

MATHEMATICS UNION



Introduction

The Mathematics Union (MU) represents the interests of, organizes events for, and generally works to improve the experience of all undergraduates enrolled in a program or course offered by the Department of Mathematics. Please feel free to contact us by email at mu@math.toronto.edu

MU Executive

APM 236H1F Applications of Linear Programming

Instructor(s): P. Kergin

Enr: 94	Resp: 40							Retake: 73%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	2	0	2	17	37	20	20	5.3
Explains	0	0	7	25	32	17	17	5.1
Communicates	0	0	10	17	35	27	10	5.1
Teaching	2	0	0	22	27	32	15	5.3
Workload	7	7	20	50	7	5	2	3.7
Difficulty	7	10	17	52	5	5	2	3.6
Learn Exp	3	0	9	48	19	12	6	4.5

Most students commended Kergin for his ability to explain course material in a thorough and well-organized manner, and at a suitable pace. A few students felt more examples (as opposed to derivation and explanation of theory) would have been useful.

APM 236H1S Applications of Linear Programming

Instructor(s): S. Homayouni

Enr: 51	Resp: 26							Retake: 45%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	8	12	12	40	12	12	4	3.9
Explains	4	8	12	52	16	8	0	3.9
Communicates	8	0	12	29	33	16	0	4.3
Teaching	4	8	8	36	20	24	0	4.3
Workload	0	4	17	56	17	4	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	13	8	56	21	0	0	3.9
Learn Exp	0	6	0	46	40	6	0	4.4

Despite computational errors, the lectures were generally well-presented and clear. The lecturer was very approachable outside of class. Some students complained that the tests were much harder than the material taught in lectures. More examples should have been discussed in class.

APM 346H1F Differential Equations

Instructor(s): V. Jurdjevic

Enr: 66	Resp: 41							Retake: 67%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	2	4	17	39	21	14	5.2
Explains	0	2	7	9	46	34	0	5.0
Communicates	0	0	0	7	17	34	41	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	12	32	37	17	5.6
Workload	0	0	4	51	41	2	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	7	36	41	14	0	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	3	34	24	24	13	5.1

Jurdjevic was said to be very dedicated and knowledgeable, but somewhat disorganized. Most enjoyed his lecturing style, describing him as enthusiastic and inspiring, entertaining enough to make students consistently attend 9 a.m. classes. The one major complaint was that not enough examples were provided/completed in class. Outside of lecture, the instructor was said to be kind, courteous, and helpful. Students did criticize the book as well as minimal feedback with regards to marking. Posting problem sets and marks online was also suggested.

APM 351Y1Y Partial Differential Equations

Instructor(s): G. Forni

Enr: 25	Resp: 14							Retake: 54%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	14	0	35	14	35	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	21	35	7	35	5.6
Communicates	0	7	0	14	21	28	28	5.5
Teaching	0	0	0	28	21	7	42	5.6
Workload	0	0	0	50	33	8	8	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	50	33	8	8	4.8
Learn Exp	0	12	0	37	37	0	12	4.5

Forni was said to be a hard working instructor, "who tried to communicate in great detail". Tests were though to be challenging, and the text was not considered helpful.

APM 421H1F Mathematical Foundations of Quantum

Instructor(s): R. Jerrard

Enr: 10	Resp: 9							Retake: 50%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	25	62	12	0	4.9
Explains	0	0	12	25	50	12	0	4.6
Communicates	0	0	12	12	37	25	12	5.1
Teaching	0	0	0	33	33	22	11	5.1
Workload	0	0	0	66	33	0	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	44	22	22	11	5.0
Learn Exp	0	0	12	25	37	25	0	4.8

APM 426H1S General Relativity

Instructor(s): R. McCann

Enr: 13	Resp: 9							Retake: 62%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	22	11	22	44	0	4.9
Explains	0	0	11	22	33	22	11	5.0
Communicates	0	0	0	11	33	33	22	5.7
Teaching	0	12	0	0	62	12	12	5.0
Workload	0	0	0	0	33	22	44	6.1
Difficulty	0	0	0	22	33	11	33	5.6
Learn Exp	0	14	0	14	28	14	28	5.1

Students praised McCann as a good instructor, noting his knowledge and his lecturing skills. There was a concern, however, about the difficulty of the material and the heavy workload.

APM 461H1S Combinatorial Methods

Instructor(s): S. Tanny

Enr: 26

Resp: 17

Retake: 93%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	6	13	53	26	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	0	26	33	40	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	12	61	56	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	0	12	56	31	6.2
Workload	0	6	43	43	6	0	0	3.5
Difficulty	0	0	31	37	31	0	0	4.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	27	36	27	9	5.2

APM 462H1S Nonlinear Optimization

Instructor(s): N. Derzko

Enr: 29

Resp: 22

Retake: 28%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	4	9	19	14	28	19	4	4.3
Explains	4	0	22	18	31	18	4	4.5
Communicates	0	0	13	18	40	27	0	4.8
Teaching	4	0	13	9	40	27	4	4.8
Workload	0	4	4	45	36	4	4	4.5
Difficulty	4	0	9	45	22	18	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	7	14	42	35	0	0	4.1

While most appreciated Derzko's instruction and careful explanations, a few found his lectures somewhat disorganized and lacking in examples. The assignments should have been shorter and more reflective of the test content.

