

## CHEMISTRY STUDENTS' UNION

<b>6</b>	<b>12.011</b> <b>±4,2</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>32.06</b> <b>±2,4,6</b>
<b>4470<sup>+</sup></b> <b>4190<sup>+</sup></b>	<b>C</b>	<b>717.75</b> <b>388.36</b>	<b>S</b>
<b>2.52</b>	<b>1s<sup>2</sup>2s<sup>2</sup>2p<sup>2</sup></b> <b>Carbon</b>	<b>2.07</b>	<b>[Ne]3s<sup>2</sup>3p<sup>4</sup></b> <b>Sulfur</b>

<b>92</b>	<b>238.029</b> <b>6,5,4,3</b>
<b>4407</b> <b>1405</b>	<b>U</b>
<b>18.90</b>	<b>[Rn]5f<sup>6</sup>6d<sup>1</sup>7s<sup>2</sup></b> <b>Uranium</b>

## 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 Organic Chemistry I

Instructor(s): S. Browning

Enr: 347	Resp: 240						Retake: 73%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	3	15	43	38	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	3	25	35	34	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	3	7	28	60	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	3	12	42	41	6.2
Workload	0	0	0	32	33	24	8	5.1
Difficulty	0	1	3	33	32	21	6	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	1	23	24	38	12	5.4

The students found the instructor to be extremely enthusiastic and interesting. He gave excellent preparation time as all slides were online before the lectures. Students believed his visual aids were very helpful. Overall, the Browning was open to questions and offered plenty of help during office hours.

The course material was adequately taught but students wanted more examples for the harder material. The tutorial sections were not too helpful. They also found the term tests too difficult.

Instructor(s): M. Winnik

Enr: 347	Resp: 239						Retake: 73%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	2	7	16	40	33	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	5	14	29	51	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	2	7	22	37	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	3	12	31	52	6.3
Workload	0	0	0	31	33	22	11	5.1
Difficulty	0	1	1	36	31	22	6	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	1	18	27	38	13	5.4

Students thought Winnik was very enthusiastic and that helped with learning. He explained concepts well and his stories added to life-application and appreciation of the course material.

The labs did not reflect the course material and students felt lab mark-

ing took too long.

Instructor(s): M. Winnik

Enr: 456	Resp: 291						Retake: 71%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	3	18	44	31	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	3	14	41	41	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	2	5	25	66	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	2	8	37	50	6.3
Workload	0	1	0	29	30	25	11	5.1
Difficulty	0	0	3	29	37	20	9	5.0
Learn Exp	0	0	2	21	26	36	9	5.2

The vast majority of students found Winnik to be a very engaging, informative, and well organized lecturer. He had very effective lecture notes and his use of examples and anecdotes were very much appreciated.

Instructor(s): S. Browning

Enr: 456	Resp: 293						Retake: 70%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	1	15	40	42	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	3	17	43	34	6.1
Communicates	0	0	1	2	8	31	56	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	1	10	41	46	6.3
Workload	0	0	1	30	29	26	11	5.1
Difficulty	0	0	4	30	36	18	11	5.0
Learn Exp	2	1	2	20	27	36	8	5.1

Browning was a great, enthusiastic and organized lecturer. Some commented that his passion for chemistry shone through.

However, there were some who commented that the course material was too heavy, and that the tests did not reflect the material taught in lectures.

## CHM 138H1S Introductory Organic Chemistry I

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

Enr: 261	Resp: 81						Retake: 62%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Browning:</u>								
Presents	3	0	1	16	25	40	13	5.3
Explains	1	0	3	11	42	32	8	5.3
Communicates	2	0	3	6	31	32	23	5.6
Teaching	2	0	4	14	25	39	12	5.3
<u>Chin:</u>								
Presents	2	2	9	22	33	25	4	4.7
Explains	0	0	3	17	32	38	7	5.3
Communicates	0	0	1	20	37	30	10	5.3
Teaching	0	0	3	15	39	34	6	5.2
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	1	0	1	36	35	17	8	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	2	32	36	17	11	5.0
Learn Exp	1	1	4	34	21	20	5	4.8

Both instructors were said to be enthusiastic although Chin was somewhat disorganized at times and Browning should have provided more examples of test questions. The first test was too detailed and not enough time was provided.

Instructor(s): M. Nitz

Enr: 426	Resp: 189						Retake: 64%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	2	9	29	37	21	5.7
Explains	0	0	1	9	23	31	32	5.8
Communicates	1	0	1	11	32	27	25	5.6
Teaching	0	0	0	10	24	40	24	5.8
Workload	0	0	1	33	31	21	10	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	3	29	33	20	12	5.1
Learn Exp	0	0	3	50	24	14	5	4.6

Students liked Nitz and found him to be very friendly and easy to understand. He lectured at a reasonable pace and students really enjoyed the many examples he provided in class. He was very helpful and organized.

Instructor(s): M. Nitz

Enr: 261	Resp: 82							Retake: 75%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	1	4	24	48	20	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	7	19	32	40	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	12	23	45	18	5.7
Teaching	0	0	1	3	24	50	19	5.8
Workload	1	0	5	36	32	15	8	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	7	30	33	16	11	4.9
Learn Exp	0	1	1	26	31	30	7	5.1

Students were very positive about the instructor. He made the course very enjoyable and was very organized. Students greatly enjoyed his use of examples which were praised for their quality and usefulness. Nitz was the favourite among all the instructors in this course because he was very helpful, providing extra help sessions and willingly answered questions.

