



Introduction

The Bachelor of Arts Architectural Studies Society (BAASS) is involved with all aspects, from academic to social, in the Architectural Studies Program. Check out their website at <http://baass.info>.

Editor

ARC 131H1F Introduction to Architecture

Instructor(s): L. Richards

Enr: 368	Resp: 210							Retake: 78%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	2	11	31	44	9	5.4
Explains	0	0	3	16	30	39	8	5.3
Communicates	1	5	6	19	24	27	14	5.0
Teaching	0	1	4	15	39	32	6	5.2
Workload	1	4	11	55	17	7	1	4.1
Difficulty	1	6	8	56	21	4	0	4.0
Learn Exp	1	2	6	28	30	23	7	4.8

Students found the course to be very interesting and the course material was well-organized. Students suggested that tutorials and clearer instructions for assignments would have been useful. They also felt that Richards lacked enthusiasm and assignments should have been returned before the midterm.

ARC 213H1S Architectural Design I

Instructor(s): M. Denegri

Enr: 26	Resp: 19							Retake: 76%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	31	36	26	5	5.1
Explains	0	5	0	31	36	26	0	4.8
Communicates	0	0	0	26	26	26	21	5.4
Teaching	0	0	0	27	16	44	11	5.4
Workload	0	0	0	26	31	15	26	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	31	42	26	0	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	0	35	28	21	14	5.1

Students complained that the instructions and requirements of the assignments were ambiguous. Assignment marks were not given back on time and some students felt that Denegri should have managed the class time better. However, Denegri was approachable and helpful.

Instructor(s): M. White

Enr: 31	Resp: 24							Retake: 86%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	4	29	4	25	5.9
Explains	0	0	4	0	37	29	29	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	33	66	6.7
Teaching	0	0	0	0	8	60	30	6.2
Workload	0	0	0	21	34	39	4	5.3
Difficulty	0	0	13	31	22	31	0	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	5	25	40	30	5.9

Most students found White to be enthusiastic, knowledgeable and approachable. Students enjoyed the ability to explore their ideas and White gave new and interesting ideas of approach. Overall, students enjoyed the learning environment. However, a few wished that White could have explained the requirements and instructions better.

ARC 221H1F Architectural Representation I

Instructor(s): M. Denegri

Enr: 31	Resp: 25							Retake: 86%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	12	16	28	36	8	5.1
Explains	0	0	4	12	56	24	4	5.1
Communicates	0	0	12	8	16	44	20	5.5
Teaching	0	4	4	8	32	32	20	5.4
Workload	0	0	0	12	16	24	48	6.1
Difficulty	0	0	0	24	48	24	4	5.1
Learn Exp	0	0	4	14	23	28	28	5.6

Many students found it hard to cope with the workload and the lack of time provided for each assignment. Students thought it would have been beneficial if more instructions and feedback had been given.

ARC 231H1F Architecture and Technology

Instructor(s): M. White

Enr: 91	Resp: 69							Retake: 92%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	4	25	45	24	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	3	22	51	22	5.9
Communicates	0	1	0	10	28	38	20	5.7
Teaching	0	0	1	2	20	49	25	5.9
Workload	0	0	3	51	34	6	4	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	11	59	20	5	1	4.3
Learn Exp	0	2	2	20	30	28	18	5.3

Students found White to be enthusiastic, approachable, and always available for consultation. His lectures were well-organized and structured, and he provided readings and short essays to enhance the learning experience. Some found that he was less mainstream while others appreciated the exploration outside the basic history and theory of architecture.

ARC 232H1S Architecture, Media and Communication

Instructor(s): S. Sorli

Enr: 55	Resp: 32							Retake: 77%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	3	28	34	34	0	5.0
Explains	0	3	6	18	34	28	9	5.1
Communicates	0	3	3	34	37	12	9	4.8
Teaching	0	0	3	22	29	38	6	5.2
Workload	0	0	6	59	21	9	3	4.4
Difficulty	0	3	3	59	25	9	0	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	8	30	30	13	17	5.0

Most of the students found the topics discussed in lectures to be very interesting. However, they found the required readings very irrelevant to the lectures and assignments. Students thought that the assignments were helpful in providing fundamental design skills for future use.

ARC 233H1F Post-Colonial Studies in Architecture

Instructor(s): C. Elson

Enr: 43	Resp: 28							Retake: 59%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	7	10	25	21	32	3	4.7
Explains	0	10	3	21	28	28	7	4.8
Communicates	0	3	3	14	39	32	7	5.1
Teaching	0	3	14	14	32	35	0	4.8
Workload	0	0	7	53	25	7	7	4.5
Difficulty	0	3	7	64	21	3	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	7	11	46	19	15	0	4.2

Many students found the material hard to comprehend. The lectures were vague and sometimes disorganized. However, this was the first time the instructor taught the course. Students found Elson approachable and nice. The course would have benefitted more if the material had

14 ARCHITECTURE

been better explained with visual aids.

