



"THESE PROBLEMS MAY SEEM DIFFICULT AND BORING NOW, BUT JUST REMEMBER, YOU'RE LEARNING A SKILL YOU'LL PROBABLY NEVER USE AGAIN."

Introduction

ASSU would like to thank the 2004/05 Math, Actuarial and Statistics Students' Union (MASSU) Executive for their help with the following evaluations. MASSU has now split into two separate Course Unions - one representing Math and the other representing Actuarial Science and Statistics. Look for them in September and get involved!!

Editor

ACTUARIAL SCIENCE & STATISTICS

ACT 240H1F Mathematics of Investment & Credit

Instructor(s): L. Florence

	Enr: 126							Mean
	Resp: 75							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	9	23	36	30	5.9
Explains	0	0	1	4	27	32	35	6.0
Communicates	0	0	1	8	24	38	27	5.8
Teaching	0	0	1	5	16	46	30	6.0
Workload	2	2	12	58	14	5	4	4.1
Difficulty	1	4	13	47	24	5	4	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	2	34	29	14	19	5.1

Students thought Florence communicated the material very well.

ACT 247H1S Introductory Life Contingencies

Instructor(s): S. Jaimungal

	Enr: 140							Mean
	Resp: 106							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	05	19	40	33	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	0	26	44	28	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	1	21	39	36	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	1	16	46	35	6.1
Workload	0	0	3	49	25	19	0	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	33	30	27	5	5.0
Learn Exp	0	0	2	25	32	33	6	5.2

Students were extremely positive about Jaimungal and the course. Students found him well-organized and enthusiastic. Some students thought that tutorials would have been useful.

ACT 348H1F Advanced Life Contingencies

Instructor(s): S. Broverman

	Enr: 100							Mean
	Resp: 65							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	1	14	42	21	20	5.5

Explains	0	0	0	6	38	30	25	5.7
Communicates	0	0	1	15	31	28	22	5.5
Teaching	0	0	0	1	38	29	30	5.9
Workload	0	0	0	33	36	23	6	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	30	30	25	14	5.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	40	28	21	9	5.0

ACT 349H1S Topics in Actuarial Mathematics

Instructor(s): L. Florence

	Enr: 59							Mean
	Resp: 45							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	4	8	24	40	22	5.7
Explains	0	0	9	6	31	31	20	5.8
Communicates	0	2	0	11	20	31	34	5.8
Teaching	0	0	4	6	27	37	23	5.7
Workload	2	0	18	47	27	4	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	9	54	18	15	2	4.5
Learn Exp	0	3	3	37	28	21	6	4.8

Students found the instructor organized and enthusiastic. Many students complained about the difficulty of the tests, especially in comparison to the previous year's.

ACT 370H1F Asset and Liability Management

Instructor(s): S. Jaimungal

	Enr: 106							Mean
	Resp: 78							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	1	0	8	12	33	25	18	5.3
Explains	2	0	5	18	24	30	18	5.3
Communicates	2	1	2	10	31	22	28	5.5
Teaching	2	0	4	16	22	35	18	5.4
Workload	0	1	5	50	28	10	3	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	2	34	35	18	9	5.0
Learn Exp	1	0	6	24	32	24	9	5.0

ACT 451H1F Risk Theory

Instructor(s): S. Broverman

	Enr: 79							Mean
	Resp: 66							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	1	9	35	25	27	5.7
Explains	0	0	3	8	19	36	32	5.9
Communicates	0	0	4	14	29	22	27	5.7
Teaching	0	0	0	3	27	37	32	6.0
Workload	0	1	4	44	24	18	6	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	0	29	31	26	13	5.2
Learn Exp	0	0	4	28	26	28	11	5.1

ACT 455H1S Advanced Topics in Actuarial Mathematics

Instructor(s): S. Broverman

	Enr: 63							Mean
	Resp: 54							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	1	11	19	41	25	5.8
Explains	0	0	1	5	13	45	33	6.0
Communicates	0	0	6	10	24	38	20	5.6
Teaching	0	0	0	8	20	46	24	5.9
Workload	0	1	5	41	37	11	1	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	41	33	18	5	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	0	29	44	26	0	5.0

ACT 460H1S Estimation of Survival & Loss Models

Instructor(s): S. Jaimungal

	Enr: 100							Mean
	Resp: 80							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	2	2	6	25	29	22	10	4.9
Explains	0	2	6	17	34	26	11	5.1
Communicates	0	1	7	15	28	30	16	5.3
Teaching	1	2	3	17	28	38	7	5.2

Workload	0	1	5	62	20	7	2	4.4
Difficulty	0	1	1	55	28	10	2	4.5
Learn Exp	1	1	1	52	13	17	9	4.7

ACT 466H1S Credibility Theory & Loss Models

Instructor(s): S. Broverman

Enr: 69 Resp: 66 Retake: 74%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	2	2	6	25	25	38	5.9
Explains	0	2	0	4	14	36	42	6.1
Communicates	0	2	0	12	20	37	27	5.7
Teaching	0	2	0	0	19	44	34	6.1
Workload	0	0	0	46	32	16	4	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	48	28	18	4	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	3	30	30	23	13	5.1

Students were generally positive about the instructor.

ACT 470H1S Advanced Pension Mathematics

Instructor(s): L. Cohen

Enr: 62 Resp: 47 Retake: 52%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	2	12	25	44	14	0	4.6
Explains	0	2	14	31	29	19	2	4.6
Communicates	0	0	4	23	29	38	4	5.1
Teaching	0	0	6	31	31	27	2	4.9
Workload	0	0	0	61	23	14	0	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	21	40	29	8	5.3
Learn Exp	3	3	0	46	34	6	6	4.5

STA 107H1F An Introduction to Probability and Modelling

Instructor(s): M. Du

Enr: 69 Resp: 29 Retake: 55%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	7	3	17	14	28	14	14	4.5
Explains	7	11	18	18	14	18	11	4.2
Communicates	7	10	14	14	35	3	14	4.3
Teaching	11	3	14	18	22	18	11	4.4
Workload	7	7	7	57	14	0	7	3.9
Difficulty	7	0	10	46	21	10	3	4.2
Learn Exp	8	12	12	37	12	8	8	3.9

On the whole, students praised the instructor's enthusiasm and approachability, and the lecture note summaries she gave for test preparation. However, many students had difficulty understanding her lectures, in particular, her explanations of concepts. Some also felt that more examples should have been presented in class.

STA 220H1F The Practice of Statistics I

Instructor(s): A. Vukov

Enr: 225 Resp: 128 Retake: 27%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	2	4	15	28	28	16	4	4.5
Explains	0	3	11	23	29	27	3	4.8
Communicates	1	1	6	21	34	26	7	5.0
Teaching	1	4	7	27	33	23	2	4.7
Workload	0	0	3	47	28	12	8	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	5	46	23	15	7	4.7
Learn Exp	5	3	17	44	17	5	4	4.0

The use of videos in class was praised as being helpful for understanding the material. On the other hand, students found the Minitab software package to be of little educational value. It was also thought that the tests were too long for the time allotted. There was also concern about the structure of the course. Some felt that too much time was spent on easier material at the expense of the difficult, and others would have liked the course to follow the syllabus and the textbook more closely.

