

## CHEMISTRY STUDENTS' UNION

6	12.011 ±4,2	16	32.06 ±2,4,6
4470 <sup>+</sup> 4100 <sup>+</sup>	<b>C</b>	717.75 388.36	<b>S</b>
2.62		2.07	
1s <sup>2</sup> 2s <sup>2</sup> p <sup>2</sup>		[Ne]3s <sup>2</sup> p <sup>4</sup>	
Carbon		Sulfur	

92	238.029 6,5,4,3
4407 1405	<b>U</b>
18.90	
[Rn]5f <sup>6</sup> d <sup>3</sup> 7s <sup>2</sup>	
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](mailto:csu@chem.utoronto.ca) or check out our website [www.chem.utoronto.ca/students/csu](http://www.chem.utoronto.ca/students/csu).

CSU Executive

## CHM 138H1F Introductory Chemistry I

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

Enr: 346      Resp: 189      Retake: 59%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Chin:</u>								
Presents	0	2	13	24	30	21	7	4.8
Explains	0	0	3	16	40	29	9	5.2
Communicates	0	1	4	15	35	32	11	5.3
Teaching	0	0	3	15	35	33	11	5.3
<u>Nitz:</u>								
Presents	0	2	3	19	29	33	11	5.2
Explains	0	1	4	13	23	35	21	5.5
Communicates	0	1	4	17	38	25	12	5.2
Teaching	0	2	4	13	33	34	10	5.2
<u>Browning:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	10	21	42	23	5.7
Explains	0	1	3	15	22	36	20	5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	6	11	34	46	6.2
Teaching	0	0	2	7	16	46	26	5.8
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	1	24	31	31	10	5.3
Difficulty	0	0	1	26	28	28	15	5.3
Learn Exp	1	1	4	29	33	24	5	4.9

Although most students found Chin to be very knowledgeable, they also felt he dwelled on introductory slides, which left less time for more relevant material to be examined. Chin posted his lecture slides late, and some commented that he needed to be a little more organized.

Students did not feel well-prepared for the test or exam, and felt the course should be made into a full-year course.

Most students found that Nitz approachable and helpful, and that his in-class examples were good. However, he went through the lecture slides too quickly and there were often many mistakes on the over-heads. Students appreciated his sense of humour.

Many felt that the tests did not reflect the lecture material well and

that they did not have time to finish. Most found the labs irrelevant.

Browning was found to be extremely enthusiastic, approachable and motivational. His lectures were well-organized, concise and engaging. The course was enjoyable according to most students, but all were in accord that the term test was not reflective of the lecture or homework material covered.

Instructor(s): J. Chin; M. Nitz; S. Browning

Enr: 446	Resp: 241							Retake: 51%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Chin:</u>								
Presents	0	2	8	22	33	22	10	4.9
Explains	0	0	6	17	31	31	12	5.2
Communicates	0	1	3	20	37	22	12	5.1
Teaching	0	1	2	15	35	35	10	5.3
<u>Nitz:</u>								
Presents	0	1	6	18	30	27	14	5.2
Explains	0	0	4	12	23	34	23	5.6
Communicates	0	2	5	21	28	28	12	5.1
Teaching	0	1	4	16	28	36	12	5.3
<u>Browning:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	10	27	36	25	5.8
Explains	0	1	5	22	28	27	14	5.2
Communicates	0	0	0	3	15	34	46	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	9	28	37	23	5.7
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	1	19	28	30	20	5.5
Difficulty	0	0	1	13	30	32	23	5.6
Learn Exp	0	0	5	27	20	25	20	5.2

Students commented that Chin was nice and approachable, but tended to speak in a monotone. He lectured slowly and repeatedly emphasized concepts, which some students found to be helpful while others felt it was repetitive.

Nitz was commended for his good use of examples which helped prepare students for the tests. He was an approachable and generally effective lecturer.

Browning was liked by the students who felt that he was a very enthusiastic lecturer. He explained concepts clearly and was very helpful regarding student concerns and questions. His lecture notes were also very organized and very easy to understand. However, his test was deemed as too difficult and the lecture material did not really prepare them for the tests.

Students noted that the tests were difficult and long, and that some material on the tests were not covered in lectures. Moreover, the pace of instruction over the entire course was imbalanced; too much time was spent in the first half covering easy material while difficult material in the second half was rushed through. Finally, students complained that lab material did not reflect material taught in the lectures.

## CHM 138H1S Introductory Organic Chemistry I

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

Enr: 483      Resp: 276      Retake: 66%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Browning:</u>								
Presents	1	1	1	7	26	34	26	5.7
Explains	0	1	4	13	31	30	17	5.4
Communicates	0	0	1	5	17	37	36	6.0
Teaching	0	0	1	11	22	34	28	5.7
<u>Winnik:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	3	25	33	36	6.0
Explains	0	0	1	2	17	36	42	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	2	10	25	60	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	5	12	34	47	6.2
<u>Nitz:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	3	25	33	36	6.0
Explains	0	0	1	2	17	36	42	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	2	10	25	60	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	5	12	34	47	6.2

## 22 CHEMISTRY

Course:								
Workload	1	0	0	28	33	26	10	5.1
Difficulty	1	0	0	23	35	26	11	5.2
Learn Exp	1	2	4	30	25	26	9	4.9

Students thought that Browning was humorous, charismatic and very engaging during lectures. He sometimes spoke quickly but overall was a good lecturer.