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

Enr: 426	Resp: 195							Retake: 63%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Chin:</u>								
Presents	2	3	13	20	33	20	6 con	4.7
Explains	1	2	7	19	28	27	13	5.1
Communicates	1	1	3	20	37	23	12	5.1
Teaching	1	1	3	23	30	26	12	5.1
<u>Browning:</u>								
Presents	1	1	6	10	36	29	14	5.3
Explains	2	1	5	21	30	29	10	5.1
Communicates	1	1	3	12	27	34	20	5.5
Teaching	2	0	5	16	29	30	16	5.3
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	1	0	1	35	28	21	11	5.0
Difficulty	1	0	4	32	33	16	11	4.9
Learn Exp	1	3	5	44	24	15	5	4.5

Generally, students thought Chin was fair, helpful and friendly. However, some students believed there should have been more structure to the lectures.

Students found this course challenging - a lot of material was covered for a half-credit course. The tests were challenging and students did not think they were well-prepared for the examinations.

Browning was well-liked - his lectures were engaging and many students thought he was friendly and helpful. However, the material he taught was extremely difficult. Some students thought he went too quickly to cover material thoroughly in class.

### CHM 139H1F Chemistry: Physical Principles

Instructor(s): S. Browning; A. Wheeler

Enr: 387	Resp: 263							Retake: 53%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Browning:</u>								
Presents	1	1	5	15	25	34	15	5.3
Explains	1	1	5	12	24	33	21	5.4
Communicates	1	0	2	8	26	29	31	5.7
Teaching	1	1	3	14	29	31	17	5.3
<u>Wheeler:</u>								
Presents	0	0	1	6	24	43	22	5.7
Explains	0	0	1	7	24	34	31	5.9
Communicates	0	0	1	6	20	36	34	5.9
Teaching	0	0	1	7	26	38	25	5.8
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	3	20	26	29	19	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	1	27	28	28	11	5.1
Learn Exp	3	4	6	38	26	15	4	4.4

Browning's teaching style was somewhat ineffective for several reasons: his lectures were a bit dry, and the material he focussed on were not reflected in the tests and exams; the material in the textbook was not discussed in lectures; he spoke too quickly and explained concepts in a confusing and rushed manner. On the positive, however, a handful of students thought he was very approachable and willing to help especially during office hours. He also provided ample examples to illustrate the concepts he touched upon, and his use of overhead notes was valuable. Some students suggested consulting Browning outside of class because he could explain the material in better terms one-on-one and was not intimidating. He was funny at times.

Wheeler was organized, enthusiastic, and very efficient. His lectures reflected the reading material and were lively. He ensured that students understood basic chemical foundations or principles before discussing complicated topics. His teaching style was interactive: asked students questions and opened the floor to questions or discussion. Although his slides were detailed, he showed them too quickly thereby not giving students enough time to write the material down. Overall, students enjoyed Wheeler's instruction as he was able to connect concepts and ideas clearly, and in simple ways.

As for the course, several students commented that the lab component was difficult and very tedious. Some wished that labs coincided with the lecture material more to be complementary. Some were disappointed with having to purchase "Mastering Chemistry" as it didn't really help explain concepts effectively, and a few felt "it wasted so much (of students') time". A few appreciated both instructors' discussion and step-by-step solution of some problems in class. Some students complained that the tests did not reflect most of the concepts explained in class, and that some topics were too simplified in lectures. By test time, some were therefore surprised at how difficult many of the questions were.

Instructor(s): S. Browning; A. Wheeler

Enr: 294	Resp: 141							Retake: 50%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Browning:</u>								
Presents	0	0	1	7	30	39	19	5.6
Explains	0	0	2	5	29	40	22	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	10	15	39	32	5.9
Teaching	0	0	2	12	24	38	23	5.7
<u>Wheeler:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	10	23	43	22	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	5	28	40	24	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	10	21	37	30	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	6	27	40	25	5.8
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	1	0	1	19	29	30	16	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	1	23	35	26	11	5.2
Learn Exp	2	5	8	36	23	20	4	4.5

Browning was well-liked by the class and they felt that he was enthusiastic about the material. The students felt that more time was needed for the tests and that the tests did not truly reflect the material taught in class.

Wheeler was also well-liked and students felt he was a good lecturer who demonstrated passion and dedication. Students felt that he demanded a lot of class participation which somewhat ruined the flow of the lectures; but some felt that this made the instructor very engaging. A few thought that Wheeler had a fast pace and did not give them enough time to copy the notes.

Instructor(s): I. McNab

Enr: 294	Resp: 140							Retake: 51%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	2	2	7	17	32	25	11	5.0
Explains	3	5	12	22	26	20	10	4.7
Communicates	2	2	5	19	25	24	20	5.2
Teaching	2	2	6	19	34	23	10	4.9
Workload	0	0	0	21	26	32	17	5.4
Difficulty	0	1	0	25	32	29	9	5.1
Learn Exp	2	4	13	35	20	20	5	4.5

## 24 CHEMISTRY

The test did not reflect the material covered in lectures. Lectures were interesting and McNab was funny and engaging. A few felt that he read off lecture slides. Many students found quantum mechanics difficult.

Instructor(s): I. McNab

Enr: 387	Resp: 254						Retake: 45%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	3	3	12	23	27	19	9	4.6
Explains	4	6	16	29	16	20	6	4.3
Communicates	6	3	12	25	18	20	12	4.6
Teaching	5	1	10	23	25	25	8	4.7
Workload	0	0	2	21	28	26	19	5.4
Difficulty	1	1	1	26	27	29	12	5.1
Learn Exp	3	5	8	41	23	12	1	4.2

Some students thought the course was difficult and the test material did not coincide with the concepts learned in lectures. Some even went on to say that the tutorials were also not very helpful.