Instructor(s): H. Moshonov

Enr: 179 Resp: 64 Retake: 41%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	3	1	0	6	22	44	21	5.6
Explains	1	0	0	3	25	41	28	5.9
Communicates	1	0	0	11	37	24	24	5.6
Teaching	1	0	1	11	20	38	26	5.7
Workload	0	1	6	25	46	18	1	4.8
Difficulty	0	3	5	35	37	13	5	4.7
Learn Exp	4	2	10	45	25	12	0	4.2

Instructor(s): S. Jeon

Enr: 186 Resp: 75 Retake: 36%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	1	4	17	22	35	12	6	4.5
Explains	2	5	28	27	17	14	4	4.1
Communicates	0	2	5	31	35	20	5	4.8
Teaching	0	2	25	27	25	12	5	4.4
Workload	0	2	4	50	27	15	0	4.5
Difficulty	0	4	5	46	30	13	0	4.4
Learn Exp	3	3	22	44	8	15	3	4.1

Students felt the lectures were disorganized and expressed concern that the pace of the course was too uneven. As well, some found the Minitab software package to be of little educational value. There were concerns that midterms were too long. Finally, it was also felt by many that too much time was being taken up by questions which could have been answered in tutorials or in office hours.

STA 221H1S The Practice of Statistics II

Instructor(s): A. Vukov

Enr: 102 Resp: 50 Retake: 51%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	8	19	23	29	19	5.3
Explains	0	2	6	17	29	22	25	5.4
Communicates	0	2	6	10	24	34	22	5.5
Teaching	0	2	2	12	28	34	20	5.5
Workload	0	4	0	50	20	16	8	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	4	45	22	14	12	4.9
Learn Exp	0	7	7	30	25	23	5	4.6

Students generally considered Vukov to be a good instructor, praising him particularly for being well-organized and enthusiastic. They also found the homework to be quite useful, and were extremely appreciative of the supplementary notes. There were many complaints, however, about the scheduling of the weekly lecture (one 7-10 p.m. block each week). Some students also found the tests to be difficult, while others mentioned that they would have appreciated the instructor providing references to relevant sections in the supplementary notes and textbook prior to lectures.

STA 247H1F Probability with Computer Applications

Instructor(s): R. Neal

Enr: 69 Resp: 32 Retake: 50%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	6	25	32	22	12	5.1
Explains	0	0	9	25	18	31	15	5.2
Communicates	0	3	6	15	37	21	15	5.2
Teaching	0	0	6	25	31	31	6	5.1
Workload	3	0	12	65	12	6	0	4.0
Difficulty	3	0	6	50	28	12	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	6	62	20	10	0	4.3

Students felt that the final exam was weighted too heavily towards the final mark, and some found the textbook to be of little use in the context of what was actually covered in class and on tests and the exam.

142 MATH, ACTUARIAL & STATISTICS

STA 248H1S Statistics for Computer Scientists

Instructor(s): A. Gibbs

	Enr: 22			Resp: 13			Retake: 75%		Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	0	0	7	30	30	30	5.8	
Explains	0	0	0	0	30	23	46	6.2	
Communicates	0	0	0	0	15	30	53	6.4	
Teaching	0	0	0	0	23	30	46	6.2	
Workload	0	0	25	58	16	0	0	3.9	
Difficulty	0	0	8	75	16	0	0	4.1	
Learn Exp	0	0	0	25	37	25	12	5.2	

Students lauded Gibbs for her enthusiasm, fairness, and teaching skills, particularly her explanation of concepts, use of examples and pacing. Overall, she was considered to be a very good instructor.

STA 250H1F Statistical Concepts

Instructor(s): A. Vukov

	Enr: 134			Resp: 53			Retake: 31%		Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	1	4	32	37	11	7	4.7	
Explains	1	5	9	41	27	9	3	4.3	
Communicates	1	1	9	20	33	22	9	4.9	
Teaching	1	0	9	28	28	23	7	4.8	
Workload	0	0	0	32	35	18	13	5.1	
Difficulty	1	0	1	30	30	22	13	5.1	
Learn Exp	2	4	14	50	14	4	4	4.0	

There was a concern that the level of the course was too high and that there was too much material covered. Consequently, the pace of the course was too fast. Students felt that the evaluations were too long and too difficult, particularly the midterm. Some also found the Minitab software package to be of little educational value.

STA 255H1S Statistical Theory

Instructor(s): M. Samarakoon

	Enr: 85			Resp: 47			Retake: 71%		Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	0	0	4	14	46	34	6.1	
Explains	0	2	0	2	14	46	34	6.1	
Communicates	0	0	0	6	19	34	40	6.1	
Teaching	0	0	0	2	12	51	34	6.2	
Workload	0	0	8	60	13	8	8	4.5	
Difficulty	0	0	6	54	13	17	8	4.7	
Learn Exp	2	0	8	35	26	20	5	4.7	

Samarakoon was highly regarded by students, who praised him for his enthusiasm, helpfulness, approachability, and teaching skills, particularly his use of textbook exercises or examples in class. Students also found his tests to be fair, though some concern was expressed about the difficulty of the homework. The course was found to be challenging, and some noted that it required a fairly high level of mathematical skill.

STA 257H1F Probability and Statistics I

Instructor(s): P. McDunnough

	Enr: 183			Resp: 112			Retake: 28%		Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	12	18	18	25	12	5	7	3.5	
Explains	10	11	21	19	26	5	5	3.8	
Communicates	11	15	7	29	16	11	7	3.9	
Teaching	9	10	15	25	19	12	6	4.0	
Workload	3	0	5	38	25	17	7	4.7	
Difficulty	1	0	5	14	26	24	26	5.4	
Learn Exp	5	15	9	39	9	11	8	4.0	

While students praised the instructor's knowledge of the subject, and found the postings of lecture notes online useful, they were generally dissatisfied with the course. The principle concern was that the course

seemed disorganized - to this end, many students would have liked a clearer syllabus, handed out at the beginning of term. There were also concerns that the textbook was inappropriate for the course, and that more real world examples be presented. There were also complaints that the day and evening sections of the course were not of equal difficulty, and that material required on the midterm was only covered in class after the test.

Instructor(s): D. Brenner

	Enr: 79			Resp: 48			Retake: 90%		Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	0	4	2	15	20	57	6.2	
Explains	0	0	2	2	8	20	66	6.5	
Communicates	0	0	2	0	8	6	82	6.7	
Teaching	0	0	0	2	2	15	80	6.7	
Workload	0	4	10	45	25	10	4	4.4	
Difficulty	0	0	12	27	19	25	14	5.0	
Learn Exp	0	0	0	9	25	40	25	5.8	

Brenner was consistently praised as an "excellent" instructor. His lecture notes were also highly thought of, while the textbook was not considered to be of much use at all. The only criticism students had was that he had a tendency to occasionally get off topic and thereby lose valuable lecture time.

STA 257H1S Probability and Statistics I

Instructor(s): P. McDunnough

	Enr: 58			Resp: 22			Retake: 47%		Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	13	9	18	40	13	4	4.5	
Explains	4	0	14	23	33	14	9	4.6	
Communicates	4	0	4	9	33	38	9	5.2	
Teaching	0	4	0	18	36	22	18	5.3	
Workload	0	0	14	28	33	19	4	4.7	
Difficulty	0	0	0	28	9	28	33	5.7	
Learn Exp	7	0	0	46	7	23	15	4.8	

Students were generally satisfied with McDunnough's performance as an instructor, and were appreciative of the detailed derivations given in class. Some suggested that class material be posted online, particularly scanned lecture notes and solutions to practice tests.

STA 261H1S Probability and Statistics II

Instructor(s): K. Knight

	Enr: 187			Resp: 83			Retake: 29%		Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	2	1	5	27	23	25	15	5.0	
Explains	2	3	16	30	23	12	11	4.5	
Communicates	3	12	8	32	20	15	7	4.3	
Teaching	1	3	11	29	20	29	3	4.7	
Workload	0	2	3	35	30	18	8	4.9	
Difficulty	0	0	1	11	38	29	19	5.6	
Learn Exp	3	3	17	44	12	12	6	4.2	

Many students were satisfied with Knight's performance as an instructor, and they praised him particularly for his approachability, helpfulness, organization, and lecture notes. There was consensus, however, that the textbook was inadequate. Some students felt that more explanation was needed in class, and there was some concern that the instructor was unenthusiastic, and that he gave too little attention to the students during lectures.