APM 466H1S Mathematical Theory of Finance

Instructor(s): L. Seco

Enr: 47

Resp: 18

Retake: 87%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	5	5	22	27	11	27	5.2
Explains	0	11	0	16	27	16	27	5.2
Communicates	0	0	0	5	33	22	38	5.9
Teaching	0	5	0	22	11	38	22	5.4
Workload	0	0	6	73	6	6	6	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	12	50	18	12	6	4.5
Learn Exp	7	0	7	21	14	21	28	5.1

Seco was felt to be knowledgeable and enthusiastic, teaching a useful and interesting course.

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

Instructor(s): P. Kergin

Enr: 53

Resp: 19

Retake: 17%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	5	5	11	5	22	22	27	5.1
Explains	11	0	11	22	27	5	22	4.6
Communicates	5	0	16	22	22	16	16	4.7
Teaching	5	5	0	27	11	33	16	5.0
Workload	0	5	5	47	15	5	21	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	11	27	16	27	16	5.1
Learn Exp	7	15	0	38	15	7	15	4.2

Most students described Kergin as very clear and concise, but a few stated that his lectures were unorganized and his notes long and wordy. Some expressed concerns regarding the test marking scheme as well as time for individual consultation.

MAT 125H1S Calculus I (A)

Instructor(s): A. Lam

Enr: 65

Resp: 31

Retake: 55%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	3	12	35	48	6.3
Explains	0	0	0	0	16	35	48	6.3

Communicates	0	0	0	3	3	30	63	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	0	13	30	56	6.4
Workload	0	0	0	50	26	20	3	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	3	46	23	20	6	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	25	20	25	30	5.6

Lam received outstanding reviews. He was said to be kind, humorous, friendly, enthusiastic, and eager to help students, while communicating concepts well and giving detailed examples for clarity. Tests were said to accurately reflect the content of the lectures. While Lam was often identified as "the most exemplary" math lecturer at UofT, common criticisms included concerns that sometimes he spoke too quickly.

[ED Note: A. Lam received ASSU's Ranjini Ghosh Award for Excellence in Teaching for 2005-06]

MAT 133Y1Y Calculus and Linear Algebra for Commerce

Instructor(s): J. Tate

Enr: 125

Resp: 66

Retake: 51%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	1	0	0	3	6	37	57	6.3
Explains	1	0	0	4	9	39	46	6.2
Communicates	0	1	0	9	21	41	26	5.8
Teaching	0	1	0	3	6	38	50	6.3
Workload	0	0	4	28	15	34	15	5.3
Difficulty	1	0	4	30	27	19	16	5.0
Learn Exp	6	0	4	23	29	23	12	4.9

Tate was said to be an exemplary instructor. She was praised for her organization, clarity and thoroughness as well as her enthusiasm and dedicated efforts to help students learn and comprehend the material.

An insightful course, though many would have liked lectures to have been spread out over a week rather than scheduled in 3-hour blocks.

Instructor(s): R. Saghin

Enr: 87

Resp: 17

Retake: 57%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	23	35	23	11	5	4.4
Explains	0	0	23	35	11	23	5	4.5
Communicates	0	11	11	23	29	17	5	4.5
Teaching	0	6	18	37	12	18	6	4.4
Workload	0	0	0	58	35	5	0	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	47	35	17	0	4.7
Learn Exp	0	7	7	50	21	14	0	4.3

While students noted Saghin's preparedness and efforts in lecture, some felt that he gave unclear explanations and did not answer students' questions effectively.

Evaluations for the course (not written by this instructor, but common across lecture sections) were said to be unfair as they did not adequately represent the course material.

Instructor(s): A. Igelfeld

Enr: 130

Resp: 24

Retake: 45%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	4	16	4	16	33	20	4	4.4
Explains	4	8	12	25	25	25	0	4.3
Communicates	0	4	16	8	37	20	12	4.9
Teaching	0	8	12	25	20	25	8	4.7
Workload	0	4	4	33	16	25	16	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	8	20	25	25	20	5.3
Learn Exp	5	5	5	40	20	20	5	4.4

Igelfeld was described as knowledgeable, but "lacking in his explanation and presentation skills." Some felt that he spent discrepant proportions of time on particular topics. Also they expressed a need for the lecture organization to be consistent with respect to that of the text. While Igelfeld gave difficult examples in class, these were said to be of great use in preparing for difficult tests. Tutorials were considered ineffective.

Instructor(s): J. Tate

	Resp: 66							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	3	0	0	1	6	24	64	6.4
Explains	1	0	1	0	6	22	68	6.5
Communicates	0	1	1	6	9	35	45	6.1
Teaching	1	0	1	1	6	32	56	6.3
Workload	0	1	4	28	18	32	14	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	7	34	18	23	15	5.0
Learn Exp	3	5	1	20	25	25	16	5.0

Students were divided in their evaluation of the course and instructor. Some said Tate was effective and explained the material clearly with the use of many examples, while a few thought she was confusing because of some errors she made. The course was enjoyable despite very difficult tests, that were designed by a different instructor. The multiple choice based tests, with each question worth 4%, were not positively viewed and deemed unfair.