McNab, overall, was a very organized and generally good lecturer, but some commented that he was not enthusiastic or animated about the material.

### CHM 139H1S Chemistry: Physical Principles

Instructor(s): R. Jockusch

Enr: 382	Resp: 180						Retake: 39%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	6	3	15	26	23	17	7	4.4
Explains	5	4	14	23	27	18	5	4.4
Communicates	5	2	11	20	34	14	10	4.6
Teaching	3	5	14	26	29	15	5	4.4
Workload	0	0	1	31	33	21	10	5.1
Difficulty	0	0	4	28	29	25	13	5.1
Learn Exp	3	0	9	50	23	10	1	4.3

Jockusch was considered approachable and enthusiastic, however, a few students felt that the material was not clearly explained.

The material tested did not reflect what was actually taught in class. The tests were also very challenging and too long.

Instructor(s): R. Jockusch

Enr: 337	Resp: 163						Retake: 48%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	1	5	14	21	27	19	8	4.6
Explains	3	5	10	23	31	15	7	4.6
Communicates	3	4	11	15	34	19	10	4.8
Teaching	2	4	9	30	26	18	8	4.6
Workload	0	0	1	31	37	22	6	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	1	30	33	21	12	5.1
Learn Exp	1	3	5	43	27	16	2	4.5

Jockusch was very knowledgeable and performed professionally. However, some students thought the lectures were confusing at times and she spoke too quickly.

Instructor(s): A. Wheeler

Enr: 382	Resp: 177						Retake: 38%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	1	5	27	35	29	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	6	21	39	31	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	5	23	31	37	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	6	22	39	31	6.0
Workload	0	0	1	36	32	18	10	4.9
Difficulty	0	1	4	26	32	23	12	5.1
Learn Exp	0	2	8	47	26	11	3	4.4

Wheeler lectured clearly with lots of good examples. A few suggested posting detailed notes online because some concepts were discussed too quickly or that minute details needed for tests or assignments were not

included. Several students enjoyed Wheeler's showing of movies and his enthusiasm for the material.

Instructor(s): K. Quinlan

Enr: 95	Resp: 38						Retake: 50%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	13	13	56	16	5.8
Explains	0	0	2	10	18	37	29	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	10	16	32	40	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	13	16	43	27	5.8
Workload	0	0	0	45	21	24	9	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	25	31	46	3	5.2
Learn Exp	0	6	3	50	16	20	3	4.5

Students were evenly split on their opinions on the use of "clickers" in the course. Generally, although the "clickers" and the participation mark helped students keep awake and pay attention, they were simply too expensive.

Quinlan was praised for her use of an overhead for examples in conjunction with her slides. Students appreciated her enthusiasm and her chemistry jokes. The labs were disliked. Students felt the lecture and lab material should have been tied together more closely. The lab assignments were marked subjectively as scores varied widely between TAs.

Instructor(s): A. Wheeler

Enr: 337	Resp: 142						Retake: 51%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	2	19	43	33	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	2	21	39	36	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	2	14	32	50	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	2	17	43	36	6.1
Workload	0	0	2	28	42	20	6	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	2	29	34	20	12	5.1
Learn Exp	2	1	9	39	26	16	4	4.5

Students generally liked Wheeler and thought he performed well as an instructor. He made lectures interesting and enjoyable. He provided good examples and was very organized.

The course was difficult to some and the course expectations were not communicated very well.

### CHM 151Y1Y Chemistry: The Molecular Science

Instructor(s): R. Kluger; R.J.D. Miller

Enr: 67	Resp: 36						Retake: 82%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<b>Kluger:</b>								
Presents	0	2	0	5	13	38	38	6.0
Explains	0	5	0	19	13	25	36	5.6
Communicates	0	5	0	2	16	33	41	6.0
Teaching	0	2	0	5	25	25	40	5.9
<b>Miller:</b>								
Presents	2	0	2	0	5	36	52	6.2
Explains	2	0	0	5	8	27	55	6.2
Communicates	2	0	0	5	2	13	75	6.5
Teaching	2	0	0	5	2	25	63	6.4
<b>Course:</b>								
Workload	2	2	2	38	30	19	2	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	5	36	22	25	11	5.0
Learn Exp	0	3	0	10	23	43	20	5.6

Kluger was very clear, concise, enthusiastic about the material, and effective in presenting fundamental ideas of organic chemistry. Some students commented that he was unable to address questions properly, and could have simplified the slides a bit.

Miller was a "brilliant" instructor! He made lectures interesting and concepts easy to remember by showing demonstrations at the beginning of every lecture. These demos showed how to apply the material and were relevant to the midterms. Students really appreciated Miller's genuine concern for them and his passion for teaching. He created PREP101

sessions and came to the university on Sundays to run the program. Students immensely found these valuable and integral to their learning. He was very approachable and always willing to help or answer questions. He inspired several students to study chemistry, especially when he explained the relevance of the subject to other sciences and global issues. Many would love to take any course he teaches.

The course was well-planned and executed. The material and concepts were interesting. Some would have liked samples of past tests to get a glimpse of what was expected. A student suggested doing the required readings before attending the lectures to understand unfamiliar terms and concepts.

