6	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	0	12	56	31	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	6	18	56	18	5.9
Workload	0	0	0	56	37	6	0	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	56	43	0	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	22	33	33	11	5.3

Stone was a well-organized lecturer who communicated the concepts of the course clearly. His attempts at humour along with a wide variety of assignments made the course entertaining.

CHM 432H1F Organometallic Chemistry

Instructor(s): J. Powell

Enr: 13	Resp: 13							Retake: 72%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	25	16	50	8	5.4
Explains	0	0	0	41	0	50	8	5.2
Communicates	0	0	8	33	8	33	16	5.2
Teaching	0	0	8	8	41	16	25	5.4
Workload	0	0	0	50	25	8	16	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	50	25	0	25	5.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	28	57	14	0	4.9

Some students felt that this course was extremely difficult.

CHM 434H1F Solid State Materials Chemistry

Instructor(s): G. Ozin

Enr: 30	Resp: 23							Retake: 81%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	8	13	26	34	17	5.4
Explains	0	0	0	4	17	43	34	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	4	43	52	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	4	30	30	34	6.0
Workload	0	0	0	59	31	4	4	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	4	63	27	0	4	4.4

Learn Exp	0	0	0	17	41	29	11	5.4
-----------	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	-----

Students thought that Ozin was very engaging and enthusiastic. There was a good use of modern examples. Some students felt that the lecture slides were difficult to understand, and poor organized. Students also felt the first assignment was worth too little for how much work was involved.

CHM 437H1S Bio-Inorganic Chemistry

Instructor(s): R. Morris

Enr: 31	Resp: 15							Retake: 71%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	6	20	33	33	6	5.1
Explains	0	0	6	13	53	26	0	5.0
Communicates	0	0	13	13	46	13	13	5.0
Teaching	0	0	0	13	46	26	13	5.4
Workload	0	0	0	40	46	13	0	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	6	26	53	13	0	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	7	42	28	14	7	4.7

Students enjoyed the course and felt that Morris was very personable and approachable. However, students felt that there was insufficient feedback on their assignments.

CHM 440H1F The Synthesis of Modern Pharmaceutical Agents

Instructor(s): A. Yudin

Enr: 19	Resp: 15							Retake: 76%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	40	40	20	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	6	33	26	33	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	0	33	40	26	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	0	40	26	33	5.9
Workload	0	0	0	73	13	6	6	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	73	6	0	20	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	8	41	41	0	8	4.6

Students found the material to be interesting and the instructor to be very enthusiastic.

CHM 443H1S Physical Organic Chemistry

Instructor(s): J. Chin

Enr: 19	Resp: 18							Retake: 94%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	11	33	27	27	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	11	38	22	27	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	11	33	33	22	5.7
Teaching	0	0	0	0	27	38	33	6.1
Workload	0	0	11	64	23	0	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	5	76	17	0	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	66	22	11	0	4.4

Chin was an interesting lecturer who was very approachable outside of class. This was an excellent course.

CHM 441H1F Spectroscopic Analysis of Organic Chemistry

Instructor(s): S. Skonieczny

Enr: 25	Resp: 20							Retake: 90%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	25	5	40	30	5.8
Explains	0	0	5	5	5	50	35	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	5	15	40	40	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	5	15	40	40	6.2
Workload	0	0	0	40	40	15	5	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	45	10	45	0	5.0
Learn Exp	0	0	10	20	20	30	20	5.3

Students enjoyed the material and thought that the instructor was very good. Some felt that there wasn't sufficient time to finish the tests due to the difficulty of the questions.

22 CHEMISTRY

CHM 447H1F Bio-organic Chemistry

Instructor(s): A. Woolley

	Enr: 51							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	5	23	29	26	14	5.2
Explains	0	0	0	20	23	44	11	5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	20	29	35	14	5.4
Teaching	0	0	0	11	32	44	11	5.6
Workload	0	0	3	69	6	18	3	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	54	27	12	6	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	39	28	17	14	5.1

Students felt the instructor took the time to explain the concepts clearly. A few students felt that the test was not reflective of the material taught in class.

CHM 479H1S Biological Chemistry

Instructor(s): D. Zamble; A. Woolley

	Enr: 27							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Zamble:								
Presents	0	0	0	7	30	53	7	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	0	41	50	8	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	8	8	50	33	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	0	25	58	16	5.9
Woolley:								
Presents	0	0	15	15	46	23	0	4.8
Explains	0	0	0	14	42	42	0	5.3
Communicates	0	0	7	15	38	23	15	5.2
Teaching	0	0	0	7	38	53	0	5.5
Course:								
Workload	0	0	7	57	21	14	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	35	42	14	7	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	12	25	37	25	0	4.8

Instructor(s): M. Nitz

	Enr: 27							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	8	41	33	16	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	16	25	33	25	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	8	25	33	33	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	0	50	33	16	5.7
Workload	0	0	0	42	57	0	0	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	28	57	0	14	5.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	25	25	50	0	5.2

Although Nitz delivered interesting lectures and was an overall good instructor, many students felt Nitz spoke too fast and should slow down a bit. Nevertheless, he was responsive to questions and was approachable.

tired of failing?
york & ryerson
not an option?
looking for
past tests?

think past tests.
think student rights.
think academics.

think pink.

think volunteering.
think course unions.
think...

Assu.ca

arts & science students' union

<http://www.assu.ca> · students.assu@utoronto.ca · 100 st. george st. room 1068 · 416-978-4903