Instructor(s): P. Kergin

	Resp: 28							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	17	17	14	14	35	5.3
Explains	0	0	21	14	21	7	35	5.2
Communicates	0	3	7	35	14	7	32	5.1
Teaching	7	0	7	17	32	3	32	5.1
Workload	3	0	0	21	42	14	17	5.1
Difficulty	3	0	0	39	17	25	14	5.0
Learn Exp	3	7	11	40	11	14	11	4.4

Kergin was described at times as "absolutely brilliant", but many felt his "teaching style did not reflect his knowledge on the subject". Although he was said to be considerate and eager to help students, his explanations were considered, at times, unclear and confusing. Some students suggested giving more examples in class and being slightly more interactive. A specific tutorial agenda was requested, as the course had several sections.

Instructor(s): A. Igelfeld

	Resp: 31							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	6	6	22	35	22	6	4.8
Explains	3	3	3	29	32	19	9	4.8
Communicates	0	0	19	6	25	35	12	5.2
Teaching	0	3	3	19	22	35	16	5.3
Workload	0	0	0	43	33	16	6	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	10	20	31	27	10	5.1
Learn Exp	4	4	0	28	36	28	0	4.7

Igelfeld was said to be very knowledgeable, though students had differing opinions regarding his ability to communicate concepts effectively. Many commended Igelfeld for his enthusiasm and approachability. In-class examples and tests were said to be difficult.

MAT 135Y1Y Calculus I

Instructor(s): E. LeBlanc

	Resp: 46							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	2	13	40	44	6.3
Explains	0	0	0	4	22	35	237	6.1
Communicates	0	0	8	17	20	24	28	5.5
Teaching	0	0	0	2	17	40	40	6.2
Workload	0	0	4	41	28	23	2	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	4	35	31	22	6	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	5	37	29	16	10	4.9

Students felt LeBlanc was a superb instructor. He always arrived with "structured and well-prepared" notes and was described as friendly and

encouraging. Students praised him for his enthusiasm and impressive clarity, which made math enjoyable despite the lectures being each 3 hours long.

Instructor(s): G-V. Nguyen-Chu

	Resp: 17							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	5	11	35	29	11	5	4.5
Explains	0	5	23	5	47	11	5	4.5
Communicates	0	5	35	23	23	5	5	4.1
Teaching	0	5	23	29	23	11	5	4.3
Workload	0	0	0	35	35	23	5	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	35	29	11	23	5.2
Learn Exp	0	0	8	66	16	0	8	4.3

Students were generally satisfied with Nguyen-Chu's performance as an instructor. Some were appreciative of his course notes, which they found to be clear and well-organized, while others lauded him for what they considered a significant improvement in teaching skills as the term progressed. There was some concern, however, about the weight given to multiple-choice evaluations.

Instructor(s): F. Latremoliere

	Resp: 35							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	5	37	40	17	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	17	37	25	20	5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	8	25	22	42	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	5	42	25	25	5.7
Workload	0	0	2	51	20	11	14	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	2	34	34	20	8	5.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	48	14	22	14	5.0

Instructor(s): T. Bloom

	Resp: 84							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	1	0	7	15	30	24	20	5.3
Explains	0	2	4	9	26	28	28	5.6
Communicates	2	2	4	23	21	26	18	5.1
Teaching	0	0	6	7	30	28	28	5.6
Workload	1	2	0	43	29	15	7	4.7
Difficulty	0	2	2	25	29	28	12	5.1
Learn Exp	1	7	5	41	14	22	5	4.5

Students, in general, were quite happy with Bloom, with some praising him, in particular, for his good use of examples and for his sense of humour. Some, however, thought the pace of the course was a little too quick.

Instructor(s): D. Klein

	Resp: 87							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	11	25	27	34	5.9
Explains	0	0	3	13	27	19	34	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	3	15	23	57	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	9	35	33	21	5.7
Workload	0	1	1	35	37	15	9	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	2	29	30	27	9	5.1
Learn Exp	2	0	1	52	13	23	6	4.7

Students praised Klein as a good instructor lauding him, in particular, for his enthusiasm, his use of examples, his sense of humour, and his course notes. They were also appreciative of the improvement he made in teaching over the course of the year. Some expressed concern, however, that the pace of the course was a little too quick.

Instructor(s): E. LeBlanc

	Resp: 71							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	1	0	0	9	22	43	22	5.7
Explains	2	1	2	8	25	40	18	5.5
Communicates	1	1	7	18	29	29	12	5.1
Teaching	1	0	2	5	26	46	16	5.6
Workload	0	1	0	36	33	23	4	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	28	26	28	16	5.3
Learn Exp	4	1	9	57	13	9	3	4.1

Most students felt LeBlanc was a good instructor, and praised him for his well-organized lectures and notes. He was also commended for his "use of appropriate and progressively harder examples" to communicate concepts with clarity. The students felt LeBlanc answered questions adequately and explicitly, and was also available for individual consultation. His sense of humour was appreciated, as the course was scheduled for a 3-hour block of time. A few felt LeBlanc could have spoken a bit louder, but in all other respects, he was very well-liked.