STA 322H1S Design of Sample Surveys

Instructor(s): D. Banjevic

	Enr: 85			Resp: 39			Retake: 55%		Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	2	2	11	27	33	11	11	4.6	
Explains	2	5	5	23	43	7	12	4.7	

Communicates	2	2	19	30	25	12	7	4.4
Teaching	2	0	15	20	43	7	10	4.7
Workload	0	0	20	51	17	10	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	5	5	43	30	15	0	4.5
Learn Exp	0	6	16	50	10	13	3	4.2

On one hand, a number of students were satisfied with the course and with Banjevic's performance as an instructor, citing his helpfulness, organization and patience. The handout package came particularly appreciated. On the other hand, there was concern that the instructor was not approachable, and most students felt that the tests were too long and difficult for the time allotted. Some also found his handwriting difficult to read.

STA 332H1S Experimental Design

Instructor(s): B. Knowles

Enr: 74 Resp: 39 Retake: 92%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	5	26	39	28	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	7	34	31	26	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	23	36	39	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	5	28	31	34	5.9
Workload	0	2	12	69	7	7	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	2	2	69	20	2	2	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	46	35	3	14	4.9

Students praised Knowles as a good, approachable instructor, who taught in a clear, well-organized, and enthusiastic manner. In particular, students appreciated the use of overheads. There were some concerns, however, that too much time was spent on basic material, leaving less time for the more advanced content.

STA 347H1F Probability

Instructor(s): P. McDunnough

Enr: 151 Resp: 94 Retake: 41%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	8	8	19	21	23	12	5	4.0
Explains	4	11	13	28	19	14	6	4.2
Communicates	1	11	13	21	23	10	7	4.3
Teaching	2	4	18	21	34	10	8	4.4
Workload	1	2	3	40	22	15	13	4.8
Difficulty	0	2	4	16	31	15	29	5.4
Learn Exp	10	5	15	26	17	19	5	4.1

There was some praise for the instructor's enthusiasm and knowledge of the material. However, it was a difficult course, and many felt that it was too abstract and theoretical. On a similar note, students also complained that the course was too heavy on memorization. The course itself seemed rather disorganized, at times, and a few students felt that the instructor was unapproachable.

STA 352Y1Y Introduction to Mathematical Statistics

Instructor(s): D. Fraser

Enr: 72 Resp: 47 Retake: 42%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	4	6	31	14	19	10	12	4.2
Explains	2	6	19	27	17	19	8	4.4
Communicates	4	2	8	17	19	34	14	5.1
Teaching	2	2	8	19	23	21	21	5.1
Workload	4	0	0	44	21	27	2	4.7
Difficulty	2	0	4	17	21	38	17	5.4
Learn Exp	6	6	20	33	6	20	6	4.1

Students found Fraser to be very approachable. However, students found the course disorganized, particularly in terms of the course structure and the presentation of material, which they felt could have been helped by a greater use of examples. Students also found Fraser's handwriting difficult to read.

STA 410H1S Statistical Computation

Instructor(s): N. Reid

Enr: 23 Resp: 20 Retake: 62%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	5	25	30	30	10	5.2
Explains	0	0	20	20	60	10	20	4.9
Communicates	0	0	0	20	35	25	20	5.4
Teaching	0	0	0	21	26	36	15	5.5
Workload	0	0	0	55	35	10	0	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	30	45	15	10	5.1
Learn Exp	0	0	8	41	16	25	8	4.8

Reid was praised as a skilled instructor, noted particularly for her helpfulness, approachability, enthusiasm and knowledge. There were concerns, however, about the difficulty of the course, particularly the quantity of course material and the level of theoretical content.

STA 429H1F Advanced Statistics for the Life and Social Sciences

Instructor(s): J. Brunner

Enr: 8 Resp: 7 Retake: 85%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	57	28	14	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	0	0	66	33	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	14	85	6.9
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	71	28	6.3
Workload	0	0	16	50	16	16	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	57	14	28	0	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	14	0	42	42	6.1

Brunner was praised by students as an enthusiastic, approachable and effective instructor.

STA 447H1S Stochastic Processes

Instructor(s): P. McDunnough

Enr: 38 Resp: 16 Retake: 41%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	6	6	46	6	20	13	4.7
Explains	0	13	20	33	6	26	0	4.1
Communicates	6	0	6	46	0	33	6	4.6
Teaching	0	6	6	40	20	20	6	4.6
Workload	0	0	0	43	18	31	6	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	6	20	13	20	40	5.7
Learn Exp	0	0	15	46	0	15	23	4.8

Students expressed concern that the instructor did not communicate and explain the material well, and would have liked to see a greater use of examples. It was also felt by some that the test was too hard, and that too much emphasis was placed on the memorization of proofs.

STA 450H1S Topics in Statistics

Instructor(s): N. Reid

Enr: 11 Resp: 6 Retake: 100%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	0	33	66	6.7
Explains	0	0	0	0	16	16	66	6.5
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	16	83	6.8
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	33	66	6.7
Workload	0	0	0	0	50	50	0	5.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	16	33	33	16	5.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	25	75	0	5.8

Students considered Reid to be an "amazing" instructor, praising her for her lectures, specifically her use of examples, and her helpfulness and approachability. Overall, students were satisfied with the course, though some concern was expressed about the difficulty of the text.

STA 457H1F Time Series Analysis

Instructor(s): A. Benn

	Enr: 129							Mean
	Resp: 80				Retake: 58%			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	3	15	27	25	27	5.6
Explains	0	1	12	25	16	25	16	5.0
Communicates	0	1	0	19	36	23	19	5.4
Teaching	0	0	0	20	27	27	24	5.6
Workload	0	1	2	44	36	10	5	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	2	25	34	25	11	5.2
Learn Exp	4	2	10	34	32	10	8	4.5

Students praised Benn as an approachable, helpful, and enthusiastic instructor, and found his tests to be fair. Some, however, were concerned about the difficult and quantity of course material. Also, some felt that more examples from outside the textbook, particularly real-world examples should have been used in class.

APPLIED MATHEMATICS & MATHEMATICS

APM 236H1F Applications of Linear Programming

Instructor(s): P. Kergin

	Enr: 74							Mean
	Resp: 26				Retake: 75%			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	4	4	12	16	32	32	5.6
Explains	0	4	4	8	12	54	16	5.6
Communicates	0	0	4	16	20	36	24	5.6
Teaching	0	4	0	12	24	40	20	5.6
Workload	7	0	50	34	3	0	3	3.4
Difficulty	4	0	36	18	8	0	4	3.7
Learn Exp	0	0	15	57	5	21	0	4.3

Students found Kergin to be a dedicated, well-organized, and effective instructor. Some felt, however, that the pace of the course was too slow, and that too much time was being spent on introducing material.

APM 236H1S Applications of Linear Programming

Instructor(s): S. Homayoumi

	Enr: 41							Mean
	Resp: 18				Retake: 62%			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	11	29	23	23	11	4.9
Explains	0	0	18	18	25	18	18	5.0
Communicates	0	0	0	37	31	12	18	5.1
Teaching	0	0	0	18	25	37	18	5.6
Workload	0	5	0	66	27	0	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	11	50	27	5	5	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	53	26	13	6	4.7

Students were generally satisfied with the course. Some expressed concern, though, that the tests were too long, and that more examples could have been given in class.