Winnik was also deemed funny and charismatic and students liked how they could ask questions in class and how the material was related to real-life examples.

Students appreciated the many examples provided by Nitz, claiming them to be very helpful. However, he sometimes went too quickly through the material. He was very approachable and patient with students.

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

Enr: 374	Resp: 139							Retake: 67%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Winnik:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	5	21	41	31	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	2	14	37	45	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	1	10	28	58	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	1	14	40	43	6.3
<u>Browning:</u>								
Presents	0	0	2	8	27	39	21	5.7
Explains	0	1	4	12	28	36	16	5.4
Communicates	0	0	1	5	23	41	28	5.9
Teaching	0	0	2	10	27	35	22	5.6
<u>Nitz:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	11	28	33	25	5.7
Explains	0	0	2	8	17	35	36	5.9
Communicates	0	0	1	9	26	36	25	5.7
Teaching	0	0	1	7	23	40	25	5.8
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	0	38	26	22	11	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	30	31	23	14	5.2
Learn Exp	1	1	0	27	29	26	12	5.1

The overall course experience was enjoyable with interesting labs. The course tests did not always reflect the course material; were usually too hard and did not have enough time allocated to them.

Winnik was a very humorous and interesting lecturer. He had a very effective teaching style, whereas he had numerous examples which explained concepts well. He was extremely well-organized with an effective use of examples and a planned lecture schedule.

Browning was a well-liked lecturer; he explained concepts clearly and well. He should have used more examples during lectures to enhance the teaching experience.

Students thought Nitz was an enthusiastic and approachable instructor. His lectures were organized with many examples helping in understanding the material. Many thought more time was needed for the tests and that Nitz sometimes spoke quickly.

### CHM 139H1F Chemistry: Physical Principles

Instructor(s): S. Browning; K. Quinlan

Enr: 350	Resp: 243							Retake: 47%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Browning:</u>								
Presents	0	1	7	17	22	36	14	5.2
Explains	0	0	6	18	26	35	10	5.2
Communicates	0	0	1	7	23	36	30	5.8
Teaching	0	0	3	11	26	37	18	5.5
<u>Quinlan:</u>								
Presents	0	0	2	7	28	34	25	5.7
Explains	0	0	1	13	29	34	20	5.5
Communicates	0	0	3	12	29	31	22	5.6
Teaching	0	0	1	10	29	35	21	5.6
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	1	19	29	30	18	5.4

Difficulty	0	1	0	21	28	32	14	5.3
Learn Exp	4	0	10	32	26	17	7	4.6

Students found Browning to be very enthusiastic and knowledgeable. He presented the material in a very simple and concise manner. Browning was available outside of teaching hours and his humour was appreciated.

Quinlan was enthusiastic about the material and attempted to answer all questions with concise explanations and examples. Students also thought that Quinlan was very approachable and encouraging. She explained all material thoroughly.

Most students thought the course was very difficult. Term tests were not reflective of homework, lab and lecture material, and most students were shocked by the level of difficulty. Lab material and lecture material did not overlap and correlate well.

Instructor(s): K. Quinlan; S. Browning

Enr: 351	Resp: 139							Retake: 54%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Quinlan:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	9	21	36	31	5.9
Explains	0	0	3	11	24	38	22	5.6
Communicates	0	0	2	8	27	32	28	5.8
Teaching	0	0	2	7	28	38	22	5.7
<u>Browning:</u>								
Presents	1	0	1	15	30	29	21	5.4
Explains	1	0	5	12	26	31	22	5.5
Communicates	1	0	0	7	22	38	30	5.8
Teaching	1	0	2	11	26	36	21	5.6
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	0	26	26	25	20	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	3	24	23	35	11	5.3
Learn Exp	4	0	11	37	24	14	6	4.5

Students felt that Quinlan was very enthusiastic. She delivered lectures well and was liked by her students. The tests were not reflective of the lecture material.

Browning was very funny and enthusiastic. He was a little disorganized at times, but was overall, a good instructor.

### CHM 139H1S Chemistry: Physical Principles

Instructor(s): A. Wheeler; J. Schofield; R. Jockusch

Enr: 346	Resp: 224							Retake: 61%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Wheeler:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	3	15	39	41	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	3	18	40	36	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	3	15	35	45	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	1	14	43	39	6.2
<u>Schofield:</u>								
Presents	0	0	3	12	26	37	19	5.6
Explains	0	0	2	14	33	35	14	5.5
Communicates	0	0	1	18	28	27	22	5.5
Teaching	0	0	0	11	33	35	18	5.6
<u>Jockusch:</u>								
Presents	3	3	11	16	29	21	13	4.8
Explains	2	4	7	23	26	20	15	4.9
Communicates	2	1	2	19	28	24	21	5.3
Teaching	2	3	3	22	27	27	12	5.0
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	0	38	38	17	3	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	3	46	28	16	4	4.7
Learn Exp	2	0	4	41	28	17	5	4.7

Wheeler was an amazing instructor. Without exception, all comments on him were positive. He gave excellent lecture notes that were very well organized. He did fun demonstrations and provided real life examples to go with his lectures. Some students felt that he should have gone more slowly, so they could have taken better notes.

Schofield was clearly enthusiastic and knowledgeable about the mate-

rial. He often talked about material unrelated to the course. He was a little disorganized, however, he set a fair test.