Instructor(s): R. Morris

Enr: 67	Resp: 36							Retake: 80%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	5	2	27	41	22	5.7
Explains	0	0	5	8	22	44	19	5.6
Communicates	0	2	14	8	26	26	20	5.2
Teaching	0	0	2	11	19	41	25	5.8
Workload	0	5	0	40	31	20	2	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	5	37	22	22	11	5.0
Learn Exp	0	3	0	6	32	38	19	5.6

Morris was an effective lecturer. He presented background information for the labs in class and used interesting demos to liven up the lessons. A few commented that he was a monotonous, but nonetheless a clear speaker.

#### CHM 217H1F Introduction to Analytical Chemistry

Instructor(s): D. Stone

Enr: 102	Resp: 71							Retake: 39%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	2	4	10	24	21	25	11	4.8
Explains	1	4	15	21	21	25	10	4.7
Communicates	0	1	4	14	20	27	32	5.7
Teaching	0	5	8	17	27	23	16	5.0
Workload	0	0	1	22	28	20	27	5.5
Difficulty	0	0	1	37	28	15	13	5.0
Learn Exp	1	3	6	36	31	18	1	4.6

Stone was enthusiastic, however, his lecture notes were sometimes a little disorganized and off-topic. The tutorials were thought to be useless.

#### CHM 220H1F Physical Chemistry for Life Sciences

Instructor(s): A. Dhirani

Enr: 289	Resp: 87							Retake: 57%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	2	2	14	16	34	29	5.7
Explains	1	1	2	14	20	26	34	5.7
Communicates	0	0	1	4	15	30	48	6.2
Teaching	0	0	3	9	16	38	31	5.9
Workload	1	5	16	51	17	4	1	4.0
Difficulty	0	4	8	44	16	22	3	4.5
Learn Exp	0	3	9	33	22	18	13	4.8

Overall, students found Dhirani enthusiastic and inspiring. His demonstrations in class were exciting. They also found him very approachable and he explained concepts very clearly and in detail. Suggestions for next year included a better textbook, since it lacked the all-important kinetics section. Others wanted a lab component for the course.

Instructor(s): A. Dhirani

Enr: 228	Resp: 107							Retake: 48%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	1	2	5	14	29	25	19	5.2
Explains	2	1	7	10	27	31	18	5.3
Communicates	0	0	1	10	22	27	37	5.9

Teaching	0	2	5	11	23	37	18	5.4
Workload	2	3	11	57	13	6	4	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	0	51	23	12	9	4.7
Learn Exp	2	2	6	50	22	9	5	4.4

Many students found Dhirani to be an efficient, organized and caring lecturer. The compiled textbook received mixed reviews, some thinking that it should have been better organized and corresponded more accurately with the lecture material. The vast majority of students appreciated and benefitted from the demonstrations frequently performed in lectures. Many felt that the course evaluations were fair but heavily math-based.

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

Instructor(s): J. Schofield

Enr: 55	Resp: 22							Retake: 17%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	9	0	4	23	28	28	4	4.7
Explains	9	0	19	28	9	23	9	4.4
Communicates	0	0	0	40	30	30	0	4.9
Teaching	5	5	5	25	25	20	15	4.8
Workload	0	0	16	44	22	0	16	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	10	31	31	26	5.7
Learn Exp	0	6	6	53	20	13	0	4.3

#### CHM 225Y1Y Introduction to Physical Chemistry

Instructor(s): R. Kapral; J. Schofield

Enr: 46	Resp: 26							Retake: 35%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<b>Kapral:</b>								
Presents	0	0	4	4	28	48	16	5.7
Explains	0	0	8	12	32	28	20	5.4
Communicates	0	0	8	4	20	35	32	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	12	24	40	24	5.8
<b>Schofield:</b>								
Presents	0	0	16	16	40	20	8	4.9
Explains	0	0	16	28	36	12	8	4.7
Communicates	0	0	12	8	36	24	20	5.3
Teaching	0	0	4	20	44	20	12	5.2
<b>Course:</b>								
Workload	0	0	7	53	15	19	3	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	20	24	32	24	5.6
Learn Exp	0	11	22	44	16	5	0	3.8

Students generally liked both instructors but found the material difficult to understand.

#### CHM 238Y1Y Introduction to Inorganic Chemistry

Instructor(s): S. Browning

Enr: 101	Resp: 41							Retake: 15%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	5	20	47	25	2	5.0
Explains	0	0	12	20	52	10	5	4.8
Communicates	0	2	5	17	35	30	10	5.2
Teaching	0	5	2	25	40	25	2	4.8
Workload	0	0	0	12	26	26	34	5.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	12	34	17	36	5.8
Learn Exp	11	2	14	41	17	8	2	3.9

Many students agreed that the labs were very challenging and time consuming. There was simply too much material to learn and the tests didn't focus on knowledge as much as on memorization.

Browning was described by most as organized and enthusiastic although tough in grading students' work.



**CHM 247H1F Introductory Organic Chemistry II**

Instructor(s): C. Laferriere

Enr: 245	Resp: 120							Retake: 40%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	2	2	8	30	22	21	11	4.8
Explains	3	4	7	32	23	17	11	4.6
Communicates	2	4	8	22	27	21	13	4.9
Teaching	1	5	3	31	24	21	11	4.8
Workload	0	0	0	19	31	26	19	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	2	14	32	29	19	5.5
Learn Exp	1	6	16	36	23	9	5	4.3

Students felt that the instructor taught the material too quickly and was somewhat disorganized, but some felt the instructor improved over time. Despite this, Laferriere was very approachable and available for help outside of the classroom. Many students suggested that lecture slides be posted online and that the tests should have reflected the material they learned in class.

