

Introduction

The Undergraduate Sociology Students' Union (USSU) is a student-run organization that acts as a liaison between students and the Department of Sociology. We offer a variety of services to undergrads in Sociology: peer counselling service and test packages from past Sociology courses. Various USSU members have office hours where students can drop by and ask questions. To find out more or to join USSU, call us at (416) 978-4385, e-mail us at ussu\_soc@hotmail.com or drop by our office at 725 Spadina Ave., room 225.

**USSU** Executive

#### SOC 101Y1Y Introduction to Sociology

Instructor(s): M. Mackinnon

Enr: 698		Res	sp: 29	7				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	3	4	5	25	26	28	5	4.7
Explains	1	3	8	18	29	25	13	5.0
Communicates	4	7	12	22	27	16	8	4.4
Teaching	2	3	6	19	29	31	7	4.9
Workload	1	3	11	58	17	4	3	4.1
Difficulty	1	1	12	57	16	7	2	4.2
Learn Exp	4	2	8	41	21	15	5	4.4

Most students felt that Mackinnon was a good instructor and tried to keep students awake with little jokes, but a few mentioned his monotonous voice and disorganization. The multiple-choice tests did not reflect important points of the class.

Students would have appreciated more (and better) tutorials because there was no chance for discussion in such a large class.

Instructor(s): R. Brym

Enr: 810		Res	p: 484	4	Retake: 69%			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	2	13	20	35	27	5.7
Explains	0	1	1	13	24	34	24	5.6
Communicates	0	1	5	12	22	31	25	5.5
Teaching	1	0	3	11	18	39	24	5.6
Workload	1	1	4	48	25	12	6	4.6
Difficulty	0	2	4	54	22	10	5	4.5
Learn Exp	3	1	6	30	21	23	11	4.8

Brym was said to be good. Tests should have been simpler and an essay would have better reflected the students' knowledge.

#### SOC 200Y1Y Introduction to Social Research

Instructor(s): T. Newmeyer

Enr: 219		Res	p: 138	3		, D		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	3	5	25	35	20	8	4.9
Explains	1	4	7	26	34	21	4	4.7

Communicates	5	13	10	25	26	9	9	4.2
Teaching	2	3	4	23	33	21	11	4.9
Workload	0	0	2	25	30	19	22	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	5	47	23	16	8	4.8
Learn Exp	6	10	23	39	10	6	3	3.7

This class was said to have too many assignments and the material was somewhat boring. Newmeyer had a great sense of humour.

# SOC 203Y1Y History of Social Theory

Instructor(s): J. Veugelers

Enr: 240	Resp: 157					Reta	ke: 36%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	1	1	11	28	38	17	5.5
Explains	0	0	2	11	30	37	17	5.5
Communicates	0	1	2	14	26	34	20	5.5
Teaching	0	2	1	7	23	42	21	5.7
Workload	1	0	1	54	32	8	1	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	1	43	38	14	2	4.7
Learn Exp	2	3	5	41	26	17	2	4.5

This course had great material. There was said to be too much reading and the class was too big. However, students appreciated Veugelers' enthusiasm for the material.

## SOC 205Y1Y Urban Sociology

Instructor(s): G. Stalker

Enr: 77	Re	sp: 55	5					
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	3	18	27	38	11	5.4
Explains	0	0	3	29	23	38	5	5.1
Communicates	9	5	20	22	24	12	5	4.1
Teaching	0	1	5	32	30	27	1	4.8
Workload	0	1	5	52	27	10	1	4.5
Difficulty	0	1	5	58	24	7	1	4.4
Learn Exp	2	0	7	42	28	13	5	4.6

Students found the instructor to be very knowledgeable and organized, although some felt the instructor was a little dry and unapproachable. Students commented that material was very interesting, although readings were somewhat dry.