APM 346H1F Differential Equations

Instructor(s): V. Jurdjevic

	Enr: 99							Mean
	Resp: 50				Retake: 55%			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	2	6	10	27	25	20	8	4.6
Explains	4	6	16	20	25	18	8	4.5
Communicates	0	2	2	10	23	36	23	5.6
Teaching	2	2	8	22	22	37	4	4.9
Workload	0	0	11	44	20	22	2	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	11	31	24	33	0	4.8
Learn Exp	7	3	3	40	25	11	7	4.4

There was praise for Jurdjevic's enthusiasm. However, there were many concerns about the course. Many complained that the course was too abstract for their needs, and would have liked the instructor to

be more approachable, and in particular, to be available for contact via email. Students generally found his lectures to be disorganized, and many asked for the introduction of a tutorial for the course, as well as more comments on marked problem sets, and the posting online of problem set solutions.

APM 351Y1Y Partial Differential Equations

Instructor(s): C. Sulem

	Enr: 11							Mean
	Resp: 9				Retake: 88%			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	11	0	88	6.8
Explains	0	0	0	0	11	44	44	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	66	33	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	22	77	6.8
Workload	0	0	0	55	22	11	11	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	66	22	0	11	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	11	11	55	22	5.9

Sulem received rave reviews from all students; she was said to be a great resource and described as fair and organized as well as conscientious about her work.

APM 362H1S Nonlinear Optimization

Instructor(s): N. Derzko

	Enr: 58							Mean
	Resp: 29				Retake: 37%			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	10	13	6	20	27	20	0	4.0
Explains	10	6	6	27	24	24	0	4.2
Communicates	6	0	3	27	37	17	6	4.7
Teaching	7	0	10	17	35	25	3	4.6
Workload	0	0	13	48	24	13	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	7	46	35	3	7	4.6
Learn Exp	4	9	14	28	38	4	0	4.0

Students found the instructor to be helpful and approachable. However, most felt that the course could have been more organized, and in particular, a single, suitable textbook should have been used. There was also some concern that too few examples were given in class.

APM 421H1F Mathematical Foundations of Quantum

Instructor(s): R. Jerrard

	Enr: 8							Mean
	Resp: 5				Retake: 80%			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	40	40	20	0	4.8
Explains	0	0	0	40	40	20	0	4.8
Communicates	0	0	0	20	40	40	0	5.2
Teaching	0	0	0	20	20	60	0	5.4
Workload	0	0	20	60	20	0	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	0	20	60	20	6.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	40	40	20	0	4.8

Students thought Jerrard to be an effective instructor. The method used in the course of assigned readings and required questions on the readings was considered by all to be an excellent idea, though there was some dissatisfaction with the textbook. Some also felt that the course progressed too quickly.

MAT 123H1S Calculus and Linear Algebra for Commerce (A)

Instructor(s): P. Kergin

	Enr: 68							Mean
	Resp: 17				Retake: 26%			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	11	11	17	35	17	5	4.5
Explains	0	0	11	17	41	23	5	4.9
Communicates	5	0	17	35	23	11	5	4.3
Teaching	0	0	12	31	18	31	6	4.9
Workload	0	0	18	56	25	0	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	6	6	37	25	25	0	4.6
Learn Exp	0	14	21	57	7	0	0	3.6

Kergin was said to be patient and clear in his explanations, was available for help and gave reasonable test papers. Some students felt more in class examples were needed, and also expressed concern about the discrepancy between the difficulties of problem sets and exams

MAT 125H1S Calculus I (A)

Instructor(s): A. Lam

	Enr: 84							Mean
	Resp: 54			Retake: 48%				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	1	7	16	74	6.6
Explains	0	0	0	1	5	18	74	6.6
Communicates	0	0	1	0	5	18	74	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	1	1	31	64	6.6
Workload	0	0	0	46	27	14	11	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	33	25	31	9	5.2
Learn Exp	2	0	0	21	26	19	29	5.5

Lam was considered by students to be an "amazing" instructor, and was praised by them for his teaching skills, enthusiasm, friendliness and sense of humour.

MAT 133Y1Y Calculus and Linear Algebra for Commerce

Instructor(s): P. Kergin

	Enr: 139							Mean
	Resp: 37			Retake: 31%				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	5	5	18	10	18	16	24	4.8
Explains	8	10	8	18	29	16	8	4.3
Communicates	21	5	13	13	32	5	8	3.8
Teaching	16	0	10	21	24	16	10	4.3
Workload	0	0	13	33	27	19	5	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	11	33	16	30	8	4.9
Learn Exp	3	6	12	34	34	9	0	4.2

Some students were satisfied with Kergin's performance, finding his explanations clear and concise. They felt the slower pace of the course helpful for understanding. Many, however, found the lectures to be of little use, and there was concern that too much class time was spent on what were felt to be unimportant or irrelevant matters. Some students also felt that the instructor could have delivered lectures with greater enthusiasm.

Instructor(s): J. Gordon

	Enr: 65							Mean
	Resp: 14			Retake: 38%				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	14	21	42	21	0	4.7
Explains	0	0	15	15	46	23	0	4.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	35	21	42	6.1
Teaching	0	0	7	15	30	46	0	5.2
Workload	0	0	0	50	14	35	0	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	7	35	21	28	7	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	8	25	58	8	0	4.7

Instructor(s): A. Igelfeld

	Enr: 82							Mean
	Resp: 20			Retake: 52%				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	5	5	10	30	10	35	5	4.6
Explains	0	5	10	25	20	30	10	4.9
Communicates	5	0	10	20	20	20	25	5.1
Teaching	5	0	15	5	20	40	15	5.2
Workload	0	0	5	26	31	21	15	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	5	42	21	21	10	4.9
Learn Exp	6	6	12	37	18	12	6	4.2

Students were divided in their opinions of Igelfeld. Most were happy with his performance, praising him for his overall teaching skills, especially with regard to the explanation of concepts, and his sense of humour. As a general rule, stronger students tended to be happier with Igelfeld's performance than those expecting lower marks.

Instructor(s): J. Tate

	Enr: 66							Mean
	Resp: 49			Retake: 50%				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	8	25	66	6.6
Explains	2	0	0	0	6	27	64	6.5
Communicates	2	0	0	10	12	22	52	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	2	2	25	70	6.6
Workload	2	0	0	35	22	18	20	5.2
Difficulty	2	0	0	29	31	22	14	5.1
Learn Exp	2	0	2	16	22	19	36	5.6

Students praised Tate as an "excellent" instructor, praising her for her teaching skills, especially with regards to explaining concepts and using examples, her enthusiasm, and her approachability. Students also appreciated her organization, and found her lecture notes to be useful. There was some concern about the difficulty of the tests.

Instructor(s): J. Tate

	Enr: 160							Mean
	Resp: 124			Retake: 63%				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	2	9	27	60	6.5
Explains	0	0	0	2	8	28	60	6.5
Communicates	0	0	0	4	17	41	37	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	0	5	30	64	6.6
Workload	0	0	1	34	28	22	12	5.1
Difficulty	0	2	5	23	29	26	13	5.1
Learn Exp	0	1	2	24	24	26	21	5.4

Students were unanimous in their praise for Tate, lauding her for her overall teaching skills, her helpfulness and her concern for the students' learning experience. However, some complained about the scheduling of the section as a single three-hour weekly lecture, finding the 3-hour block to long and unwieldy.