Many students found the lab component difficult because students felt better prepared TAs were needed.

**CHM 247H1S Introductory Organic Chemistry II**

Instructor(s): S. Skonieczny

Enr: 200	Resp: 113							Retake: 52%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	1	6	21	41	21	8	5.0
Explains	0	1	4	22	36	22	11	5.1
Communicates	0	0	5	19	34	27	12	5.2
Teaching	0	0	3	20	33	31	10	5.2
Workload	0	2	1	27	32	22	13	5.1
Difficulty	0	2	2	23	31	25	14	5.2
Learn Exp	4	2	0	41	25	17	7	4.6

Students found Skonieczny was sometimes difficult to understand and tended to go through the slides too quickly. Generally, students liked the commercial breaks, and appreciated the extra help on labs. The instructor was engaging and very approachable, but unclear on the requirements of the term tests.

Instructor(s): S. Skonieczny

Enr: 377	Resp: 193							Retake: 49%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	2	1	8	20	29	27	10	5.0
Explains	2	2	3	21	31	23	14	5.1
Communicates	2	2	4	14	31	24	20	5.2
Teaching	3	2	3	14	34	24	18	5.2
Workload	1	1	0	21	30	28	15	5.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	20	26	30	20	5.5
Learn Exp	3	1	8	34	32	12	7	4.6

Students found Skonieczny to be enthusiastic and knowledgeable. Discussion of lab-related material was appreciated. Some felt that the instructor taught too quickly and that it would have been a benefit for lecture notes to be posted online. There was some confusion about course requirements in terms of tested material.

Instructor(s): S. Skonieczny

Enr: 135	Resp: 70							Retake: 47%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	2	0	2	20	28	27	17	5.2
Explains	4	0	4	11	24	34	20	5.4
Communicates	2	0	2	11	20	31	31	5.7
Teaching	2	0	5	13	23	27	26	5.4
Workload	3	1	0	10	30	35	18	5.4
Difficulty	3	0	0	15	28	32	20	5.4
Learn Exp	0	0	6	29	33	25	6	5.0

The instructor was well-liked. His teaching methods were appreciated,

especially his help sessions. Skonieczny taught material in a simple and clear manner. Some students commented that the tests might have been too long.

Instructor(s): A. Dicks

Enr: 377	Resp: 208							Retake: 48%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Dicks:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	1	14	35	47	6.3
Explains	0	0	0	3	16	41	36	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	1	13	34	48	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	4	10	42	40	6.1
<u>Dong:</u>								
Presents	1	1	9	15	28	30	14	5.2
Explains	0	1	3	13	28	34	17	5.4
Communicates	0	0	2	2	20	42	31	5.9
Teaching	0	0	1	10	27	41	16	5.5
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	1	0	15	33	31	17	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	1	15	30	30	22	5.5
Learn Exp	3	2	7	33	30	15	7	4.6

Students found Dicks to be enthusiastic and well-organized. His sense of humour was appreciated. A few mentioned that they enjoyed his singing. Some felt that the term tests were too long. *ED. NOTE: Dr. Andy Dicks was the 2006-07 recipient of ASSU's Ranjini (Rini) Ghosh Excellence in Teaching Award.*

Students found Dong to be enthusiastic and very attentive to students' questions. Some appreciated her attempts to interact with the students.

Instructor(s): A. Dicks; V. Dong

Enr: 135	Resp: 77							Retake: 43%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Dicks:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	5	12	31	50	6.3
Explains	0	0	0	3	19	42	34	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	7	12	31	48	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	5	13	39	41	6.2
<u>Dong:</u>								
Presents	1	0	6	19	30	27	14	5.2
Explains	1	0	5	14	24	36	18	5.4
Communicates	1	0	3	11	15	35	32	5.8
Teaching	1	0	3	10	25	37	20	5.6
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	6	1	0	10	31	25	24	5.3
Difficulty	5	2	0	12	28	32	20	5.3
Learn Exp	0	3	6	28	31	23	6	4.9

Dicks was concise and well-versed, enthusiastic and approachable. His lecture notes and teaching methods were very well appreciated by the students.

Dong was engaging and enthusiastic. Some found him to unequally distribute lecture time and then rush towards the end of class.

The course was engaging and interesting. Some students felt that material not emphasized in class was unfairly tested.

Instructor(s): V. Dong; A. Dicks

Enr: 200	Resp: 119							Retake: 53%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Dong:</u>								
Presents	0	0	1	16	37	33	10	5.3
Explains	0	0	2	11	29	38	17	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	4	19	41	34	6.1
Teaching	0	0	1	8	27	42	19	5.7
<u>Dicks:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	2	9	29	57	6.4
Explains	0	0	0	2	12	36	47	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	3	8	33	54	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	2	14	30	52	6.3

Course:

Workload	0	1	0	25	34	27	11	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	16	31	34	15	5.4
Learn Exp	2	3	2	45	24	15	7	4.6

Most students found Dong to be a good and enthusiastic instructor. Students felt her slides needed more organization.

Students found Dicks to be an amazing teacher, with excellent, well-organized notes, very enthusiastic, and he communicated lecture material clearly.

Some students felt the test unfair, and that more time should have been allotted. It was suggested that the lecture slides should have been posted on line.