## SOC 212Y1Y Deviance and Control

Instructor(s): C. Colagnori

Enr: 329	Resp: 238				Reta	ke: 88%		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	2	3	11	28	32	20	5.5
Explains	0	0	2	6	18	41	30	5.9
Communicates	0	0	1	4	15	38	40	6.1
Teaching	0	0	2	5	21	37	31	5.9
Workload	0	1	9	70	12	5	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	1	7	66	19	4	0	4.2
Learn Exp	1	0	3	24	32	20	18	5.2

Colagnori was explicit in his teaching and used appropriate examples. Students felt that it was a wonderful class experience. Colagnori was approachable and responded to emails quickly, although he didn't have proper office hours. Students complained about the changed format on the 2nd test and felt that more time for tests was needed. The short answer questions should have been more detailed. Also, the penalty for a late assignment was too much.

# SOC 214Y1Y Sociology of the Family

Instructor(s): B. Fox

Enr: 69		Res	sp: 47	,	Retake: 80%			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	4	6	6	2	19	34	27	5.4
Explains	6	2	2	10	21	36	21	5.3

### 220 SOCIOLOGY

Communicates	4	4	0	13	17	36	23	5.4
Teaching	4	6	4	4	10	48	21	5.4
Workload	0	0	2	72	21	2	2	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	6	78	8	0	6	4.2
Learn Exp	3	3	0	20	31	34	6	5.0

Students felt that the evaluation methods were poor and did not reflect the course material. However, most students thought the instructor was passionate about the material and teaching.

#### SOC 215Y1Y Socialization

Instructor(s): I. Knezevic

Enr: 104	Resp: 48					Ret	etake: 62%		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	4	0	8	6	28	36	15	5.3	
Explains	4	0	4	4	31	35	20	5.4	
Communicates	2	2	4	19	28	30	13	5.1	
Teaching	6	2	6	4	29	34	15	5.1	
Workload	2	2	10	76	6	2	0	3.9	
Difficulty	2	0	13	75	9	0	0	3.9	
Learn Exp	10	0	13	35	21	10	8	4.2	

Students found the instructor to be passionate and enthusiastic about the material - which students found to be quite dry. The students also found that the instructor was at times sarcastic and rude to students asking questions.

### SOC 242Y1Y Sociology of Health and Medicine

Instructor(s): M. Paez-Victor

Enr: 125		Re	sp: 85	,		Reta	ke: 61%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	1	11	23	27	22	11	1	4.0
Explains	0	3	8	25	35	21	5	4.8
Communicates	1	2	1	10	32	35	16	5.4
Teaching	1	4	17	24	30	17	3	4.5
Workload	1	2	11	77	5	1	0	3.9
Difficulty	0	2	17	74	5	0	0	3.8
Learn Exp	1	5	9	33	28	16	4	4.5

Students found the main problem with the course to be organization. Students found that Paez-Victor lacked organization and this made the course confusing. The constant changes to the syllabus and course outline confused students in terms of what to expect. Tests were also confusing - not always meeting students' expectations. The instructor was praised for enthusiasm for the material. Students also liked the inclusion and variety of guest speakers.

## SOC 256H1F Lives and Societies

Instructor(s): B. Erickson

Enr: 68		Res	sp: 41		Retake: 76%			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	7	15	45	32	6.0
Explains	0	0	2	2	7	58	29	6.1
Communicates	0	0	2	2	21	41	31	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	5	25	47	22	5.9
Workload	0	0	2	78	17	2	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	2	9	78	4	4	0	4.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	54	24	15	6	4.7

Students found Erickson to be an enthusiastic and committed instructor. Lectures were thorough and well-explained. Erickson encouraged class participation. Students commented on how the tests did not appropriately cover the material and they also felt that further discussion of the readings would have been beneficial.

#### SOC 257H1F Lives in Canada

Instructor(s): B. Erickson

Enr: 63		Re	sp: 36	6	Retake: 77%			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	5	25	41	27	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	2	25	45	25	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	8	22	44	25	5.9
Teaching	0	0	2	2	22	55	16	5.8
Workload	0	2	8	75	11	2	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	2	13	69	13	0	0	3.9
Learn Exp	0	0	8	41	24	16	12	4.8

Lectures were interesting, practical and well-organized. Erickson was enthusiastic and thorough. Because of the positive lecture environment, students were able to engage in interesting class discussions. Students found the multiple choice tests "tricky". In addition, students would have appreciated the instructor and TAs to be more available for assistance.