Jockusch was very enthusiastic, some felt overenthusiastic. For the most part, students were amazed by her overuse of "chemistry pixies" in examples. She explained concepts in a very basic, simple way that was easy to understand, but some students felt she was treating them like children. Sometimes she was unprepared for class and made mistakes in the examples, which confused many students.

Instructor(s): A. Wheeler; J. Schofield; R. Jockusch

Enr: 341	Resp: 159							Retake: 60%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Wheeler:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	3	20	36	40	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	4	17	39	39	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	4	15	29	50	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	3	20	31	44	6.2
<u>Schofield:</u>								
Presents	1	0	4	22	27	30	12	5.2
Explains	0	0	7	14	31	31	14	5.3
Communicates	0	1	1	15	30	28	20	5.4
Teaching	0	0	1	19	29	31	15	5.4
<u>Jockusch:</u>								
Presents	5	1	13	25	27	15	11	4.6
Explains	5	3	10	23	28	19	9	4.6
Communicates	3	0	1	16	26	29	22	5.4
Teaching	4	2	8	18	28	26	12	4.9
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	4	42	32	14	6	4.7
Difficulty	0	1	5	45	29	14	2	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	4	48	24	19	2	4.7

Wheeler was generally thought of as a very good instructor who added humour to the lectures.

Students also liked Schofield, although some thought he needed to be clearer in his explanations of the material.

Jockusch was very enthusiastic and passionate about the material. However, she was, at times, a little unorganized which confused some students.

Instructor(s): I. McNab

Enr: 185	Resp: 28							Retake: 60%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	3	0	7	25	37	25	5.7
Explains	0	3	3	0	10	50	32	6.0
Communicates	0	3	3	0	25	39	28	5.8
Teaching	0	3	0	3	22	44	25	5.8
Workload	0	0	0	32	35	21	10	5.1
Difficulty	0	0	3	28	32	28	7	5.1
Learn Exp	0	0	4	29	37	25	4	5.0

Students thought the instructor was very knowledgeable and loved the demonstrations. Students also found the anecdotes and practical applications helpful.

### CHM 151Y1Y Chemistry: The Molecular Science

Instructor(s): R. Kluger

Enr: 118	Resp: 66							Retake: 66%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	3	10	24	33	28	5.7
Explains	0	3	3	21	37	24	10	5.1
Communicates	0	0	0	3	18	43	34	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	6	16	56	21	5.9
Workload	0	0	0	30	27	29	12	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	6	18	24	35	15	5.4
Learn Exp	0	1	1	27	37	20	11	5.1

Students generally enjoyed the lectures and the material. Labs got many negative comments about them having harsh/strict demonstra-

tors and lab material not having any correlation with the lectures. A few students confessed that this course had made them want to get into chemistry.

Kluger taught effectively. His powerpoint presentation style of lecture was appreciated. He was described as enthusiastic and easy to listen to. A few felt that he moved too quickly through the material.

Instructor(s): R. Morris; R. Miller

Enr: 83	Resp: 48							Retake: 85%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Morris:</u>								
Presents	0	0	2	6	27	31	33	5.9
Explains	0	2	2	8	25	36	25	5.7
Communicates	4	0	2	0	29	33	31	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	8	18	37	35	6.0
<u>Miller:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	2	20	37	39	6.1
Explains	0	0	2	0	20	25	52	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	6	4	25	64	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	2	6	37	54	6.4
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	2	0	10	39	20	12	14	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	6	39	29	18	6	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	13	20	31	35	5.9

Most students felt that Morris was very enthusiastic and overall a good instructor.

Students found Miller enthusiastic and overall, an excellent instructor. They loved the demos (seriously LOVED the demos).

Overall, the students found it to be a great course.

### CHM 217H1F Introduction to Analytical Chemistry

Instructor(s): D. Stone

Enr: 95	Resp: 67							Retake: 50%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	6	0	4	27	31	15	15	4.8
Explains	4	2	10	11	34	26	8	4.9
Communicates	1	0	1	1	23	29	41	6.0
Teaching	1	1	2	10	31	35	16	5.4
Workload	0	0	3	33	16	24	21	5.3
Difficulty	0	0	6	41	21	24	6	4.8
Learn Exp	6	4	6	34	26	18	6	4.5

Students found Stone to be extremely approachable and patient. He was an enthusiastic lecturer with a relaxed teaching style who gladly welcomed questions and comments. A few students believed he was somewhat disorganized and spoke too quickly.

The course was primarily focussed on the labs which took up most of the time. Labs were not returned quickly which caused problems for the test, as it covered much of the lab material. Tutorials were not useful.

### CHM 220H1F Physical Chemistry for Life Sciences

Instructor(s): G. Scholes

Enr: 450	Resp: 160							Retake: 13%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	10	13	32	25	12	3	1	3.3
Explains	7	8	24	35	11	7	3	3.7
Communicates	7	11	21	30	15	9	4	3.8
Teaching	9	9	33	25	15	5	1	3.5
Workload	1	2	6	48	18	13	11	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	12	33	20	33	5.7
Learn Exp	15	14	25	29	10	4	0	3.2

Instructor(s): G. Scholes

Enr: 82	Resp: 153							Retake: 6%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	10	15	28	28	12	3	0	3.3
Explains	9	14	22	33	14	4	0	3.4

## 24 CHEMISTRY

Communicates	6	10	18	37	15	10	2	3.8
Teaching	10	15	27	13	5	0	0	3.3
Workload	0	2	5	39	25	15	12	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	2	8	25	29	33	5.8
Learn Exp	19	26	18	24	6	4	0	2.9

A vast majority of students thought the course was poorly organized and that the level of difficulty was too high. The pre-requisites did not give enough preparation for the course. The second term test was ridiculously unfair. Many students also felt this course had little to do with life science and was targeted towards chemistry students - not life-sci students.