**CHM 249H1S Organic Chemistry**

Instructor(s): R. Batey

Enr: 42		Resp: 34						Retake: 94%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	2	5	8	20	61	6.3	
Explains	0	0	0	2	11	17	64	6.5	
Communicates	0	0	0	2	2	26	67	6.6	
Teaching	0	0	0	2	0	41	55	6.5	
Workload	0	5	0	38	32	17	5	4.7	
Difficulty	0	2	0	47	23	17	8	4.8	
Learn Exp	0	0	0	13	24	34	27	5.8	

Batey was well-liked by most students. Many found him to be a superb instructor with a profound knowledge and eagerness to help students to perform well. Some students thought that the course was challenging but Batey's professionalism and enthusiasm made it worthwhile. Students found the lab useful and it corresponded with the lecture material very well.

**CHM 310H1S Environmental Chemistry**

Instructor(s): S. Mabury

Enr: 140		Resp: 71						Retake: 67%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	8	10	21	27	25	7	4.7	
Explains	0	4	1	17	31	24	21	5.3	
Communicates	0	1	0	7	11	27	52	6.2	
Teaching	0	2	2	8	15	44	25	5.7	
Workload	0	0	1	61	22	13	1	4.5	
Difficulty	0	0	4	41	35	16	2	4.7	
Learn Exp	1	5	0	23	37	23	7	4.9	

Students generally found Mabury to be extremely enthusiastic and knowledgeable. Many praised the lecture recordings posted on the course website as they greatly helped in the studying process. However, some students found that Mabury had a tendency to go "off track" during lectures. His class notes were seen to be somewhat disorganized, some students would have preferred more writing space.

Many students felt that the material was very relevant and interesting. Students would have liked more examples relating to the assignment questions. Some felt the midterm was more difficult than in past years.

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

Instructor(s): M. Thompson

Enr: 57		Resp: 39						Retake: 61%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	2	7	26	18	31	13	5.1	
Explains	0	0	5	13	23	24	23	5.6	
Communicates	0	0	0	5	18	34	42	6.1	
Teaching	0	0	5	2	31	21	39	5.9	
Workload	0	0	0	33	33	15	17	5.2	
Difficulty	0	0	2	51	30	12	2	4.6	
Learn Exp	0	0	4	28	32	28	8	5.1	

Thompson was easily approachable, and enthusiastic about the material. His teaching methods were simple and concise. However, many

found the overhead slides difficult to read and follow. Powerpoint slides would have been appreciated.

The course was interesting and engaging. Many (if not all) students found the lab reports to be too long and time consuming. More weight should have been appropriated to the lab portion of the course.

**CHM 325H1S Introduction to Inorganic and Polymer Materials Chemistry**

Instructor(s): G. Ozin

Enr: 57		Resp: 38						Retake: 57%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	2	8	8	27	35	13	5	4.5	
Explains	2	5	8	13	41	25	2	4.7	
Communicates	0	0	0	13	11	50	25	5.9	
Teaching	5	5	0	13	22	52	0	5.0	
Workload	2	5	10	64	13	2	0	3.9	
Difficulty	0	5	5	56	27	2	2	4.2	
Learn Exp	11	3	14	37	18	14	0	3.9	

**CHM 326H1F Introduction to Quantum Mechanics and Spectroscopy**

Instructor(s): S. Whittington

Enr: 25		Resp: 19						Retake: 94%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	0	5	11	27	55	6.3	
Explains	0	0	5	5	10	47	31	5.9	
Communicates	0	0	0	5	5	66	22	6.1	
Teaching	0	0	0	5	5	21	68	6.5	
Workload	0	11	11	41	29	5	0	4.1	
Difficulty	0	0	5	33	33	16	11	4.9	
Learn Exp	0	0	0	15	23	38	23	5.7	

Students really enjoyed Whittington's lectures. Most felt he was an excellent lecturer and explained the material really well.

**CHM 328H1S Modern Physical Chemistry**

Instructor(s): J. Schofield

Enr: 19		Resp: 15						Retake: 57%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	0	20	60	20	0	5.0	
Explains	0	0	6	46	33	6	6	4.6	
Communicates	0	0	0	26	33	20	20	5.3	
Teaching	0	0	0	20	33	26	20	5.5	
Workload	0	6	0	53	33	0	6	4.4	
Difficulty	0	0	0	20	33	33	13	5.4	
Learn Exp	0	0	0	40	10	30	20	5.3	

Schofield was a very helpful instructor - approachable and willing to answer students' questions after class. Some wished he knew how to explain difficult concepts more clearly because the material was very dry and difficult. Problem sets did not reflect the lecture material. A student suggested having a textbook for the course as it would have helped with the comprehension of complex principles.

**CHM 338H1F Intermediate Inorganic Chemistry**

Instructor(s): J. Powell

Enr: 34		Resp: 29						Retake: 51%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	3	3	20	31	27	13	5.2	
Explains	0	0	6	0	37	44	10	5.5	
Communicates	0	3	0	6	17	48	24	5.8	
Teaching	0	0	3	3	37	37	17	5.6	
Workload	0	0	0	3	13	27	55	6.3	
Difficulty	0	0	0	20	34	31	13	5.4	
Learn Exp	0	0	4	25	25	25	20	5.3	

Powell was well-liked by most of the class and they thought he did a good job in teaching the course; however, some complained of his notes being messy. A number of students complained about how the labs were too time consuming but they also mentioned that it had been one of the

best lab courses that they have ever taken. The labs were challenging, fulfilling, and incorporated some of the material learned in class.