### SOC 263H1S The Quality of Social Life

Instructor(s): W. Magee

Enr: 50		Resp: 34				Reta	ke: 66	ke: 66%		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean		
Presents	0	9	12	19	25	32	0	4.6		
Explains	0	6	6	22	38	19	6	4.8		
Communicates	0	3	3	12	41	25	12	5.2		
Teaching	0	3	3	9	38	41	3	5.2		
Workload	0	3	9	54	22	9	0	4.3		
Difficulty	0	3	12	74	3	6	0	4.0		
Learn Exp	4	4	16	37	29	8	0	4.1		

Students enjoyed the discussion periods and the kind and approachable character of Magee. Furthermore, they found the lecturer to be a good presenter of the material. On the other hand, a few thought Magee lacked enthusiasm, were overwhelmed by the amount of readings, the discussion periods, and the lack of a common thread.

### SOC 297H1S Sociology of Work

Instructor(s): S. Welsh

Enr: 57		Re	Resp: 34 Retake: 94%				%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	3	15	42	39	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	3	15	45	36	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	0	6	48	45	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	0	15	48	36	6.2
Workload	0	3	15	66	15	0	0	3.9
Difficulty	0	3	12	75	9	0	0	3.9
Learn Exp	0	0	0	30	15	34	19	5.4

Welsh was said to be a very good instructor. She was very enthusiastic and easy to approach.

# SOC 300Y1Y Quantitative Analysis

Instructor(s): A. Sorenson

Enr: 15	Resp: 11					Reta	ke: 18%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	9	36	36	18	0	4.6
Explains	0	0	0	18	45	36	0	5.2
Communicates	0	0	0	9	27	54	9	5.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	36	45	18	5.8
Workload	0	0	0	18	54	18	9	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	18	63	18	0	5.0
Learn Exp	0	9	0	45	27	18	0	4.5

Sorenson was a good instructor - very kind and understanding, enthusiastic and made time for her students. The material, however, was very hard to grasp, and the textbook was not good. The exercises 'were worth little' and answers needed to be brief and specific.

#### SOC 301Y1Y Theories and Inequality

Instructor(s): B. Baldus

Enr: 67		Resp: 39				Reta	ke: 73%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	5	15	26	36	15	5.4
Explains	0	0	2	2	21	39	34	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	5	13	40	40	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	2	13	50	34	6.2
Workload	0	2	2	68	15	7	2	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	2	71	21	2	2	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	3	28	25	28	14	5.2

Students had nothing but wonderful things to say about Baldus - enthusiastic, knowledgeable, understanding, inspiring and approachable. Students thought that the material was interesting, however, there was too much of it.

# SOC 303H1F Family Demography

Instructor(s): L. Lee

Enr: 69		Re	sp: 46	6		Reta	Retake: 77%			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean		
Presents	0	0	4	8	30	34	21	5.6		
Explains	2	2	0	6	30	45	13	5.5		
Communicates	0	0	4	21	32	34	6	5.2		
Teaching	0	2	0	13	28	45	10	5.5		
Workload	0	0	2	86	6	4	0	4.1		
Difficulty	0	2	10	76	6	4	0	4.0		
Learn Exp	0	2	2	56	13	21	2	4.6		

Students praised Lee for being enthusiastic and well-organized. Students also felt that the testing method was too ambitious for so much material.

# SOC 306Y1Y Sociology of Crime and Delinquency

Instructor(s): R. Gillis

Enr: 126		Re	Resp: 92 Retake: 90%				%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	7	29	29	28	4	4.9
Explains	0	0	1	12	28	42	15	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	4	7	45	42	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	6	20	50	21	5.9
Workload	1	3	4	58	16	10	4	4.4
Difficulty	0	3	10	67	13	4	1	4.1
Learn Exp	1	2	0	14	39	30	11	5.3

Students felt that Gillis was easy going and enthusiastic about the material. Students felt that slides on the lecture outlines would have been helpful. The volume of readings for each test was disproportionate to the questions on the test. Also, some students felt that more evaluation methods were needed other than multiple choice tests. Students complained that too much reading was required and the texts were expensive.