ARC 236H1S Design and Cultural Transformation

Instructor(s): R. Fones

Enr: 62	Resp: 51							Retake: 22%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	Mean							
Presents	0	0	2	8	27	40	21	5.7
Explains	0	0	2	4	26	32	34	5.9
Communicates	0	2	2	6	26	40	22	5.7
Teaching	0	0	4	14	20	50	10	5.5
Workload	4	6	29	54	4	2	0	3.5
Difficulty	2	4	14	71	6	2	0	3.8
Learn Exp	0	0	9	36	29	15	9	4.8

Fones was a good instructor. His in-class demonstrations were much appreciated. Many felt that the 60% final exam was overweighed and that Fones was a strict marker. Students also wished that there had been a course website.

ARC 313H1F Architectural Design II

Instructor(s): T. Bessai

Enr: 23	Resp: 13							Retake: 72%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	Mean							
Presents	0	0	0	30	38	30	0	5.0
Explains	0	0	7	23	38	23	7	5.0
Communicates	0	0	0	0	30	38	30	6.0
Teaching	0	0	7	30	23	7	30	5.2
Workload	0	0	0	0	0	38	61	6.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	15	23	46	15	5.6
Learn Exp	0	0	12	12	37	25	12	5.1

Students found the course load demanding and time-consuming; however, the assignments allowed for great creativity. Bessai was approachable, friendly and inspiring, but his criticisms were, at times, more confusing than constructive. Overall, he made himself available for individual consultation.

ARC 314H1S Architectural Design III

Instructor(s): D. Carter

Enr: 24	Resp: 19							Retake: 94%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	Mean							
Presents	0	0	0	22	38	27	11	5.4
Explains	0	0	0	16	33	44	5	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	0	21	57	21	6.0
Teaching	0	0	5	0	33	50	11	5.6
Workload	0	0	0	0	52	36	10	5.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	31	42	21	5	5.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	21	28	42	7	5.4

Students found Carter to be very approachable and always available to provide useful comments and advice.

Instructor(s): M. Graham

Enr: 25	Resp: 21							Retake: 73%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	Mean							
Presents	0	0	5	5	45	35	10	5.4
Explains	0	0	0	20	30	35	15	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	5	20	45	30	6.0
Teaching	0	0	5	0	55	30	10	5.4
Workload	0	0	0	9	28	38	23	5.8
Difficulty	0	0	4	14	38	19	23	5.4
Learn Exp	0	0	6	33	26	26	6	4.9

Most students enjoyed Graham's knowledgeable and helpful criticisms. However, work was not graded within a reasonable time. Graham communicated well and listened to students. Most students enjoyed the course.

ARC 321H1F Architectural Representation II

Instructor(s): M. Denegri

Enr: 25	Resp: 20							Retake: 60%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	Mean							
Presents	0	0	0	5	45	40	10	5.6
Explains	0	0	5	10	35	35	15	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	10	40	25	25	5.7
Teaching	0	0	0	20	25	40	15	5.5
Workload	0	0	0	15	20	35	30	5.8
Difficulty	0	0	5	15	20	40	20	5.6
Learn Exp	0	0	5	17	52	17	5	5.0

Denegri was very helpful, friendly and approachable; she was always available for individual consultation. However, marks and critiques did not always seem to correspond and students felt that course expectations should have been communicated more concisely.

Instructor(s): K. Ljubanovic

Enr: 23	Resp: 18							Retake: 94%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	Mean							
Presents	0	0	0	16	50	33	0	5.2
Explains	0	0	0	27	22	44	5	5.3
Communicates	0	0	0	5	33	44	16	5.7
Teaching	0	0	0	11	27	61	0	5.5
Workload	0	0	0	5	38	38	16	5.7
Difficulty	0	0	0	22	33	38	5	5.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	14	28	42	14	5.6

Overall, Ljubanovic was described as a good instructor. A few students wished for more feedback/comments.

ARC 431H1F Architectural Design IV

Instructor(s): D. Lieberman

Enr: 18	Resp: 14							Retake: 100%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	Mean							
Presents	0	0	0	7	28	42	21	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	7	28	28	35	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	7	21	71	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	21	35	42	6.2
Workload	0	0	0	0	50	14	35	5.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	25	25	33	16	5.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	33	16	50	6.2

Students complained about the lack of grades/marks available throughout the semester. Lieberman was encouraging and provided great class discussions.