### CHM 345H1S Modern Organic Synthesis

Instructor(s): M. Lautens

	Resp: 27							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	15	30	30	23	5.6
Explains	0	3	3	7	30	30	23	5.5
Communicates	0	3	3	7	23	46	15	5.5
Teaching	3	0	3	11	15	38	26	5.6
Workload	0	0	0	56	24	12	8	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	0	24	40	24	12	5.2
Learn Exp	6	0	0	26	53	13	0	4.6

Lautens explained the material effectively, but the concepts were difficult and assignments did not reflect the material taught in class. A student thought providing more challenging examples in class could have helped with easing the difficulty of the course.

### CHM 346H1S Modern Organic Synthesis

Instructor(s): M. Lautens

	Resp: 30							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	10	16	20	33	20	5.4
Explains	0	0	3	6	36	40	13	5.5
Communicates	0	0	3	13	33	30	20	5.5
Teaching	3	0	0	0	36	56	3	5.5
Workload	0	0	0	26	26	19	26	5.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	21	35	39	3	5.2
Learn Exp	5	0	10	25	25	10	25	4.9

Most students felt that Lautens was organized and taught effectively. The material was not well co-ordinated with the lab component. Students also desired more practice problems.

### CHM 347H1F Organic Chemistry of Biological Compounds

Instructor(s): M. Nitz

	Resp: 105							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	4	16	41	37	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	4	19	39	36	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	3	10	37	48	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	1	8	47	41	6.3
Workload	0	0	6	57	23	7	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	2	44	33	20	1	4.7
Learn Exp	1	0	2	26	37	25	6	5.0

The majority of the class felt that Nitz was a good lecturer who explained concepts clearly. The material was interesting and well laid out. Many students felt that the first term test was too long and too difficult.

Students felt that more problems would have been helpful.

### CHM 348H1F Organic Reaction Mechanisms

Instructor(s): R. Kluger

	Resp: 43							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	9	9	23	37	13	2	4	3.6
Explains	4	6	20	34	20	9	2	4.0
Communicates	2	2	9	9	32	20	23	5.2
Teaching	4	6	9	32	25	11	9	4.4
Workload	0	0	0	23	32	23	20	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	11	30	37	20	5.7
Learn Exp	3	3	17	31	20	17	6	4.4

Many students found lectures poorly organized and the labs time-consuming. The textbook was also very dense and difficult to read. Finally,

students noted a lot of time was required for the assigned readings and problems. Despite this, Kluger was enthusiastic and engaging, though he sometimes went off on tangents and talked about unrelated material.

### CHM 379H1S Biomolecular Chemistry

Instructor(s): D. Zamble

	Resp: 26							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	12	24	28	36	5.9
Explains	0	0	3	7	26	23	38	5.8
Communicates	0	0	3	0	15	30	50	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	3	7	50	38	6.2
Workload	0	0	0	52	28	16	4	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	0	62	25	12	0	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	15	15	36	31	5.8

Many students found the instructor great at explaining the material and really helpful with answering questions. However, a few students thought that she sometimes spoke too quickly during class.

Some students found the lab material very interesting and closely related to the material taught in the lectures. Other students, however, found that some labs were very time-consuming and hard for people with little biological chemistry background.

### CHM 410H1F Analytical Environmental Chemistry

Instructor(s): J. Dinglasan-Panlilio; N. Stock

Enr: 21	Resp: 20						Retake: 73%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Dinglasan-Panlilio:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	5	16	33	44	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	5	26	36	31	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	10	5	50	35	6.1
Teaching	0	0	5	5	21	31	36	5.9
<u>Stock:</u>								
Presents	0	5	5	11	27	22	27	5.4
Explains	0	5	5	5	52	26	5	5.1
Communicates	0	0	0	31	42	15	10	5.1
Teaching	0	0	16	5	38	33	5	5.1
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	0	25	25	30	20	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	55	30	10	5	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	12	37	25	25	5.6

Dinglasan-Panlilio was found to be a very effective, approachable and enthusiastic lecturer. She was always available for extra help and answered questions well.

Stock was considered to be a good instructor. However, many believed that she spoke too quickly and may have been a little better organized.

Overall, this course was a good experience; many believed that it was one of their best courses they had taken. The labs were somewhat time consuming and intensive.

### CHM 414H1F Developing Techniques in Analytical Chemistry

Instructor(s): D. Stone

	Resp: 28							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	14	42	28	14	5.4
Explains	3	0	0	3	32	39	21	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	7	10	42	39	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	10	21	42	25	5.8
Workload	0	0	21	57	14	7	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	3	0	71	17	3	3	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	9	23	33	33	0	4.9

The vast majority of students found Stone to be an effective and passionate lecturer. The incorporation of choice regarding an essay, poster or presentation option as the major assignments was strongly recommended. Students found the choices of course evaluation to be fair, and appreciated this course for having no final exam.

**CHM 416H1S Separation Science**

Instructor(s): D. Stone

Enr: 30

Resp: 22

Retake: 75%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	4	22	36	36	0	5.0
Explains	0	0	0	9	27	59	4	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	9	18	45	27	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	9	22	50	18	5.8
Workload	0	0	13	68	4	13	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	9	40	36	13	0	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	35	40	10	15	5.1

Students really enjoyed Stone's lecture style and greatly appreciated his knowledge on how separation science is done in the "real world". A few felt, however, that Stone went off on tangents at times. Also students would have liked to have had some sample problems to help in their studying for the final exam. Some students would have preferred more evaluations throughout the year rather than a so-so final exam. Students also felt that too much material was covered and that the lecture were sometimes rushed.