# SOC 317Y1Y Industrial Sociology

Instructor(s): D. Dimitrova

motractor(s). D.	Dillilla	ova								
Enr: 53		Re	sp: 23	3		Retake: 72%				
-	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean		
Presents	0	4	8	8	34	30	13	5.2		
Explains	0	4	4	26	17	34	13	5.1		
Communicates	0	0	8	13	30	39	8	5.3		
Teaching	0	0	8	13	30	43	4	5.2		
Workload	0	0	0	81	13	4	0	4.2		
Difficulty	0	0	9	81	9	0	0	4.0		
Learn Exp	0	0	14	64	14	7	0	4.1		

Students felt that Dimitrova had a good sense of humour and was well-organized, though tutorial sessions would have been useful. Some students felt that the lecture slides didn't overlap the actual lectures. The group presentations were a waste of time. The TA was hard to under-

stand and didn't make an effort to know the class.

### SOC 347H1S Sociology of Language

Instructor(s): J. Panster

Enr: 94		Re	sp: 45	,	Retake: 64%			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	6	18	43	20	11	5.1
Explains	0	0	2	15	35	40	6	5.3
Communicates	0	0	0	6	17	55	20	5.9
Teaching	0	2	0	24	44	22	6	5.0
Workload	2	2	26	66	2	0	0	3.6
Difficulty	0	2	24	68	4	0	0	3.8
Learn Exp	0	4	14	41	26	7	4	4.3

Students felt the instructor was enthusiastic, approachable and respectful. The course material was interesting, however, students found the material too repetitive and tedious, and that the final essay was too heavily weighted. The instructor encouraged class discussion and participation.

## SOC 348H1S Sociology & Emotions

Instructor(s): W. Magee

Enr: 35		Re	sp: 17	,	Retake: 70%			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	6	12	25	31	18	6	4.6
Explains	0	0	5	11	35	35	11	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	11	35	41	11	5.5
Teaching	0	0	0	11	35	47	5	5.5
Workload	0	0	0	23	23	23	29	5.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	52	11	17	17	5.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	42	42	14	0	4.7

Magee was very enthusiastic but seemed unfamiliar with the material. There was too much reading in the course, but the web participation was highly enjoyed.

### SOC 351Y1Y Social & Health Care Policy

Instructor(s): I. Peng

( )	0							
Enr: 63		Re	sp: 36	i				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	2	0	13	19	25	30	8	4.9
Explains	2	2	11	13	30	30	8	4.9
Communicates	0	0	8	11	33	27	19	5.4
Teaching	0	2	8	17	31	25	14	5.1
Workload	0	0	11	72	16	0	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	8	72	19	0	0	4.1
Learn Exp	3	3	11	51	22	7	0	4.1

Peng was a good and well-organized instructor. Many students felt that the assignments were unclear as to what was required. Also, some wanted other methods of evaluation than just the essays.

# SOC 360Y1Y Sociology of Cultural Studies

Instructor(s): R. MacKay

Enr: 24		Re	esp: 8			Reta	ke: 50%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	12	0	0	50	37	0	0	4.0
Explains	0	0	25	37	37	0	0	4.1
Communicates	0	0	0	25	37	25	12	5.2
Teaching	0	0	25	25	25	12	12	4.6
Workload	0	0	0	87	12	0	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	0	87	12	0	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	57	28	0	14	4.7

MacKay was interesting and kind. Most students found his course enjoyable. Many students, however, considered the assignments to be vague.