Instructor(s): J. Hernandez-Cortez

	Resp: 31							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	31	37	31	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	0	17	39	42	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	20	37	20	20	5.4
Teaching	0	0	0	0	25	53	21	6.0
Workload	0	0	0	41	31	24	3	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	6	31	34	24	3	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	0	32	36	32	0	5.0

Most students commended the instructor for lecturing in an organized and timely manner. Many felt he was "effective in his choice of examples," eager to help the students, and patient in addressing their questions. His clarity made lectures a good review for tests, and his office hours were a big help for students as well. Tutorials were valued by most, with many asking that they be longer to allow for better test preparation.

Instructor(s): Y-H. Kim

	Resp: 43							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	2	7	21	21	38	9	5.1
Explains	2	0	6	13	32	32	11	5.2
Communicates	0	0	4	16	30	27	20	5.4
Teaching	0	0	6	20	34	25	11	5.1
Workload	0	0	0	32	32	27	6	5.1
Difficulty	2	0	0	30	27	30	9	5.1
Learn Exp	3	3	12	51	15	9	6	4.2

Students lauded Kim's teaching style, describing him as enthusiastic, hardworking, and funny. He prepared students well for the exam while showing them that "math can be fun". Some complained that he moved quickly through the material and found answering questions difficult.

Instructor(s): A. Lam

	Resp: 155							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	2	21	74	6.7
Explains	0	0	0	0	5	26	66	6.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	2	15	81	6.8
Teaching	0	0	0	1	3	16	77	6.7
Workload	0	1	3	45	28	15	5	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	4	37	30	21	6	4.9
Learn Exp	1	0	1	22	31	28	13	5.2

Students considered Lam an outstanding lecturer, with a knack for making math enjoyable and easy to comprehend. They also praised him for his enthusiasm, his well-organized course delivery, his sense

of humour, and his course notes, which students found to be clear and concise.

[ED Note: A. Lam received ASSU's Ranjini Ghosh Award for Excellence in Teaching for 2005-06]

Instructor(s): A. Lam

	Resp: 188							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	2	19	77	6.7
Explains	0	0	0	0	3	22	72	6.7
Communicates	0	0	0	0	1	11	86	6.8
Teaching	0	0	0	0	2	15	81	6.8
Workload	0	0	2	44	27	18	6	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	2	35	28	21	11	5.0
Learn Exp	0	1	0	23	29	29	16	5.4

The general opinion of students was that Lam was an "awesome" lecturer, notable, in particular, for his enthusiasm and sense of humour. The only quibbles students had about the course were concerning the textbook, which some did not find to be that good, and the ticket system for lecture attendance, which some said had failed to present overcrowding of the lecture hall.

MAT 137Y1Y Calculus!

Instructor(s): A. Savage

	Resp: 27							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	0	40	59	6.6
Explains	0	0	0	0	0	51	48	6.5
Communicates	0	0	0	0	11	44	44	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	0	3	40	55	6.2
Workload	0	0	0	11	44	25	18	5.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	33	25	29	11	5.2
Learn Exp	0	0	6	18	25	37	12	5.3

Students unanimously praised Savage for being enthusiastic, approachable, and well-organized. He was said to "elucidate concepts clearly with plenty of examples" and lectures were described as "very interactive and intellectually engaging". Many students complained about the course's heavy workload as well as the 3-hour lecture, but felt that Savage addressed their needs and concerns well. His extra review sessions were also greatly appreciated.

Tutorials for this course were deemed ineffective.

MAT 157Y1Y Analysis I

Instructor(s): E. Meinrenken

	Resp: 34							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	11	32	20	35	5.8
Explains	0	0	5	17	20	25	20	5.5
Communicates	0	0	2	17	23	35	20	5.5
Teaching	0	0	2	14	20	38	23	5.6
Workload	0	0	0	23	23	32	17	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	5	11	38	44	6.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	14	14	32	39	6.0

Students found the course interesting and helpful, with an emphasis on problem solving. They described lectures as organized yet dense, so that it was difficult to catch up on missed material.

A previous calculus course, at the high school or university level, would have been beneficial.

MAT 223H1F Linear Algebra I

Instructor(s): S. Uppal

	Resp: 91							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	1	0	3	11	30	27	26	5.6
Explains	1	2	10	17	23	29	15	5.1

152 MATHEMATICS

Communicates	1	1	5	13	26	30	21	5.4
Teaching	0	3	2	14	23	34	21	5.5
Workload	0	1	4	40	28	13	12	4.9
Difficulty	1	1	3	20	26	23	24	5.4
Learn Exp	5	4	14	28	24	15	5	4.3

Most students gave Uppal good reviews. His classes were well-organized, well-paced, and he explained concepts clearly. His sense of humour and sarcasm also made lectures enjoyable.