Scholes was described as having poor teaching skills. He did not give enough examples and did not explain concepts clearly. Some students felt that the instructor did not care about teaching nor cared about how confused the students were.

### CHM 221H1S Physical Chemistry: The Molecular Viewpoint

Instructor(s): S. Whittington; R. Kapral

Enr: 50	Resp: 29							Retake: 44%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Whittington:</u>								
Presents	0	3	0	13	34	37	10	5.3
Explains	0	3	10	17	24	41	3	5.0
Communicates	0	0	0	6	44	37	10	5.5
Teaching	0	0	0	3	41	51	3	5.6
<u>Kapral:</u>								
Presents	0	3	3	24	51	13	3	4.8
Explains	0	3	3	20	51	17	3	4.9
Communicates	0	0	0	10	44	37	6	5.4
Teaching	0	0	0	3	48	48	0	5.4
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	3	0	78	14	0	3	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	33	40	25	0	4.9
Learn Exp	0	5	5	55	25	10	0	4.3

A number of students thought that the course could have used a better textbook.

### CHM 225Y1Y Introduction to Physical Chemistry

Instructor(s): R. Kapral; S. Whittington

Enr: 60	Resp: 38							Retake: 37%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Kapral:</u>								
Presents	2	0	2	21	21	36	15	5.3
Explains	2	2	10	23	23	21	15	4.9
Communicates	2	0	2	7	31	39	15	5.5
Teaching	2	0	0	15	31	31	18	5.4
<u>Whittington:</u>								
Presents	0	0	5	13	15	31	34	5.8
Explains	0	2	5	21	21	26	23	5.3
Communicates	0	0	2	10	26	36	23	5.7
Teaching	0	0	2	7	23	34	31	5.8
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	5	7	55	23	7	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	2	24	29	24	18	5.3
Learn Exp	3	3	16	40	23	10	3	4.2

Both instructors were effective as university instructors. The text wasn't needed because the instructors taught the students everything they needed to know.

### CHM 235Y1Y Physics and Chemistry of Planet Earth

Instructor(s): J. Abbatt

Enr: 22	Resp: 23							Retake: 95%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	13	34	34	17	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	0	21	47	30	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	17	43	39	6.2

Teaching	0	0	0	0	17	56	26	6.1
Workload	0	9	9	81	0	0	0	3.7
Difficulty	0	9	14	71	4	0	0	3.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	8	58	16	16	5.4

The students loved the course and the instructor! They found the material very interesting. The students also found the instructor to be very enthusiastic and very helpful at answering questions. However, they felt that the tutorials were a waste of time and the textbook insufficient for the course.

### CHM 238Y1Y Introduction to Inorganic Chemistry

Instructor(s): J. Powell; S. Browning

Enr: 99	Resp: 78							Retake: 53%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Powell:</u>								
Presents	0	10	15	22	23	21	6	4.5
Explains	1	2	11	18	31	27	7	4.9
Communicates	0	0	3	18	24	41	11	5.4
Teaching	2	3	5	24	35	20	7	4.8
<u>Browning:</u>								
Presents	1	3	6	12	40	23	11	5.0
Explains	2	0	3	22	32	29	9	5.1
Communicates	1	0	3	10	23	41	19	5.6
Teaching	1	1	3	15	38	29	9	5.2
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	1	13	26	32	26	5.7
Difficulty	0	0	17	18	45	17	0	5.6
Learn Exp	4	1	8	24	32	21	6	4.7

Powell was a little unorganized at times but had good notes. Browning was able to communicate the material in an understandable manner.

The labs required too much preparation and for a few students, didn't have much educational value for this particular course.

### CHM 247H1F Introductory Organic Chemistry II

Instructor(s): A. Dicks

Enr: 262	Resp: 166							Retake: 53%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	4	22	71	6.6
Explains	0	0	0	1	10	37	49	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	3	6	38	51	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	1	8	28	61	6.5
Workload	0	0	0	25	35	23	14	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	29	29	24	15	5.2
Learn Exp	0	1	2	32	27	24	11	5.1

Most students thought that the instructor was an excellent lecturer. He was very approachable and felt that he was always available for help. He was very enthusiastic in how he taught the course and this was very much appreciated by the students. His notes were clear and very easy to follow but some still felt that he spoke somewhat quickly which made it hard to copy down notes during class. Students also liked his singing and urged him to sing more.

Some of the students felt that there was too much material for a half course and it required too much memorization. Students also complained about the laboratories where the lab manual and the write up sheets were a little vague.