Instructor(s): A. Igelfeld

	Enr: 109							Mean
	Resp: 25			Retake: 40%				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	12	4	12	28	28	12	4	4.1
Explains	8	4	8	44	16	16	4	4.2
Communicates	4	4	12	16	16	36	12	4.9
Teaching	8	0	0	24	32	28	8	4.9
Workload	0	4	0	56	28	8	4	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	8	28	28	28	8	5.0
Learn Exp	0	5	10	31	15	31	5	4.7

MAT 135Y1Y Calculus I

Instructor(s): A. Lam

	Enr: 190							Mean
	Resp: 186			Retake: 64%				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	6	20	73	6.7
Explains	0	0	0	0	5	16	77	6.7
Communicates	0	0	0	0	3	19	77	6.7
Teaching	0	0	0	0	4	23	70	6.6
Workload	0	0	2	38	39	16	3	4.8
Difficulty	0	1	1	27	40	22	8	5.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	28	28	26	15	5.3

Lam provided interesting, clear and concise lectures. Students unanimously agreed that he was very funny - making Calculus I a fun and easy to understand course. He explained concepts with patience, and in great detail using tons of examples to ensure that students understood the material. His notes were helpful in organizing many ideas. For many, he was one of the best instructors they've encountered here at UofT. Some students found his test questions to be very difficult, but still enjoyed taking the course as the instructor was excellent. Students thought that more sections with Lam as the instructor should be offered - he really did make Calculus an enjoyable course!

146 MATH, ACTUARIAL & STATISTICS

Instructor(s): S. Kadir

Enr: 128	Resp: 26							Retake: 34%	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	7	0	15	30	30	11	3	4.3	
Explains	3	3	15	26	34	11	3	4.3	
Communicates	0	7	23	19	38	11	0	4.2	
Teaching	7	0	3	34	38	11	3	4.5	
Workload	0	0	0	38	38	11	11	5.0	
Difficulty	0	0	0	34	34	15	15	5.1	
Learn Exp	14	9	4	38	19	9	4	3.9	

Instructor(s): A. Lam

Enr: 172	Resp: 117							Retake: 70%	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	0	0	0	5	21	73	6.7	
Explains	0	0	0	0	6	23	70	6.6	
Communicates	0	0	0	0	4	14	80	6.7	
Teaching	0	0	0	0	3	18	77	6.7	
Workload	0	0	1	30	34	26	6	5.1	
Difficulty	0	0	2	35	31	20	10	5.0	
Learn Exp	0	0	2	22	25	36	12	5.4	

Lam inspired copious praise; the students absolutely loved him. In particular, they greatly appreciated his lecture notes. Lam was said to be funny, warm, and caring, and his lectures were described as dynamic and concrete.

As one student stated, "the value of going to [Lam's] lectures cannot be overstated." Many respondents were unhappy with the course textbook and felt tutorials were not very helpful. They also felt that multiple choice testing did not adequately illustrate their capabilities.

Instructor(s): T. Bloom

Enr: 177	Resp: 83							Retake: 53%	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	0	1	21	25	33	18	5.5	
Explains	0	1	1	18	21	31	25	5.6	
Communicates	1	1	3	19	36	18	20	5.2	
Teaching	0	0	0	12	31	34	21	5.7	
Workload	0	0	2	45	24	16	10	4.9	
Difficulty	0	0	0	37	27	18	16	5.1	
Learn Exp	0	4	5	35	25	14	13	4.8	

Most students felt that Bloom did a good job at lecturing. Lectures were well-paced and Bloom explained concepts well and used several examples to make his points more clear. He was also always available for help/consultation. As for the course material, many students expressed concern with the test structure and marking schemes. In addition, tutorials were said to be not much help.

Instructor(s): S. Kadir

Enr: 128	Resp: 26							Retake: 34%	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	7	0	15	30	30	11	3	4.3	
Explains	3	3	15	26	34	11	3	4.3	
Communicates	0	7	23	19	38	11	0	4.2	
Teaching	7	0	3	34	38	11	3	4.5	
Workload	0	0	0	38	38	11	11	5.0	
Difficulty	0	0	0	34	34	15	15	5.1	
Learn Exp	14	9	4	38	19	9	4	3.9	

The few students who commented tended to praise Kadir for her approachability, helpfulness, and intelligence. However, there was concern that the material presented in lectures did not reflect the material that was actually tested, and the lectures themselves were seen by some as disorganized. It was noted by one student that this was her first year teaching, while another felt improvements in communication skills would follow from developing great confidence and ease with public speaking.

Instructor(s): E. LeBlanc

Enr: 138	Resp: 46							Retake: 59%	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	0	0	2	20	27	50	6.2	
Explains	0	0	0	7	26	33	33	5.9	
Communicates	0	0	2	11	31	28	26	5.7	
Teaching	0	0	0	2	20	42	35	6.1	
Workload	0	0	0	43	27	29	0	4.9	
Difficulty	0	0	2	35	35	20	6	4.9	
Learn Exp	0	2	5	37	20	31	2	4.8	

Students found LeBlanc to be a skilled, knowledgeable, and approachable instructor. Students appreciated, in particular, his use of examples in lectures, his helpfulness and his concern for students. The one main concern some had with the course was that the weekly 3-hour lecture was too long and unwieldy for attentiveness and effective learning.

Instructor(s): E. LeBlanc

Enr: 134	Resp: 71							Retake: 43%	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	0	0	8	19	35	36	6.0	
Explains	0	0	0	11	19	43	25	5.8	
Communicates	0	0	7	18	32	25	16	5.3	
Teaching	0	0	0	7	21	38	32	6.0	
Workload	0	0	1	36	38	15	8	4.9	
Difficulty	0	0	0	18	39	29	12	5.4	
Learn Exp	1	4	10	34	21	14	12	4.6	

Most students were happy with LeBlanc's performance as an instructor. They felt he answered their questions effectively and gave numerous examples with clear and thorough explanations. A few students suggested showing a bit more enthusiasm.

Many students found the volume of material covered overwhelming and in general, felt that the tutorials did not aid in their understanding of the material. However, several students mentioned the value of the instructor's office hours. Some suggested the use of online notes would have beneficial.

MAT 137Y1Y Calculus!

Instructor(s): P. Blue

Enr: 40	Resp: 18							Retake: 52%	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	0	0	5	16	27	50	6.2	
Explains	0	0	0	5	41	23	29	5.8	
Communicates	0	0	0	23	17	29	29	5.6	
Teaching	0	0	0	0	35	35	29	5.9	
Workload	0	0	0	11	33	33	22	5.7	
Difficulty	0	0	0	22	33	33	11	5.3	
Learn Exp	0	0	0	38	7	38	15	5.3	

Instructor(s): M. Branker

Enr: 36	Resp: 13							Retake: 38%	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	0	0	8	0	66	25	6.1	
Explains	0	0	0	15	15	46	23	5.8	
Communicates	0	0	0	30	30	23	13	5.2	
Teaching	0	0	0	7	15	38	38	6.1	
Workload	0	0	0	15	30	30	23	5.6	
Difficulty	0	0	0	7	38	38	15	5.6	
Learn Exp	0	0	0	20	40	0	10	5.2	

Students found the instructor to be good, helpful and approachable. As for the course, the students' principle concern was with what they felt to be the excessive length and difficulty of the problem sets. Some also expressed the opinion that they would have preferred having three 1-hour lectures a week, as opposed to the current 1-hour and 2-hour blocks, as the 2-hour block was too long for effective learning.

Instructor(s): F. Latremoliere

Enr: 49	Resp: 14			Retake: 57%			Mean	
	1	2	3	4	5	6		7
Presents	0	0	0	7	14	42	35	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	28	7	35	28	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	14	28	57	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	0	15	53	30	6.2
Workload	0	0	0	7	0	78	14	6.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	14	14	21	50	6.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	20	40	30	10	5.3

Students praised Latremoliere as a "great" instructor, lauding him for his teaching skills and extensive knowledge. There was some concern about what some felt was the quick pace of the course, and that the material covered in lectures did not correlate well with the material tested in problem sets and tests.