While the course was considered useful, there were many complaints regarding the lack of examples (over theory), the "large gap between standards of the quizzes and the midterm", as well as a "draconian style of evaluation" which included multiple choice questions of significant weight (and hence few/no part marks).

A re-organization of presented topics was also suggested.

Instructor(s): S. Cohen

Enr: 118	Resp: 57							Retake: 50%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	1	3	3	18	37	22	12	5.0
Explains	7	9	14	20	21	23	3	4.3
Communicates	0	0	1	14	19	39	25	5.7
Teaching	1	1	5	14	35	25	16	5.2
Workload	0	0	3	42	25	14	12	4.9
Difficulty	0	1	0	21	30	29	16	5.3
Learn Exp	11	1	11	36	19	17	1	4.1

Cohen's notes were organized he explained concepts and answers well. Students felt he was also very friendly and approachable, stating that he was "always available for consultation and overall a pleasant individual". The text was not considered very helpful. Many students also expressed concern with regard to the midterm - it was said to be overwhelmingly difficult as they felt that the assignments had not prepared them well for it. Most found that Cohen was too focussed on concepts and theoretical approaches would have liked to see additional examples from outside the textbook to show applications of theorems. [More geometric interpretation would have been appreciated and contributed to a balance between application and theory.] A full solution manual was also suggested.

MAT 223H1S Linear Algebra I

Instructor(s): J. Adler

Enr: 140	Resp: 53							Retake: 49%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	2	6	6	34	28	24	5.5
Explains	0	0	2	12	26	34	26	5.7
Communicates	0	0	5	11	23	23	35	5.7
Teaching	0	3	1	7	28	26	30	5.7
Workload	1	1	0	39	29	19	7	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	5	25	31	23	13	5.1
Learn Exp	0	9	9	38	25	13	4	4.4

Most students were impressed with Adler's organization and enjoyed his lectures. He not only clarified difficult concepts with enthusiasm and humour, but also taught mathematical thinking. Several complained that the midterm was too hard, and that Adler's section was not synchronized with the others.

Instructor(s): S. Uppal

Enr: 175	Resp: 78							Retake: 39%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	1	1	1	13	23	26	32	5.7
Explains	1	0	7	15	31	32	11	5.2
Communicates	2	1	5	16	18	33	22	5.4
Teaching	1	2	6	22	20	32	14	5.1
Workload	1	0	1	48	21	19	7	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	5	25	27	23	18	5.2
Learn Exp	1	5	10	45	24	12	0	4.2

Most students found his lectures well-organized while others had trouble following his explanations. A few suggested that he should have included more complex examples. The online laboratory was controversial. Many called for their removal from the course because they were tedious and time consuming. However, others felt that they were useful aids to understanding the material. A few complained about the extra fee for labs.

MAT 224H1F Linear Algebra II

Instructor(s): S. Uppal

Enr: 79	Resp: 38							Retake: 51%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	2	0	13	18	36	28	5.7
Explains	0	0	7	10	34	31	15	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	23	26	26	23	5.5
Teaching	0	0	2	13	29	27	27	5.6
Workload	0	2	2	37	24	21	10	4.9
Difficulty	2	0	2	21	27	32	13	5.2
Learn Exp	8	0	8	36	28	12	8	4.4

Uppal was said to be knowledgeable, approachable, clear in his explanations, and very well-organized. However, many students felt that more examples relating to the book should have been given; some suggested changing the text. In addition, many complained about multiple-choice evaluation, which meant that part marks could not be awarded.

MAT 224H1S Linear Algebra II

Instructor(s): S. Uppal

Enr: 71	Resp: 40							Retake: 56%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	2	20	27	50	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	10	15	45	30	5.9
Communicates	0	0	2	5	20	45	27	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	5	15	47	32	6.1
Workload	0	2	2	42	37	10	5	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	2	27	42	20	7	5.0
Learn Exp	0	0	6	37	34	18	3	4.8

Uppal was lauded for her thorough lecture notes, enthusiasm and clear course organization. Students found that expectations and evaluation were fair. They appreciated the solution manual.

MAT 235Y1Y Calculus II

Instructor(s): N. Tzirakis

Enr: 15	Resp: 12							Retake: 75%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	8	0	0	0	33	25	33	5.6
Explains	0	0	9	9	27	36	18	5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	16	33	33	16	5.5
Teaching	0	0	8	0	16	50	25	5.8
Workload	0	0	8	41	50	0	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	8	33	33	25	0	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	36	54	9	0	4.7

Tzirakis presented the material neatly, logically and with enthusiasm. He demonstrated a willingness to help students and was very approachable outside of class. Some students found the course to be theoretical, especially the second semester. A few would have preferred an additional form of grading, such as a lab or weekly quizzes.

Instructor(s): R. Stanczak

Enr: 66	Resp: 25							Retake: 58%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	16	44	20	20	5.4
Explains	0	0	4	8	44	28	16	5.4
Communicates	0	0	4	20	32	32	12	5.3
Teaching	0	0	0	8	40	32	20	5.6
Workload	0	4	4	36	36	12	8	4.7

Difficulty	0	4	8	40	20	16	12	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	5	41	23	17	11	4.9

Most students felt that Stanczak's lectures were well-organized and enjoyable. However, a few thought that Stanczak did not provide enough feedback on assignments.