#### SOC 365Y1Y Gender Relations

Instructor(s): B. Fox

Enr: 132	Resp: 103				Retake: 76%			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	1	4	5	33	35	21	5.6
Explains	0	1	5	6	24	44	19	5.6
Communicates	1	1	2	10	30	35	26	5.5
Teaching	0	3	3	8	21	46	19	5.6
Workload	0	1	0	50	31	13	4	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	1	72	15	6	1	4.3
Learn Exp	0	1	3	27	26	22	18	5.2

Fox, according to most students was a good instructor, very insightful and thorough, with plenty of enthusiasm and understanding. Most agreed that this course was a real eye opener. Some students were concerned about the amount of readings required. Tests were unfair because students did not know what was being asked of them. A few felt a bias towards researching only white middle class females. Others thought that textbooks were too expensive, more discussion in class was needed and the expectations for essay questions lacked clarity.

#### SOC 367H1S Race, Class and Gender

Instructor(s): J. Taylor

Enr: 61		Resp: 45				Retake: 97%		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	8	28	37	24	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	2	15	46	35	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	0	4	28	66	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	6	53	40	6.3
Workload	0	0	0	20	39	23	16	5.3
Difficulty	0	0	2	59	31	6	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	8	35	29	26	5.7

This course had to much reading, but the enthusiasm and humour of the instructor made it worthwhile. There were also great discussions in class

### SOC 373H1F Sociology of Disability I

Instructor(s): R. MacKay

Enr: 19		Resp: 11			Retake: 100%			
-	1_	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	10	30	20	0	40	5.3
Explains	0	0	10	10	30	10	40	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	10	40	50	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	10	10	40	40	6.1
Workload	0	0	18	81	0	0	0	3.8
Difficulty	0	0	9	63	18	9	0	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	25	25	25	25	5.5

Students found this course not only interesting and genuine - but enlightening. MacKay was complimented on his enthusiasm and approachability. The small class size was also praised as key to the course's success. Students found MacKay passionate and really interested in their development.

# SOC 374H1S Sociology of Disability II

Instructor(s): R. MacKay

Enr: 15		Res	sp: 10	)		Retak		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	10	60	20	10	5.3
Explains	0	0	0	10	40	40	10	5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	0	10	20	70	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	10	10	40	40	6.1
Workload	0	20	0	70	10	0	0	3.7
Difficulty	0	20	0	60	10	0	10	4.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	22	11	33	33	5.8

Students found MacKay to be very passionate and that UofT was

lucky to have him as an instructor. Students found the course material to be very valuable and that it was a wonderful learning experience.

#### SOC 382Y1Y Social Issues

Instructor(s): L. Tepperman

Enr: 66	Resp: 35				Retake: 69%			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	5	2	14	20	37	20	5.4
Explains	0	2	0	5	32	35	23	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	0	23	38	38	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	8	20	37	34	6.0
Workload	0	0	5	77	11	5	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	17	65	11	5	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	15	23	26	30	3	4.8

Students felt that the material was intense and useful. Tepperman communicated the material and course requirements very clearly, but felt he needed to talk a bit slower. The text was too simplistic. The weight of each question on the test was too much and test questions needed

#### SOC 385H1S Social Ecology

Instructor(s): B. Michelson

Enr: 39		Re	sp: 22	!		Reta	Retake: 84%		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	0	9	28	42	19	5.7	
Explains	0	0	4	9	19	52	14	5.6	
Communicates	0	0	4	4	9	45	36	6.0	
Teaching	0	0	0	4	28	47	19	5.8	
Workload	0	0	4	90	4	0	0	4.0	
Difficulty	0	0	19	76	4	0	0	3.9	
Learn Exp	0	0	11	16	33	33	5	5.1	

The class had very interesting and unique material. The instructor was very knowledgeable, engaging and enthusiastic.

# SOC 387Y1Y Qualitative Analysis

Instructor(s): I. Peng

Enr: 17		Resp: 11 Retake: 30%						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	9	36	36	9	9	0	3.7
Explains	0	0	27	18	36	9	9	4.5
Communicates	0	0	9	18	45	27	0	4.9
Teaching	0	0	9	54	27	9	0	4.4
Workload	0	0	0	81	18	0	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	9	81	9	0	0	4.0
Learn Exp	0	11	0	44	22	22	0	4.4

Peng was enthusiastic and the lectures were an interesting format - students discussions. However, with this method of learning, there should have been participation marks.

Peng was somewhat disorganized, regardless, they really liked her. She gave great positive, constructive criticism. Students felt the TAs graded unfairly.