### CHM 247H1S Introductory Organic Chemistry II

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

Enr: 290	Resp: 184							Retake: 52%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Dicks:</u>								
Presents	0	0	1	3	11	43	40	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	5	13	46	33	6.1
Communicates	0	0	1	9	12	43	32	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	3	17	41	35	6.1



Skonieczny:

Presents	0	0	1	12	24	38	20	5.6
Explains	0	0	1	14	23	36	23	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	10	21	42	24	5.7
Teaching	0	0	1	13	20	42	20	5.6

Kutas:

Presents	3	7	17	22	30	14	3	4.3
Explains	2	2	16	22	29	19	7	4.6
Communicates	4	4	15	23	23	20	6	4.5
Teaching	2	5	14	25	28	19	4	4.5

Course:

Workload	0	0	1	24	41	21	10	5.1
Difficulty	0	1	1	23	33	30	9	5.2
Learn Exp	0	2	10	34	32	15	2	4.5

A few students commented that 4 different instructors for one course was too many, since it was hard to adjust to each one's style and material.

Some commented that the term test's material required too much memorization and the term test time allotted was too short.

Overall, Dicks was an enthusiastic and well-organized instructor and Skonieczny was fair and well-organized.

Some said Kutas had really good lecture notes, but needed to work on presenting them in "a more engaging fashion." Her lectures sometimes were rushed, especially when she started to run out of time. However, she explained chemical mechanisms well.

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

Enr: 400	Resp: 137							Retake: 45%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean

Dicks:

Presents	0	0	2	5	12	38	42	6.1
Explains	0	0	1	5	17	41	32	5.9
Communicates	0	0	3	6	17	38	34	5.9
Teaching	1	0	0	4	15	44	32	5.9

Skonieczny:

Presents	0	0	1	12	33	35	17	5.5
Explains	0	0	1	12	28	35	20	5.6
Communicates	0	0	3	12	28	36	19	5.6
Teaching	0	0	2	9	26	44	16	5.6

Kutas:

Presents	4	11	9	34	25	12	2	4.1
Explains	1	3	19	27	28	14	4	4.4
Communicates	6	5	10	27	27	17	5	4.4
Teaching	5	4	13	30	29	14	2	4.3

Course:

Workload	0	1	3	28	28	29	8	5.1
Difficulty	0	0	2	23	36	22	14	5.2
Learn Exp	1	2	1	39	29	16	7	4.7

Overall, Dicks and Skonieczny were good and effective teachers. Dicks was a good speaker, clear and articulate. Skonieczny was said to be an enthusiastic and good lecturer. Few complained that the lecture notes were not posted online and that the lecture pace was too fast.

A few students felt that Kutas was sometimes disorganized, her lectures rushed, and was not attentive to students' concerns. Some said that her powerpoint slides were clear and contained good examples.

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

Enr: 56	Resp: 48							Retake: 50%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean

Dicks:

Presents	0	2	0	6	18	27	45	6.1
Explains	0	0	2	2	23	36	36	6.0
Communicates	2	0	0	2	18	43	33	6.0
Teaching	2	0	0	2	22	33	39	6.0

Skonieczny:

Presents	0	2	0	8	29	34	25	5.7
Explains	2	0	0	16	22	29	29	5.6

Communicates	2	0	0	6	27	22	41	5.9
Teaching	2	0	0	10	29	18	39	5.8

Kutas:

Presents	5	5	23	17	23	17	7	4.3
Explains	5	5	15	23	28	17	5	4.4
Communicates	10	5	15	23	23	15	7	4.2
Teaching	7	5	13	21	28	10	13	4.4

Course:

Workload	4	0	0	25	27	20	22	5.2
Difficulty	0	4	0	29	20	29	15	5.2
Learn Exp	0	3	3	33	26	20	13	5.0

The students liked Dicks and felt he was a very good lecturer who explained things well. He proceeded at a good pace and made things easier to understand. The students felt that he should have posted lecture notes beforehand so the students would not have difficulty in copying all the material down. However, some students felt that copying the material down helped them understand the material better.

Students felt that Skonieczny was good. He explained the material well and incorporated humour to make the lectures more interesting. He was also very prompt in answering emails. His material was very organized but students felt he spoke a little too quickly.

Kutas was found to be too busy to answer questions; was never available for answering problems. Lecturing style was quick and not well-organized.

Some students found lecture notes to be scattered and unorganized. They would have preferred online access to lectures. Labs were interesting and informative but reports were not returned quickly. The overall pace of the lectures was acceptable but the weight of the exam was too high.

**CHM 249H1S Organic Chemistry**

Instructor(s): R. Batey

Enr: 29	Resp: 23							Retake: 78%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	13	34	52	6.4
Explains	0	0	0	0	17	30	52	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	26	30	43	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	0	21	30	47	6.3
Workload	4	0	4	43	34	8	4	4.5
Difficulty	4	0	4	43	34	8	4	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	5	21	21	15	36	5.6

Most students felt that Batey was amazing. He taught concepts very thoroughly and provided numerous examples. He was very informative and enthusiastic about the material.

Overall, the students thought the course and instructor were very good.

**CHM 310H1S Environmental Chemistry**

Instructor(s): S. Mabury

Enr: 89	Resp: 65							Retake: 85%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	1	3	32	36	27	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	3	23	41	32	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	3	6	24	66	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	1	6	42	49	6.4
Workload	0	0	4	58	24	9	3	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	44	41	12	1	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	31	31	31	5	5.1

Mabury was extremely enthusiastic in presenting the material. It showed that the instructor really loved what he was teaching. He also clearly pointed out what he wanted the students to get out of the class. He presented the material in a very organized manner and the material all came together in the end into one cohesive idea. The material had a lot of significance to the modern world. The students also appreciated that he recorded his lectures and posted them online.