Instructor(s): E. Ruiz

Enr: 93	Resp: 21						Retake: 73%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	25	15	15	45	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	25	20	25	30	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	5	25	15	55	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	15	15	35	35	5.9
Workload	5	5	15	45	30	0	0	3.9
Difficulty	0	9	14	38	33	4	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	52	5	23	17	5.1

Ruiz was described as logical, concise, humorous and approachable. His ability to effectively answer questions both in class and during office hours was also appreciated.

Instructor(s): P. Blue

Enr: 118	Resp: 49							Retake: 74%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	8	6	24	34	26	5.7
Explains	0	0	2	6	28	28	34	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	14	26	44	14	5.6
Teaching	0	0	0	6	26	34	32	5.9
Workload	0	4	8	46	27	12	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	4	6	55	22	8	4	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	9	39	30	16	4	4.7

Students appreciated Blue's clear, concise and well-organized lectures and notes. They also noted his approachability and attentiveness to their questions. Many emphasized the tremendous value of Blue's extra help hours. Some felt that a tutorial for the course would have been beneficial.

MAT 237Y1Y Multivariate Calculus

Instructor(s): S. Cohen

Enr: 43	Resp: 10						Retake: 75%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	10	0	0	0	10	70	10	5.5
Explains	11	0	0	0	44	33	11	5.1
Communicates	0	0	0	10	0	50	40	6.2
Teaching	10	0	0	0	0	70	20	5.7
Workload	0	0	0	20	40	40	0	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	0	40	30	30	5.9
Learn Exp	11	0	0	0	33	44	11	5.2

Cohen presented lectures clearly and with humor. Students emphasized that he was willing to present mathematics beyond the course material if asked, but a few felt that not enough time was left for material on the syllabus. The textbook was described as more appropriate for a higher-level course by several students.

Overall, however, an interesting course, taught by a very good instructor.

MAT 240H1S Algebra I

Instructor(s): F. Murnaghan

Enr: 64	Resp: 23						Retake: 75%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	4	28	23	28	14	5.2
Explains	0	0	5	15	25	25	30	5.6
Communicates	4	0	14	4	28	38	9	5.0
Teaching	0	0	0	9	38	33	19	5.6
Workload	0	0	0	34	30	30	4	5.0

Difficulty	0	0	0	23	47	19	9	5.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	17	47	17	17	5.4

Murnaghan was well-prepared, explained concepts thoroughly and concisely, and made ample use of examples. However, a few considered her lectures a little disorganized at times. She was also felt to be very approachable in assisting students.

MAT 244H1F Introduction to Ordinary Differential Equations

Instructor(s): B. Khesin

Enr: 127	Resp: 51						Retake: 75%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	3	7	33	43	11	5.5
Explains	0	0	1	19	33	31	13	5.4
Communicates	0	0	5	11	23	35	23	5.6
Teaching	0	0	2	6	36	44	12	5.6
Workload	0	2	2	46	30	16	4	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	4	42	34	14	4	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	2	48	25	12	10	4.8

Many students criticized the evaluation methods and marking scheme for this course. In particular, the felt that not enough time had been allotted to tests and that the penalties for computational (as opposed to theoretical) errors were too harsh.

Despite this, most students liked Khesin's lectures. He was said to be well-organized and clear in communicating concepts.

MAT 246Y1Y Concepts in Abstract Mathematics

Instructor(s): P. Rosenthal

Enr: 70	Resp: 39						Retake: 61%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	7	17	30	30	12	5.2
Explains	0	0	2	15	38	30	12	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	7	23	38	30	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	5	30	43	20	5.8
Workload	2	0	15	58	10	12	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	7	42	21	23	5	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	3	20	24	44	6	5.3

Rosenthal was described as an enthusiastic, clear, entertaining lecturer. Many students were impressed that he could answer questions without hesitation, although this made one student uncomfortable. Students clamored for a course textbook as well as more practice questions for the heavily weighted exam. Some complained that the scope of the material was too broad at the expense of thoroughness.

Instructor(s): J. Korman

Enr: 79	Resp: 42						Retake: 86%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	2	5	28	30	33	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	12	23	35	28	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	15	17	40	27	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	2	30	35	30	5.9
Workload	2	2	7	71	7	7	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	2	7	51	23	12	2	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	29	25	32	12	5.3

A number of students described Korman as the "best instructor" they have encountered. Most students were impressed by his willingness to help and his approachability, with many mentioning extended and extra office hours. The course material was said to be difficult, however, most students enjoyed the course.