ARC 414H1F Introduction to Graphic Design

Instructor(s): K. Sugden

Enr: 18	Resp: 15							Retake: 92%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	Mean							
Presents	0	6	0	0	6	53	33	6.0
Explains	0	0	6	0	0	26	66	6.5
Communicates	0	0	0	0	6	6	86	6.8
Teaching	0	0	0	6	6	40	46	6.3
Workload	0	0	40	40	20	0	0	3.8
Difficulty	0	0	26	46	20	6	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	7	15	23	53	6.2	

Students thought Sugden was very enthusiastic and encouraging; thus they enjoyed the lectures thoroughly. Many are also inspired by the projects done by the instructor's studio.

ARC 433H1S Urban Design History, Theory Criticism

Instructor(s): A. Blackwell

	Resp: 29							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	6	0	27	37	17	10	4.9
Explains	0	6	3	17	31	34	6	5.0
Communicates	0	0	6	10	13	55	13	5.6
Teaching	0	0	3	17	41	31	6	5.2
Workload	0	0	0	46	25	25	3	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	25	39	25	10	5.2
Learn Exp	0	0	9	19	42	19	9	5.0

Blackwell was regarded by most as a good instructor, but he could have organized the lectures and projects better. Some commented that the material was too focussed and that the deadlines did not follow the syllabus. The readings were difficult.

ARC 435H1F History/Theory of Urban Landscape Architecture Design I

Instructor(s): I. Elias

	Resp: 27							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	3	18	33	33	11	5.3
Explains	0	0	3	18	29	29	18	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	11	22	40	25	5.8
Teaching	0	0	3	3	25	66	0	5.6
Workload	0	0	15	69	7	7	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	3	7	69	11	7	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	4	0	42	23	23	4	4.8

Students found Elias insightful, knowledgeable and enthusiastic, but would have preferred that she went through fewer examples in greater detail. A few students wanted more feedback and complained about the lectures being cut short, with not enough time for questions.

ARC 436H1S History/Theory of Contemporary Urban Landscape Design II

Instructor(s): A. Payne

	Resp: 5							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	40	20	40	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	0	20	0	80	6.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	20	0	80	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	40	20	40	6.0
Workload	0	0	20	20	20	20	20	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	20	40	20	20	5.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	25	0	50	25	5.8

ARC 441H1F Architecture in its Technological-Ecological Context

Instructor(s): D. Carter

	Resp: 15							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	6	0	6	26	46	13	0	4.5
Explains	6	0	0	33	46	13	0	4.5
Communicates	6	0	0	26	40	26	0	4.7
Teaching	6	0	6	40	26	20	0	4.4
Workload	0	0	6	20	60	6	6	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	6	13	40	26	13	5.3
Learn Exp	0	0	27	45	9	18	0	4.2

Students were displeased with the trajectory the class took during the semester. Students felt that the weekly readings and essays were too difficult and taxing. The seminars weren't very engaging and students felt that more discussion on building construction was needed. Carter did not clearly explain the objectives and assignments of the course. While the numerous field trips were enjoyable and enriched the overall learning experience, students felt the course was poorly structured.

ARC 442H1S Building Science, Materials and Construction I

Instructor(s): M. Lio

	Resp: 17							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	17	64	17	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	5	23	41	29	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	0	23	52	23	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	5	29	41	23	5.8
Workload	0	0	0	17	35	35	11	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	17	58	17	5	5.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	21	21	42	14	5.5

Many students felt that this course was very beneficial to their program studies because it dealt with the practical and scientific aspect of buildings. Lio was very knowledgeable. The course assignments and problem sets were very heavy as were the readings. The course lectures were sometimes rushed and there was little time for students to catch up with the information on the slideshow. Also, the textbooks were expensive.

ASIA-PACIFIC COURSES

ASI 400Y1Y Seminar in Asia-Pacific Studies

Instructor(s): T. Lam

	Resp: 9							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	25	37	37	0	5.1
Explains	0	0	12	12	25	50	0	5.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	37	62	0	5.6
Teaching	0	0	0	22	33	44	0	5.2
Workload	0	0	11	55	22	11	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	12	62	25	0	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	50	50	0	0	4.5

Instructor(s): I. Peng; S. Trott

	Resp: 9							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Peng:								
Presents	0	0	0	11	55	33	0	5.2
Explains	0	0	0	0	44	44	11	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	0	22	55	22	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	11	33	44	11	5.6
Trott:								
Presents	0	0	0	14	28	57	0	5.4
Explains	0	0	0	14	14	71	0	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	14	85	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	14	0	85	0	5.7
Course:								
Workload	0	0	11	55	22	11	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	11	66	22	0	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	28	57	17	0	4.9