**CHM 317H1S Introduction to Instrumental Methods of Analysis**

Instructor(s): M. Thompson

Enr: 39	Resp: 30						Retake: 92%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	3	0	0	30	46	10	5.7
Explains	0	0	3	3	26	40	26	5.8
Communicates	3	0	0	0	6	60	30	6.1
Teaching	0	0	3	0	13	46	36	6.1
Workload	0	0	6	46	26	16	3	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	13	66	16	0	3	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	16	41	20	20	5.5

Thompson was very knowledgeable and enthusiastic about the material. Students would have found it helpful if lectures were on paper. Some thought the lab write-ups were too long.

**CHM 325H1S Materials Chemistry**

Instructor(s): G. Ozin

Enr: 75	Resp: 37						Retake: 62%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	5	18	37	24	13	5.2
Explains	0	0	0	21	35	21	21	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	5	18	32	43	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	11	36	30	22	5.6
Workload	0	2	8	76	11	0	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	0	11	42	31	11	2	4.5
Learn Exp	0	3	6	44	17	10	17	4.8

Ozin was very enthusiastic in presenting the material. The instructor made the difficult material fun to learn. However, a few students felt that the instructor spoke a little too quickly at times.

**CHM 326H1F Introductory Quantum Mechanics and Spectroscopy**

Instructor(s): S. Whittington

Enr: 36	Resp: 26						Retake: 90%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	3	23	26	46	6.2
Explains	0	0	3	0	30	19	46	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	7	11	34	46	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	0	11	26	61	6.5
Workload	0	4	8	72	12	4	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	0	3	23	50	19	3	5.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	17	21	43	17	5.6

Overall, the students found the instructor excellent as he was very approachable and patient when addressing questions. He also had flexible office hours and he was more than willing to help out.

The course itself required a lot more math than chemistry. Having a math background was really essential.

**CHM 328H1S Modern Physical Chemistry**

Instructor(s): S. Schofield

Enr: 25	Resp: 18						Retake: 70%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	38	27	33	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	5	38	16	38	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	5	22	27	55	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	0	16	44	38	6.2
Workload	0	5	0	50	22	11	11	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	0	27	27	27	16	5.3
Learn Exp	7	0	0	21	21	35	14	5.1

Students thought the instructor was knowledgeable and enthusiastic about the material. The course was interesting, though challenging. Some students felt they did not have the appropriate math/physics background to fully grasp the material.

**CHM 338H1F Intermediate Inorganic Chemistry**

Instructor(s): J. Powell

Enr: 40	Resp: 31						Retake: 58%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	10	23	30	23	13	5.1
Explains	0	0	3	10	40	33	13	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	3	26	40	30	6.0
Teaching	0	0	6	13	46	23	10	5.2
Workload	0	0	0	10	14	32	42	6.1
Difficulty	0	0	0	35	25	14	25	5.3
Learn Exp	3	3	3	22	40	14	11	4.8

Students felt that Powell was very enthusiastic and knew his material through and through. However, some students found that he was not very specific with regards to his test questions. He expected a lot from their answers. The students thought that the textbook was not helpful. The lab component took so much of their time, though in the end, the labs were fun and were really a good experience.

**CHM 345H1S Modern Organic Synthesis**

Instructor(s): M. Lautens

Enr: 27	Resp: 18						Retake: 50%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	11	11	5	11	35	23	5.2
Explains	5	5	0	35	11	17	23	4.9
Communicates	0	5	5	0	41	29	17	5.4
Teaching	0	5	0	5	29	35	23	5.6
Workload	0	6	0	37	18	18	18	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	5	23	23	35	11	5.2
Learn Exp	0	0	15	46	30	7	0	4.3

Many students found the instructor very approachable for extra help. Some expressed that CHM 249 was necessary as a pre-requisite. Some felt the final assignment did not test the students' knowledge of organic chemistry.

**CHM 346H1S Modern Organic Synthesis**

Instructor(s): M. Lautens

Enr: 38	Resp: 25						Retake: 47%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	8	8	56	20	8	5.1
Explains	0	0	4	12	36	36	12	5.4
Communicates	0	0	4	4	44	40	8	5.4
Teaching	0	0	4	4	60	24	8	5.3
Workload	0	0	0	20	36	24	20	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	4	20	20	24	32	5.6
Learn Exp	0	5	10	10	50	20	5	4.8

Lautens was well-liked and students found him organized and enthusiastic about the material. He was very approachable and patient in attending to students' questions.

The labs were intense and there was much criticism about the TAs. The write-ups were very time consuming but marks were hard to earn.

**CHM 347H1F Organic Chemistry of Biological Compounds**

Instructor(s): R. Kluger

Enr: 156	Resp: 89						Retake: 58%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	3	4	13	25	31	13	7	4.5
Explains	4	5	10	33	26	15	3	4.3
Communicates	1	1	2	15	28	29	22	5.5
Teaching	4	2	15	19	32	19	6	4.6
Workload	0	3	6	47	28	10	3	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	1	48	34	11	4	4.7
Learn Exp	4	4	9	49	23	7	1	4.1

Although students raved about the fascinating material, they felt that it was not well reflected on the tests. They also loved the TAs and felt

that success in the course was dependent on attending the tutorials.

Students thought that Kluger was very enthusiastic, however, a few found him to be intimidating. Furthermore, they felt that he sometimes went off on tangents during the lecture.