MAT 247H1F Algebra II

Instructor(s): F. Murnaghan

Enr: 42	Resp: 26						Retake: 78%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	12	16	44	28	5.9

154 MATHEMATICS

Explains	0	0	0	12	24	36	28	5.8
Communicates	0	0	8	20	12	24	36	5.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	30	30	38	6.1
Workload	0	0	0	24	44	28	4	5.1
Difficulty	0	0	0	24	28	40	8	5.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	20	33	29	16	5.4

Murnaghan was found to be a good teacher, delivering enthusiastic, clear lectures with good use of examples. Some students mentioned that Murnaghan spoke quickly and softly, but that this was not problematic. Others were concerned that the two-hour lectures were too long, and that some proof outlines were described orally and not written on the board.

MAT 301H1F Groups and Symmetries

Instructor(s): H. Kim

Enr: 41	Resp: 18							Retake: 60%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	5	0	5	44	33	11	5.3
Explains	0	0	0	16	44	33	5	5.3
Communicates	0	0	0	22	33	33	11	5.3
Teaching	0	0	11	0	33	44	11	5.4
Workload	0	0	0	44	38	0	16	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	56	31	6	6	4.6
Learn Exp	9	0	0	45	27	18	0	4.4

Most students found Kim's lectures enjoyable; he was said to be very helpful and explained concepts clearly. A few students wished he could have provided additional in-class examples which were not from the textbook.

Instructor(s): R. Stanczak

Enr: 44	Resp: 30							Retake: 65%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	10	33	43	13	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	0	50	33	16	5.7
Communicates	0	0	3	6	46	30	13	5.4
Teaching	0	0	0	3	36	43	16	5.7
Workload	0	0	0	31	34	24	10	5.1
Difficulty	0	0	3	23	53	20	0	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	0	23	42	33	0	5.1

Most students found Stanczak to be a good teacher, who made the class "a pleasure to take". Some students required more time for the midterm, while others found the assignments challenging, but Stanczak did care for his students. His use of examples was especially helpful.

MAT 309H1F Introduction to Mathematical Logic

Instructor(s): F. Tall

Enr: 33	Resp: 19							Retake: 55%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	5	5	21	21	21	21	5	4.3
Explains	5	5	21	15	31	21	0	4.3
Communicates	5	0	10	21	10	36	15	5.1
Teaching	5	0	0	26	31	31	5	4.9
Workload	0	5	10	57	15	10	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	10	36	21	21	10	4.8
Learn Exp	6	0	6	43	18	12	12	4.6

Students felt that the instructor was very knowledgeable about the subject. Some expressed concerns regarding the evaluation methods (harsh marking and test content and length), organization, and consistency with the textbook. Tall was said to occasionally deviate from course material, as well as assume non-prerequisite material, but was also described as having good interaction with his students.

MAT 315H1S Introduction to Number Theory

Instructor(s): H. Kim

Enr: 67	Resp: 36							Retake: 77%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	11	34	31	22	5.7
Explains	0	0	5	20	25	34	14	5.3
Communicates	0	0	0	20	29	26	23	5.5
Teaching	0	0	0	5	25	48	20	5.8
Workload	0	0	0	34	40	20	5	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	2	60	28	5	2	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	29	37	20	12	5.2

Both the instructor and the textbook were said to be good. Students described Kim as well-organized, enthusiastic and thorough in his explanations. He was said to be approachable at any time, as well as very kind. In addition, most students felt he gave appropriate homework and tests that represented the course content well.

MAT 327H1F Introduction to Topology

Instructor(s): M. Shub

Enr: 37	Resp: 20							Retake: 100%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	5	30	35	15	15	5.1
Explains	0	0	10	20	40	15	15	5.1
Communicates	0	0	0	10	20	35	35	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	5	25	50	25	5.8
Workload	0	0	0	20	30	40	10	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	20	30	45	5	5.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	11	11	55	22	5.9

Students praised Shub for being helpful and friendly, and for explaining concepts and theorems clearly.

MAT 335H1S Chaos, Fractals and Dynamics

Instructor(s): E. Pujals

Enr: 92	Resp: 39							Retake: 67%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	10	15	28	28	10	5	4.3
Explains	0	5	8	10	32	32	10	5.1
Communicates	0	2	0	10	29	32	24	5.6
Teaching	0	2	8	18	40	24	5	4.9
Workload	0	13	16	61	8	0	0	3.6
Difficulty	5	11	22	51	8	0	0	3.5
Learn Exp	0	7	10	57	25	0	0	4.0

Most students said he emphasized his knowledge, enthusiasm and approachability, while some criticized him for his lack of organization and repetitiveness due to underestimating students' comprehension of the material. Expectations of the course were also said to be a little unclear, and some students felt a tutorial would have been beneficial.

MAT 337H1S Introduction to Real Analysis

Instructor(s): I. Graham

Enr: 48	Resp: 29							Retake: 72%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	37	42	17	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	7	25	57	10	5.7
Communicates	0	3	0	3	46	35	10	5.4
Teaching	0	0	0	3	32	46	17	5.8
Workload	0	0	3	14	32	35	14	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	3	3	25	42	25	5.8
Learn Exp	4	0	0	9	36	45	4	5.3

Graham was commended for being attentive to questions and for being approachable outside of class. A few requested that more examples could have been developed in class.