Instructor(s): N. Derzko

Enr: 75	Resp: 13			Retake: 33%			Mean	
	1	2	3	4	5	6		7
Presents	0	0	30	7	23	38	0	4.7
Explains	0	7	15	23	30	23	0	4.5
Communicates	0	0	23	23	30	15	7	4.6
Teaching	0	0	46	0	38	15	0	4.2
Workload	0	0	0	0	23	15	61	6.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	7	23	30	38	6.0
Learn Exp	0	12	25	25	37	0	0	3.9

Instructor(s): S. Uppal

Enr: 79	Resp: 64			Retake: 66%			Mean	
	1	2	3	4	5	6		7
Presents	0	0	0	0	6	33	60	6.5
Explains	0	0	0	3	9	41	46	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	21	39	39	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	0	9	38	52	6.4
Workload	0	0	0	9	22	37	29	5.9
Difficulty	0	0	3	16	14	46	19	5.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	25	36	34	3	5.2

Uppal was always organized, and spoke and taught with clarity. He was said to be a "highly motivated instructor whose knowledge of the material and enthusiasm [made] attending lectures worthwhile". A few expressed concern with the fast pace of the lectures.

Students had mixed opinions about the course material itself. Some felt it was too difficult, while others claimed there was "sufficient opportunity to master the material". Many complained about frequent and lengthy problem sets, though they were said to be helpful and a good review source for exams.

Instructor(s): A. Igelfeld

Enr: 51	Resp: 24			Retake: 60%			Mean	
	1	2	3	4	5	6		7
Presents	0	0	0	29	8	37	25	5.6
Explains	0	0	9	4	27	22	36	5.7
Communicates	0	0	4	8	17	21	47	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	12	25	29	33	5.8
Workload	0	0	0	16	25	29	29	5.7
Difficulty	0	0	0	20	25	20	33	5.7
Learn Exp	0	0	4	30	26	26	13	5.1

Igelfeld was praised for his ability to explain concepts thoroughly and clearly. The material was described by most as difficult, though it was said to be a good experience overall in that it led to clarification of concepts. Igelfeld was also said to be well-organized, enthusiastic and humorous.

MAT 157Y1Y Analysis I

Instructor(s): D. Bar-Natan

Enr: 56	Resp: 40			Retake: 81%			Mean	
	1	2	3	4	5	6		7
Presents	0	0	2	7	26	28	34	5.8
Explains	0	2	2	7	21	23	42	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	12	5	15	66	6.4
Teaching	0	0	2	2	17	30	46	6.2
Workload	0	0	2	36	26	23	10	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	7	26	36	28	5.9
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	9	32	58	6.5

The instructor was praised for his ability to explain concepts clearly as well as his incredible enthusiasm. The course was said to involve demanding work, but was described by most as an excellent learning experience. Many stated that despite the difficulty of the course, it was their favourite among first-year courses.

MAT 223H1F Linear Algebra I

Instructor(s): R. Stanczak

Enr: 122	Resp: 88			Retake: 59%			Mean	
	1	2	3	4	5	6		7
Presents	1	0	1	13	32	25	22	5.5
Explains	1	1	2	12	23	34	24	5.6
Communicates	1	3	1	21	32	21	18	5.2
Teaching	1	1	2	12	22	37	21	5.6
Workload	0	1	6	55	25	9	2	4.4
Difficulty	0	1	4	44	29	14	5	4.7
Learn Exp	2	1	6	37	27	16	6	4.6

Students found the material somewhat dry, but thought this was partially alleviated by the instructor's sense of humour. A few thought the instructor didn't interact with the class - eg. talking to the board and failing to ask for questions. Others felt that the instructor lectured well given the nature of the class and its size.

Instructor(s): S. Cohen

Enr: 137	Resp: 49			Retake: 53%			Mean	
	1	2	3	4	5	6		7
Presents	0	0	2	19	31	29	17	5.4
Explains	0	2	6	22	22	27	18	5.2
Communicates	0	0	2	14	29	31	21	5.6
Teaching	2	0	0	14	26	32	24	5.6
Workload	0	2	8	47	25	12	4	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	4	35	25	25	10	5.0
Learn Exp	0	5	7	34	31	18	2	4.6

The majority of the comments were positive, with students describing Cohen as a good motivator, communicator and approachable individual.

MAT 223H1S Linear Algebra I

Instructor(s): S. Cohen

Enr: 109	Resp: 44			Retake: 52%			Mean	
	1	2	3	4	5	6		7
Presents	0	0	0	14	19	35	30	5.8
Explains	0	0	2	14	40	28	14	5.4
Communicates	0	2	0	6	13	34	41	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	0	16	59	23	6.1
Workload	0	0	6	39	27	20	4	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	2	37	18	25	16	5.2
Learn Exp	5	0	2	52	23	14	0	4.3

Students praised Cohen as a skilled and enthusiastic instructor, and lauded him particularly for his sense of humour. Some appreciated the wider geometric/theoretical context presented for the course content, while others felt that more examples were needed, particularly of a computational nature. Some students were also concerned about what they felt was the quick pace of the course. Overall, students were satisfied

148 MATH, ACTUARIAL & STATISTICS

with the course.

Instructor(s): R. Stanczak

	Enr: 172							Resp: 79	Retake: 49%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	1	2	14	38	25	16	5.4	
Explains	0	3	1	14	32	35	12	5.3	
Communicates	2	2	12	22	32	20	6	4.7	
Teaching	0	2	2	15	39	29	10	5.2	
Workload	0	2	11	35	25	17	6	4.6	
Difficulty	0	1	7	29	32	19	10	4.9	
Learn Exp	0	5	9	49	23	11	0	4.3	

Stanczak's lectures were organized and well-presented. He gave students a lot of examples and detailed explanations to illustrate difficult concepts. He was very informed about the material and was comfortable in sharing his knowledge with the students. The midterm test was difficult and the material was generally complex.

MAT 224H1F Linear Algebra II

Instructor(s): R. Stanczak

	Enr: 76							Resp: 33	Retake: 63%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	3	9	48	30	9	5.3	
Explains	0	0	3	9	39	36	12	5.5	
Communicates	0	0	3	21	39	24	12	5.2	
Teaching	0	0	0	12	32	48	6	5.5	
Workload	0	0	3	31	25	34	6	5.1	
Difficulty	0	0	3	22	32	32	9	5.2	
Learn Exp	0	4	8	34	30	17	4	4.6	

Students felt the instructor was good in all respects but disliked the 3-hour lectures.

MAT 224H1S Linear Algebra II

Instructor(s): R. Stanczak

	Enr: 106							Resp: 41	Retake: 45%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	2	10	27	32	27	5.7	
Explains	0	0	0	19	21	21	36	5.8	
Communicates	0	0	5	15	22	35	22	5.6	
Teaching	0	0	0	9	31	31	26	5.8	
Workload	0	0	4	43	31	19	0	4.7	
Difficulty	0	4	0	29	24	31	9	5.1	
Learn Exp	0	3	18	34	12	28	3	4.5	

This course received mixed reviews. Students shunned the text, but commended the instructor for communicating the material effectively. Stanczak was also described as showing great interest in the course material and possessing a great sense of humour. Some suggested more graded problem sets and/or quizzes would have helped students grasp the material.

MAT 235Y1Y Calculus II

Instructor(s): S. Uppal

	Enr: 117							Resp: 104	Retake: 61%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	0	3	16	33	43	6.1	
Explains	0	0	0	8	10	45	33	6.0	
Communicates	0	0	4	10	30	37	16	5.5	
Teaching	0	0	0	6	15	43	32	6.0	
Workload	0	2	9	46	26	12	5	4.5	
Difficulty	0	3	5	46	28	12	6	4.6	
Learn Exp	0	1	3	46	31	14	2	4.6	

Students were unanimous in their praise for Uppal, lauding him for his skill in explaining concepts, his enthusiasm, his knowledge and his organization. They appreciated, in particular, his course notes, and found

the homework useful for learning the material. There was some concern, though, about the difficult of the tests.