### CHM 348H1F Organic Reaction Mechanisms

Instructor(s): A. Yudin

	Resp: 52							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Enr: 71								
Presents	0	3	3	5	25	32	28	5.7
Explains	0	1	1	5	17	32	40	6.0
Communicates	0	1	0	1	11	42	42	6.2
Teaching	0	1	0	5	19	34	38	6.0
Workload	3	3	15	47	21	3	3	4.1
Difficulty	4	6	14	50	18	6	2	4.0
Learn Exp	2	2	0	30	30	23	10	4.9

Students found the course to be very interesting and an enjoyable experience for the most part. Some students felt that the labs could have been more engaging and related more closely to the lecture material.

The instructor was found to be very interesting and knowledgeable.

### CHM 379H1S Biomolecular Chemistry

Instructor(s): D. Zamble

	Resp: 30							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Enr: 35								
Presents	0	3	0	0	24	48	24	5.9
Explains	3	0	3	3	13	44	31	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	3	3	37	55	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	3	20	36	40	6.1
Workload	0	0	10	63	16	10	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	10	60	10	20	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	4	0	8	48	24	16	5.4

Zamble was very knowledgeable, enthusiastic and well-liked. Students liked how the lectures overlapped with the labs and many professed this to be among the best chemistry course taken so far. A few felt that the instructor went over some lectures quickly.

### CHM 414H1F Developing Techniques in Analytical Chemistry

Instructor(s): D. Stone

	Resp: 23							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Enr: 44								
Presents	0	4	8	21	34	21	8	4.9
Explains	0	4	4	8	17	52	13	5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	4	26	47	21	5.9
Teaching	0	0	4	4	13	60	17	5.8
Workload	0	0	9	72	18	0	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	0	65	34	0	0	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	15	42	26	10	5	4.5

Stone was very enthusiastic, and the lecture material was very interesting. Many appreciated his sense of humour. The course was good overall, but some felt that the last problem set was given too late. Some also commented that a smaller class size would have improved instructor-student interaction, and that inclusion of a lab component would have been a welcome addition.

### CHM 415H1S Atmospheric Chemistry

Instructor(s): J. Donaldson

	Resp: 31							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Enr: 40								
Presents	6	3	13	48	13	27	0	4.5
Explains	3	3	13	26	26	23	3	4.5
Communicates	3	0	6	16	20	26	30	5.4
Teaching	3	0	10	21	28	7	28	4.9
Workload	0	0	0	44	24	20	10	5.0

Difficulty	0	0	0	50	21	21	7	4.9
Learn Exp	4	8	17	30	30	8	0	4.0

Some students thought Donaldson spoke quickly and it was too hard to copy down slides and understand the lecture simultaneously. A few students thought that the assignments were difficult and time consuming.

### CHM 416H1S Separation Science

Instructor(s): D. Stone

	Resp: 27							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Enr: 31								
Presents	3	3	0	3	33	44	11	5.4
Explains	3	0	7	0	29	37	22	5.5
Communicates	0	3	0	11	22	44	18	5.6
Teaching	0	3	3	7	29	33	22	5.5
Workload	0	0	0	69	26	3	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	7	61	23	7	0	4.3
Learn Exp	4	0	4	38	23	28	0	4.6

Some thought Stone was a good and enthusiastic teacher. Others felt that he spoke too fast and his lectures were a little disorganized. Many thought the labs were poorly run and harshly marked.

### CHM 417H1F Instrumentation for Chemists

Instructor(s): M. Thompson

	Resp: 15							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Enr: 19								
Presents	0	6	0	33	20	33	6	4.9
Explains	0	0	6	6	46	20	20	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	6	26	26	40	6.0
Teaching	0	0	6	6	20	46	20	5.7
Workload	0	0	0	80	13	6	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	6	20	60	13	0	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	46	23	23	7	4.9

Overall, students found the material interesting. The instructor was clear in presenting the material.

### CHM 426H1S Polymer Chemistry

Instructor(s): M. Winnik

	Resp: 15							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Enr: 19								
Presents	0	0	0	6	13	40	40	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	0	33	40	26	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	0	26	33	40	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	13	20	26	40	5.9
Workload	0	6	0	56	23	13	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	60	33	6	0	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	10	30	20	30	10	5.0

Course was found to be very informative and interesting, although the amount of material covered was extensive. Students required sample problems and would have liked a better distribution of the marks.

Winnik was appreciated for his sense of humour, experience and knowledge. He taught in a well-organized manner and was always available to answer questions.

### CHM 432H1F Organometallic Chemistry

Instructor(s): J. Powell

	Resp: 20							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Enr: 20								
Presents	0	0	10	10	35	20	25	5.4
Explains	0	0	0	20	20	40	20	5.6
Communicates	0	0	5	26	31	10	26	5.3
Teaching	0	0	0	35	30	20	15	5.2
Workload	0	0	5	45	15	20	15	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	40	20	20	20	5.2

## 28 CHEMISTRY

Learn Exp 0 0 0 57 35 0 7 4.6

Most students felt that the instructor was good. He had a good teaching style and explained the material very well. The students felt that the material was very interesting albeit somewhat difficult. The problem sets reflected this difficulty and students felt that they were really challenging (almost to the point of being impossible). The lecture handouts were also very much appreciated by the students.