## SOC 389Y1Y Contemporary Sociological Theory

Instructor(s): J. Veugelers

Enr: 19	Ü	Re	Resp: 14 Retake: 58%					
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	7	35	42	14	5.6
Explains	0	0	14	7	28	35	14	5.3
Communicates	0	0	0	21	14	14	50	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	7	21	35	35	6.0
Workload	0	0	7	57	14	14	7	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	28	28	21	21	5.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	16	41	8	33	5.6

Veugelers was very inspiring and effective. He gave stimulating lectures which taught his students to think critically. He was said to be a little

intimidating and unapproachable by a few.

# SOC 394Y1Y Urban Health in Toronto

Instructor(s): B. Berry

Enr: 15	Resp: 11				Retake: 90%			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	77	0	22	5.4
Explains	0	0	0	0	30	40	30	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	0	11	33	55	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	0	11	44	44	6.3
Workload	0	0	0	70	20	10	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	70	20	10	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	20	20	40	20	5.4

Students really enjoyed the intimate setting of a small class and thought that Berry was well-suited to this environment. Students enjoyed and greatly benefitted from Berry's enthusiasm and expertise in the field. Berry was also noted as being very approachable and helpful. Students felt, however, that more emphasis and focus was needed in class on local events.

### SOC 396H1F Urban Health

Instructor(s): B. Berry

Enr: 25		Resp: 20 Retake: 9					ke: 949	94%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	5	0	5	30	45	15	5.6	
Explains	0	5	0	15	25	35	20	5.4	
Communicates	0	0	0	5	20	50	25	5.9	
Teaching	0	0	5	0	20	50	25	5.9	
Workload	0	0	11	61	22	0	5	4.3	
Difficulty	0	0	10	73	10	0	5	4.2	
Learn Exp	0	0	6	6	53	26	6	5.2	

Overall, students found Berry approachable and enthusiastic about the material. The readings were noted as a bit dry. Some of the material was, at times, too abstract for a few students.

### SOC 396H1S Urban Health

Instructor(s): B. Berry

Enr: 20		Res	Resp: 15 Retake: 66%					
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	6	33	53	6	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	13	46	26	13	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	26	26	26	20	5.4
Teaching	0	0	0	6	40	40	13	5.6
Workload	0	0	6	53	33	6	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	86	13	0	0	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	7	38	23	15	15	4.9

Berry was very accessible and helpful with explaining concepts. Students considered him organized and the readings interesting.

Every response recognized Berry's devotion to personally attending to those who requested help, and noted his passion for his work.

### SOC 401Y1Y Advanced Seminar

Instructor(s): B. Baldus

	Resp: 8				Retake: 85%			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
0	0	0	0	25	37	37	6.1	
0	0	0	0	25	12	62	6.4	
0	0	0	0	12	12	75	6.6	
0	0	0	0	12	12	75	6.6	
0	0	0	75	25	0	0	4.2	
0	0	12	50	25	12	0	4.4	
0	0	0	0	37	37	25	5.9	
	0 0 0 0 0	1 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1 2 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 12	1 2 3 4   0 0 0 0   0 0 0 0   0 0 0 0   0 0 0 0   0 0 0 75   0 0 12 50	1     2     3     4     5       0     0     0     0     25       0     0     0     0     25       0     0     0     0     12       0     0     0     0     12       0     0     0     75     25       0     0     12     50     25	1     2     3     4     5     6       0     0     0     0     25     37       0     0     0     0     25     12       0     0     0     0     12     12       0     0     0     0     12     12       0     0     0     75     25     0       0     0     12     50     25     12	1 2 3 4 5 6 7   0 0 0 0 25 37 37   0 0 0 0 25 12 62   0 0 0 0 12 12 75   0 0 0 0 12 12 75   0 0 0 75 25 0 0   0 0 12 50 25 12 0	

Students enjoyed this class and considered Baldus to be an excellent instructor. The course was "thought-provoking". Baldus was considered to have great enthusiasm for the material and was also praised for being helpful and available for help.