MAT 237Y1Y Multivariable Calculus

Instructor(s): A. Savage

	Enr: 67							Resp: 37	Retake: 82%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	0	8	18	10	62	6.3	
Explains	0	0	0	10	13	32	43	6.1	
Communicates	0	0	0	5	24	18	51	6.2	
Teaching	0	0	0	5	11	33	50	6.3	
Workload	0	0	5	35	29	29	0	4.8	
Difficulty	0	0	5	27	10	16	8	4.9	
Learn Exp	0	0	0	23	23	36	16	5.5	

Students appreciated Savage's brightness and enthusiasm. He was said to be clear, neat, and organized, and gave helpful examples in class as well as extra problems. Students also felt he was very approachable.

Some students complained about the difficulty of the problem sets, though many said they learned a lot from them. Overall, the course received good reviews, with students commending the instructor for making a potentially boring and difficult subject interesting and fun.

Instructor(s): R. Stanczak

	Enr: 156							Resp: 100	Retake: 63%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	1	1	9	34	31	22	5.6	
Explains	0	0	1	12	26	29	30	5.8	
Communicates	0	0	0	6	34	32	26	5.8	
Teaching	0	0	0	8	26	39	25	5.8	
Workload	0	0	2	34	40	15	7	4.9	
Difficulty	1	0	0	23	37	28	10	5.2	
Learn Exp	0	3	3	32	34	15	9	4.8	

Stanczak was said to be enthusiastic and respectful. Students praised him for his excellent examples in class and clear notes that were useful for tests. Many appreciated his explaining concepts in an alternative way to the textbook. He was also said to be funny, friendly and kind.

Major issues of concern were the computational nature of the course (it was said to be useful only for those who would need math as a tool) as well as marking (not addressed in a timely manner, unclear and unreliable). Some students suggested having shorter but more frequent problem sets as well.

MAT 244H1F Introduction to Ordinary Differential Equations

Instructor(s): S. Homayouni

	Enr: 70							Resp: 50	Retake: 50%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	4	18	24	42	10	5.4	
Explains	0	0	4	17	27	40	10	5.4	
Communicates	0	0	0	8	30	30	30	5.8	
Teaching	0	0	0	14	25	48	10	5.6	
Workload	0	2	8	65	23	0	0	4.1	
Difficulty	0	2	18	56	16	6	0	4.1	
Learn Exp	0	2	8	45	29	13	0	4.4	

Students felt the instructor did a good job with what many felt was dry material. Several students complained that the course was too applied (the Math Department offers MAT 267H a more theoretical version of the course).

MAT 246Y1Y Concepts in Abstract Mathematics

Instructor(s): P. Rosenthal

	Enr: 38							Resp: 52	Retake: 78%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	6	18	22	34	18	5.4	
Explains	0	0	3	15	31	27	21	5.5	

Communicates	0	0	2	12	20	22	42	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	6	24	34	34	6.0
Workload	0	5	9	64	5	11	1	4.1
Difficulty	0	6	2	48	24	14	4	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	3	34	18	21	21	5.2

Rosenthal was an effective lecturer overall. He was knowledgeable, approachable and very helpful. His exam questions were fair - they reflected the material learned in class. Students would have appreciated a textbook as it would have been a useful reference for the concepts discussed by the instructor.

Instructor(s): J. Korman

Enr: 83	Resp: 21							Retake: 75%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	9	14	28	33	14	5.3
Explains	0	0	0	19	23	38	19	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	10	40	40	10	5.5
Teaching	0	0	0	14	14	52	19	5.8
Workload	5	5	10	50	30	0	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	25	45	30	0	5.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	25	30	30	15	5.3

Students found the course an enjoyable learning experience. Korman interacted with students well, and provided effective, enthusiastic and lucid instruction.

MAT 247H1F Algebra II

Instructor(s): F. Murnaghan

Enr: 46	Resp: 23							Retake: 80%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	30	43	26	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	0	34	34	30	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	13	34	21	30	5.7
Teaching	0	0	0	4	26	26	43	6.1
Workload	0	0	0	17	17	47	17	5.7
Difficulty	0	0	0	27	18	31	22	5.5
Learn Exp	0	5	5	23	17	23	23	5.2

Students almost unanimously felt the instructor was very good. Students felt the course was good; they enjoyed the material and greatly enjoyed the instructor's style of lecturing.

MAT 257Y1Y Analysis II

Instructor(s): J. Arthur

Enr: 44	Resp: 35							Retake: 87%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	2	28	68	6.7
Explains	0	0	2	5	8	20	62	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	2	5	11	80	6.7
Teaching	0	0	0	0	8	11	80	6.7
Workload	0	0	9	36	30	9	15	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	0	15	30	54	6.4
Learn Exp	0	0	7	3	7	29	51	6.1

Students thought it was a pleasure to attend Arthur's lectures. He presented difficult material effectively and in a clear fashion. He was organized, approachable and very kind. He genuinely cared about his students' learning. The material made students' "brains hurt", but this was all right because Arthur was willing to remedy the problem with his kindness and ability to explain the material in fun ways.

MAT 267H1S Advanced Ordinary Differential Equations I

Instructor(s): A. Khovanskii

Enr: 42	Resp: 19							Retake: 72%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	10	0	31	21	21	10	5	3.9
Explains	0	10	15	21	26	5	21	4.6

Communicates	0	0	5	5	31	36	21	5.6
Teaching	0	11	11	22	22	16	16	4.7
Workload	5	21	26	21	21	0	5	3.5
Difficulty	0	0	10	26	21	31	10	5.1
Learn Exp	0	0	14	42	0	21	21	4.9

Khovanskii tried his best to explain the material clearly. He provided a "good picture of differential equations, rather than just showing the class how to solve the problems." His notes on the board were so cluttered, however, it was a bit hard to take notes. The book chosen for the course didn't seem useful as it didn't give good explanations of the material. Students also recommended the use of some assignments to help students stay focussed and up-to-date on the material. Overall, a worthwhile course to take despite the little problems.

MAT 301H1F Groups and Symmetries

Instructor(s): H. Bursztyn

Enr: 65	Resp: 35							Retake: 65%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	32	41	26	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	2	20	50	26	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	2	23	50	23	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	0	26	44	29	6.0
Workload	0	2	5	40	40	8	2	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	5	37	34	14	8	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	40	33	25	0	4.9

Instructor(s): M. Shub

Enr: 28	Resp: 6							Retake: 83%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	33	16	16	33	5.5
Explains	0	0	0	0	50	16	33	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	16	50	33	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	0	16	50	33	6.2
Workload	0	0	0	66	33	0	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	50	50	0	0	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	16	50	0	33	5.5

MAT 302H1S Polynomial Equations and Fields

Instructor(s): M. Shub

Enr: 33	Resp: 9							Retake: 62%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	11	22	44	11	11	4.9
Explains	0	0	22	0	22	44	11	5.2
Communicates	0	0	11	11	22	11	44	5.7
Teaching	0	0	0	22	11	44	22	5.7
Workload	0	11	0	33	44	11	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	12	0	37	37	12	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	14	28	28	14	14	4.9

Shub was a "nice, helpful, and clear" instructor. It was evident that Shub enjoyed teaching - he was always willing to help students.

MAT 309H1F Introduction to Mathematical Logic

Instructor(s): F. Tall

Enr: 32	Resp: 20							Retake: 90%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	10	20	45	25	0	4.8
Explains	0	5	15	26	31	15	5	4.5
Communicates	0	0	0	20	35	10	35	5.6
Teaching	0	0	0	21	26	36	15	5.5
Workload	0	0	15	60	25	0	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	30	15	30	20	5	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	29	52	11	5	4.9

Students found the instructor lectured well and was highly entertaining.