### CHM 434H1F Solid State Materials Chemistry

Instructor(s): G. Ozin

Enr: 18		Resp: 24						Retake: 86%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	8	45	20	20	4	4.7	
Explains	0	0	4	20	41	20	12	5.2	
Communicates	0	0	0	0	8	33	58	6.5	
Teaching	0	0	0	8	41	37	12	5.5	
Workload	0	0	0	29	45	20	4	5.0	
Difficulty	0	0	4	41	29	25	0	4.8	
Learn Exp	0	0	5	22	27	33	11	5.2	

Ozin was touted for his incredible knowledge, but some felt that he needed to be more organized and more readily available to students. Also, they felt that lecture slides should have been updated more frequently, since there were often additions or mistakes that needed to be addressed.

The course material was very interesting, but there were mixed feelings about the marking scheme. Some felt the final exam was weighted too heavily, while others wished there was the option of having the final exam weigh 100% of the course mark.

### CHM 437H1S Bio-Inorganic Chemistry

Instructor(s): R. Morris

Enr: 60		Resp: 32						Retake: 66%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	6	18	37	34	3	5.1	
Explains	0	0	9	21	34	28	6	5.0	
Communicates	3	3	12	22	29	22	6	4.6	
Teaching	0	0	0	22	25	38	12	5.4	
Workload	0	0	6	64	22	3	3	4.3	
Difficulty	0	0	6	51	32	6	3	4.5	
Learn Exp	8	4	0	30	47	4	4	4.3	

The class was split - some really enjoyed the material, whereas others found the lectures to be dry and too detailed. Overall, the class enjoyed the instructor. There were some concerns in regards to the textbook, with many believing it was not adequate for the course. Also, some did not know what to study for the final.

### CHM 440H1F The Synthesis of Modern Pharmaceutical Agents

Instructor(s): A. Yudin

Enr: 19		Resp: 8						Retake: 50%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	12	25	12	12	12	25	4.6	
Explains	0	12	25	12	12	12	25	4.6	
Communicates	0	0	12	25	12	25	25	5.2	
Teaching	0	0	25	25	12	0	37	5.0	
Workload	0	0	0	37	25	12	25	5.2	
Difficulty	0	0	0	25	37	12	25	5.4	
Learn Exp	0	16	0	16	0	33	33	5.3	

### CHM 441H1F Spectroscopic Analysis in Organic Chemistry

Instructor(s): S. Skonieczny

Enr: 29		Resp: 20						Retake: 70%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	0	10	30	45	15	5.7	
Explains	0	0	0	35	25	35	5	5.1	
Communicates	0	0	5	45	10	25	15	5.0	

Teaching	0	0	5	15	30	25	25	5.5
Workload	0	0	10	55	20	15	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	10	45	35	10	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	73	15	10	0	4.4

### CHM 443H1S Physical Organic Chemistry

Instructor(s): J. Chin

Enr: 27		Resp: 25						Retake: 88%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	4	20	24	20	32	5.6	
Explains	0	0	4	20	16	32	28	5.6	
Communicates	0	0	8	8	24	32	28	5.6	
Teaching	0	0	0	20	12	36	32	5.8	
Workload	0	0	12	60	16	4	8	4.4	
Difficulty	0	0	12	62	12	4	8	4.3	
Learn Exp	0	0	0	22	33	27	16	5.4	

Overall, students enjoyed Chin's course. He was a good lecturer and very approachable. Students did complain about the computational assignment saying that it was slow and often didn't work.

### CHM 447H1F Bio-Organic Chemistry

Instructor(s): A. Woolley

Enr: 85		Resp: 59						Retake: 68%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	1	14	12	40	29	1	4.9	
Explains	0	0	3	15	35	35	10	5.3	
Communicates	0	5	3	21	33	31	5	5.0	
Teaching	0	0	1	15	24	47	10	5.5	
Workload	0	3	5	73	15	1	0	4.1	
Difficulty	0	0	5	66	20	5	1	4.3	
Learn Exp	0	0	12	46	7	23	10	4.7	

Most students liked the instructor and found him knowledgeable. However, sometimes he spoke too softly and mumbled which made him harder to understand. The students felt that he should have put up notes for class and should have given more practice problems to help in understanding the course material.

### CHM 479H1S Biological Chemistry

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

Enr: 53		Resp: 33						Retake: 58%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
<b>Woolley:</b>									
Presents	0	3	0	6	45	21	24	5.5	
Explains	0	0	3	9	33	30	24	5.6	
Communicates	0	0	0	12	33	30	24	5.7	
Teaching	0	0	3	12	24	39	21	5.6	
<b>Zamble:</b>									
Presents	0	0	9	18	36	12	24	5.2	
Explains	0	0	6	24	30	24	27	5.5	
Communicates	3	0	6	9	30	24	27	5.5	
Teaching	0	0	9	15	30	30	15	5.3	
<b>Nitz:</b>									
Presents	0	6	9	16	29	19	19	5.0	
Explains	0	3	12	16	29	22	16	5.0	
Communicates	0	0	3	19	29	25	22	5.5	
Teaching	0	3	9	19	38	12	16	5.0	
<b>Course:</b>									
Workload	3	0	3	46	21	21	3	4.6	
Difficulty	0	0	0	43	21	21	12	5.0	
Learn Exp	0	3	0	46	32	10	7	4.7	

Woolley was a good instructor who gave excellent examples. Zamble sometimes spoke too fast but most felt she was also a good instructor.

Nitz was a good instructor but the test was difficult and didn't reflect the material taught.