MAT 344H1F Introduction to Combinatorics

Instructor(s): S. Tanny

Enr: 61

Resp: 42

Retake: 82%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	2	0	4	26	14	33	19	5.3
Explains	2	0	2	7	33	23	30	5.6
Communicates	0	0	4	9	19	28	38	5.9
Teaching	0	2	7	9	16	40	23	5.6
Workload	0	4	21	56	14	2	0	3.9
Difficulty	0	2	26	29	31	9	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	11	36	22	22	8	4.8

This was said to be a very useful course, with some students stating it was the most interesting 300-level mathematics course they had ever taken.

Students commended the instructor for his enthusiasm, approachability, clarity and attentiveness to students' questions. Online notes were readily available.

MAT 354H1F Complex Analysis I

Instructor(s): E. Bierstone

Enr: 39

Resp: 29

Retake: 85%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	3	31	27	37	6.0
Explains	0	0	10	10	20	27	31	5.6
Communicates	0	0	3	0	20	37	37	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	3	24	37	34	6.0
Workload	0	0	3	3	21	32	39	6.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	0	13	24	62	6.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	23	19	28	28	5.6

Bierstone's lectures were well-planned and well-explained, and he was described as very helpful and personable. The problem sets and midterm were considered difficult by most, but the marking was said to be very fair.

The textbook was not well-liked and many suggested another text that they felt was "superior in pedagogical value". Lectures were of tremendous value, though many students still expressed a need for tutorials. A challenging yet rewarding course.

MAT 391H1S History of Mathematics after 1700

Instructor(s): C. Fraser

Enr: 59

Resp: 50

Retake: 80%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	6	0	8	23	40	21	5.6
Explains	0	2	2	4	28	39	23	5.7
Communicates	0	2	2	6	18	37	33	5.9
Teaching	2	0	2	2	22	47	22	5.8
Workload	2	4	6	66	14	4	2	4.1
Difficulty	2	6	8	64	14	4	0	4.0
Learn Exp	0	2	2	24	32	27	10	5.1

Fraser was very passionate and enthusiastic about the material. Lectures were interesting and enjoyable, and well-communicated. Students also appreciated the use of visual aids - such as the videos.

MAT 401H1S Polynomial Equations and Fields

Instructor(s): J. Gordon

Enr: 50

Resp: 29

Retake: 42%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	3	0	7	48	22	18	5.4
Explains	0	0	6	13	34	31	13	5.3
Communicates	0	0	0	6	6	41	44	6.2
Teaching	0	3	0	3	24	41	27	5.8
Workload	0	0	0	24	34	27	13	5.3
Difficulty	0	0	3	20	17	37	20	5.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	28	38	23	9	5.1

Gordon was well-liked by her students. She was commended for preparing clear, coherent lectures and being enthusiastic and attentive to students' questions. However, some would have preferred that she speak slower and provide a few more examples. Students greatly appreciated Gordon's availability for help outside of class hours.

The textbook was considered abominable by most, and some students expressed concerns regarding the heavy workload and the scheduling of the lectures into 3-hour blocks of time.

MAT 402H1S Classical Geometries

Instructor(s): A. Khovanskii

Enr: 22

Resp: 18

Retake: 94%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	22	22	5	33	16	5.0
Explains	0	0	0	33	16	27	22	5.4
Communicates	0	0	5	5	0	27	61	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	23	11	29	35	5.8
Workload	0	0	16	55	16	11	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	5	61	16	16	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	21	28	35	14	5.4

Overall, Khovanskii was well-liked despite an unorthodox lecturing style. He was described as "clearly inspired, and infectiously enthusiastic". A few students would have preferred more examples and better organization of chalkboard notes, but this did not detract much from the communication of concepts.

MAT 427H1S Algebraic Topology

Instructor(s): D. Bar-Natan

Enr: 30

Resp: 25

Retake: 90%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	24	32	44	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	0	8	20	72	6.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	4	12	84	6.8
Teaching	0	0	0	0	8	28	64	6.6
Workload	0	0	0	66	23	9	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	42	19	23	14	5.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	10	21	26	42	6.0

Students generally found Bar-Natan to be an "excellent" instructor, and they lauded him, in particular, for his enthusiasm and his ability to make difficult material enjoyable.

MAT 449H1F Algebraic Curves

Instructor(s): A. Khovanskii

Enr: 11

Resp: 9

Retake: 100%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	11	0	0	22	0	44	22	5.2
Explains	0	11	0	0	11	55	22	5.7
Communicates	0	0	11	0	0	11	77	6.4
Teaching	0	11	0	0	11	33	44	5.9
Workload	0	0	11	44	33	11	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	33	33	22	11	5.1
Learn Exp	0	0	12	0	37	12	37	5.6

MAT 477H1Y Seminar in Mathematics

Instructor(s): R. Rotman

Enr: 11

Resp: 10

Retake: 55%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	11	66	11	11	5.2
Explains	0	0	0	0	50	50	0	5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	11	33	44	11	5.6
Teaching	0	0	0	11	44	33	11	5.4
Workload	0	11	55	22	0	11	0	3.4
Difficulty	0	0	10	20	30	30	10	5.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	44	33	11	11	4.9