150 MATH, ACTUARIAL & STATISTICS

MAT 315H1S Introduction to Number Theory

Instructor(s): K-H. Lee

	Enr: 89							Mean
	Resp: 22			Retake: 50%				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	36	22	36	4	5.1
Explains	0	0	18	36	22	18	4	4.5
Communicates	0	4	9	27	18	27	13	5.0
Teaching	0	9	18	18	31	22	0	4.4
Workload	0	0	0	18	40	36	4	5.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	27	45	13	13	5.1
Learn Exp	5	5	17	35	17	17	0	4.1

Lee provided "coherent, easy-to-follow and lively" lectures. However, students found the course very challenging and tedious despite Lee's efforts to make it seem easy. The midterm was quite long and difficult to write within the time allotted. There was very little or no feedback at all making it hard for students to see where they had gone wrong. It also took several weeks before the assignments were returned.

MAT 334H1S Complex Variables

Instructor(s): T. Bloom

	Enr: 99							Mean
	Resp: 43			Retake: 54%				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	2	4	23	26	33	9	5.1
Explains	0	2	0	18	25	39	13	5.4
Communicates	2	2	13	23	32	16	9	4.7
Teaching	0	0	7	19	26	31	14	5.3
Workload	4	0	4	57	23	9	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	2	6	34	32	20	2	4.7
Learn Exp	0	3	6	60	23	6	0	4.2

Bloom was a good instructor who explained the material clearly and with the use of many examples. Students were not really happy with the quizzes that had questions worth 7% of the final mark - these were done win only twenty minutes, so if students made slight errors, the penalty was quite high. The material was challenging, and the tests were difficult. However, Bloom was friendly and accommodating.

MAT 335H1S Chaos, Fractals and Dynamics

Instructor(s): E. Pujals

	Enr: 76							Mean
	Resp: 16			Retake: 35%				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	6	6	25	43	6	12	4.8
Explains	0	0	0	31	25	12	31	5.4
Communicates	0	0	6	6	18	31	37	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	25	37	18	18	5.3
Workload	0	0	0	68	18	6	6	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	6	13	46	13	20	5.3
Learn Exp	0	0	14	42	14	7	21	4.8

MAT 347Y1Y Groups, Rings and Fields

Instructor(s): A. Del Junco

	Enr: 20							Mean
	Resp: 9			Retake: 55%				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	44	33	11	11	0	3.9
Explains	0	11	11	44	22	11	0	4.1
Communicates	0	0	33	11	44	11	0	4.3
Teaching	0	0	22	22	22	22	11	4.8
Workload	0	0	0	22	33	33	11	5.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	11	11	22	55	6.2
Learn Exp	0	0	14	14	42	14	14	5.0

For many students, this was a really difficult course. However, Del Junco tried his best to explain the material clearly with use of examples. He was a bit disorganized with lectures.

MAT 354H1F Complex Analysis I

Instructor(s): E. Bierstone

	Enr: 35							Mean
	Resp: 25			Retake: 75%				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	8	12	24	56	6.3
Explains	0	0	4	8	28	24	36	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	28	24	48	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	4	24	20	52	6.2
Workload	0	0	0	16	16	41	25	5.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	4	8	33	54	6.4
Learn Exp	0	0	4	13	13	43	26	5.7

Students spoke to Bierstone's outstanding lecturing style. They felt the course was very difficult and should have had a tutorial. Students complained that the textbook was hard to follow and did not connect well with the lectures. Students found Bierstone to be very approachable and excellent one-on-one during office hours as well as during class.

MAT 363H1S Introduction to Differential Geometry

Instructor(s): H. Bursztyn

	Enr: 31							Mean
	Resp: 21			Retake: 88%				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	9	42	47	6.4
Explains	0	0	0	5	5	30	60	6.4
Communicates	0	0	0	0	15	30	55	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	0	10	50	40	6.3
Workload	4	4	0	57	19	14	0	4.2
Difficulty	5	0	25	35	10	20	5	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	14	28	42	14	5.6

Students thought Bursztyn was a very good instructor who made use of excellent examples to explain concepts clearly. He was very knowledgeable, friendly and helpful.

MAT 365H1S Classical Geometrics

Instructor(s): A. Khovanskii

	Enr: 26							Mean
	Resp: 12			Retake: 63%				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	8	25	33	8	16	8	4.2
Explains	0	0	8	33	25	25	8	4.9
Communicates	0	0	0	8	8	16	66	6.4
Teaching	0	0	8	8	33	25	25	5.5
Workload	0	0	0	81	9	9	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	54	18	18	9	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	11	11	22	33	22	5.4

Khovanskii was enthusiastic, but lacking in organization. There was no textbook for the course - it would have helped if there was. Students also wished examples were used to present the material more clearly.

MAT 390H1F History of Mathematics up to 1700

Instructor(s): C. Fraser

	Enr: 44							Mean
	Resp: 49			Retake: 77%				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	4	10	32	32	20	5.6
Explains	0	0	2	10	38	34	14	5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	8	30	32	28	5.8
Teaching	0	0	2	8	30	44	14	5.6
Workload	0	2	10	61	22	4	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	2	16	55	20	6	0	4.1
Learn Exp	2	0	2	45	17	25	5	4.7

Fraser's lectures were entertaining, enthusiastic and interesting. Some students thought that the tests did not reflect the material, or were difficult and long. Other's said the expectations on assignments were unclear and very little feedback was given. Overall, however, students enjoyed Fraser's style of teaching.

MAT 425H1F Differential Topology

Instructor(s): A. Khovanskii

	Enr: 9				Resp: 9			Retake: 100%			Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	14	28	57				6.4
Explains	0	0	0	0	0	28	71				6.7
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	0	100				7.0
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	14	85				6.9
Workload	0	28	28	42	0	0	0				3.1
Difficulty	0	0	0	28	42	14	14				5.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	16	0	83				6.7

Students thought that the instructor's lecture style was incredible. The felt he made a personal connection that greatly motivated them.

MAT 427H1S Algebraic Topology

Instructor(s): D. Bar-Natan

	Enr: 35				Resp: 25			Retake: 82%			Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	5	6	7	
Presents	0	4	17	13	8	30	26				5.2
Explains	0	0	8	4	13	30	43				6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	0	12	50	37				6.2
Teaching	0	0	4	4	20	16	54				6.1
Workload	0	0	12	41	12	29	4				4.7
Difficulty	0	0	4	37	29	20	8				4.9
Learn Exp	0	5	0	21	5	42	26				5.6

Bar-Natan was enthusiastic and very good in making Math "intuitive". He used proofs or pictorial explanations to clarify concepts. Students suggested organizing the material in a better way as it appeared disorganized at times. Overall, students thought the course was very enjoyable.

MAT 454H1S Complex Analysis II

Instructor(s): E. Bierstone

	Enr: 20				Resp: 19			Retake: 80%			Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	15	15	68				6.5
Explains	0	0	1	05	26	36	21				5.5
Communicates	0	5	0	5	11	44	33				5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	11	0	35	52				6.3
Workload	0	0	0	11	44	27	16				5.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	22	27	27	22				5.5
Learn Exp	0	6	0	6	6	53	26				5.8

The course material was said to be difficult/challenging, though most felt it was worthwhile. Bierstone's lectures were describe as very engaging and "unusually interactive" for a mathematics course. His instructing style was said to be very effective and offered new insight into material that had been introduced in the previous complex analysis course. There was some concerns that the instructor overestimated the level of the class.

MAT 457Y1Y Real Analysis II

Instructor(s): A. Del Junco

	Enr: 8				Resp: 5			Retake: 100%			Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	20	20	40	20	0				4.6
Explains	0	0	0	40	40	20	0				4.8
Communicates	0	0	0	40	40	20	0				4.8
Teaching	0	0	0	20	60	20	0				5.0
Workload	0	0	0	20	40	40	0				5.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	0	40	60	0				5.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	20	80	0				5.8

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...



arts & science students' union

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