**CHM 417H1F Instrumentation for Chemists**

Instructor(s): S. Sadeghi; M. Thompson

Enr: 19

Resp: 14

Retake: 71%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Sadeghi:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	8	41	41	8	5.5
Explains	0	0	16	8	33	25	16	5.2
Communicates	0	0	0	8	25	25	41	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	25	25	25	25	5.5
<u>Thompson:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	14	21	64	0	5.5
Explains	0	0	0	7	28	35	28	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	0	35	21	42	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	7	21	35	35	6.0
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	23	53	7	7	7	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	7	23	38	30	0	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	8	25	41	16	8	4.9

This course was enjoyed by many students and the material was interesting. However, more examples should have been used.

**CHM 423H1F Applications of Quantum Mechanics**

Instructor(s): P. Brumer

Enr: 8

Resp: 7

Retake: 83%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	14	0	42	14	28	5.4
Explains	0	0	0	14	42	42	0	5.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	14	57	28	6.1
Teaching	0	0	14	0	42	14	28	5.4
Workload	0	0	0	28	42	28	0	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	42	14	28	14	5.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	40	20	20	20	5.2

Most of the class felt that the instructor was good, funny, knowledgeable and accommodating. The students felt the material was very interesting. Some felt the course was a bit unorganized and unplanned because dates for tests were not finalized till later in the school year. Students would also have appreciated it if more examples were presented in class.

**CHM 426H1S Polymer Chemistry**

Instructor(s): M. Winnik

Enr: 14

Resp: 14

Retake: 75

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	7	21	57	14	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	7	28	57	7	5.6

Communicates	0	0	0	7	7	42	42	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	7	14	57	21	5.9
Workload	0	7	0	78	0	14	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	7	0	50	28	7	7	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	46	15	23	15	5.1

**CHM 432H1F Organometallic Chemistry and Polymer Materials Chemistry**

Instructor(s): J. Powell

Enr: 14

Resp: 13

Retake: 76%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	7	0	38	23	7	23	4.9
Explains	0	0	0	7	38	38	15	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	7	7	53	30	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	7	53	15	23	5.5
Workload	0	0	0	25	25	41	8	5.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	8	25	50	16	5.8
Learn Exp	0	10	0	10	30	30	20	5.3

The vast majority of students found Powell to be a very enthusiastic lecturer. This course covered a lot of material, however, the provided lecture notes were very much appreciated.

**CHM 434H1F Advanced Materials Chemistry: Solid State Chemistry**

Instructor(s): G. Ozin

Enr: 20

Resp: 20

Retake: 94%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	10	35	35	20	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	0	26	47	26	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	0	10	20	70	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	11	44	44	6.3
Workload	0	0	5	10	63	10	10	5.1
Difficulty	0	0	0	50	16	33	0	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	13	20	33	33	5.9

Students found the course challenging but the instructor was effective and enthusiastic. Some students suggested the notes should have been more clear.

**CHM 437H1S Bio-Inorganic Chemistry**

Instructor(s): R. Morris

Enr: 51

Resp: 34

Retake: 75%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	2	11	26	41	17	5.6
Explains	0	0	5	17	20	35	20	5.5
Communicates	0	0	5	17	26	32	17	5.4
Teaching	0	0	0	5	38	38	17	5.7
Workload	0	0	14	70	8	5	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	2	55	29	11	0	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	4	52	26	17	0	4.6

Generally, students found Morris to be very knowledgeable, although the lectures were sometimes monotonous.

Most students felt this was a great course to take.

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

Instructor(s): A. Yudin

Enr: 19

Resp: 15

Retake: 78%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	13	20	26	40	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	13	20	33	33	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	40	60	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	20	40	40	6.2
Workload	0	6	20	53	6	6	6	4.1
Difficulty	0	6	0	46	26	20	0	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	21	42	28	7	5.2

Although most found Yudin to be a very good instructor, many students felt that he spent too much time discussing concepts from previous



### 30 CHEMISTRY

classes.

#### CHM 441H1F Spectroscopic Analysis in Organic Chemistry

Instructor(s): S. Skonieczny

Enr: 25	Resp: 24							Retake: 90%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	4	4	8	30	30	21	5.4
Explains	0	0	9	0	18	45	27	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	13	26	30	30	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	8	14	56	17	5.8
Workload	0	0	4	30	26	21	17	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	18	27	36	13	4	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	26	6	33	33	5.7

The instructor was well-liked by the students. Some students found the assignments tedious but nevertheless helpful.

#### CHM 443H1S Physical Organic Chemistry

Instructor(s): J. Chin

Enr: 23	Resp: 20							Retake: 70%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	5	15	36	21	15	5	4.4
Explains	0	5	10	15	31	26	10	4.9
Communicates	0	0	0	0	44	33	22	5.8
Teaching	0	0	5	5	31	42	15	5.6
Workload	5	11	27	33	22	0	0	3.6
Difficulty	0	5	22	44	11	11	5	4.2
Learn Exp	7	0	7	46	15	23	0	4.3

Students found Chin to be available for extra help, enthusiastic and gave effective lectures. Students generally felt this was an enjoyable course.

#### CHM 447H1F Bio-organic Chemistry

Instructor(s): A. Woolley

Enr: 89	Resp: 85							Retake: 81%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	3	10	38	28	19	5.5
Explains	0	0	1	10	23	34	29	5.8
Communicates	0	1	1	23	29	26	17	5.3
Teaching	0	0	0	3	19	51	25	6.0
Workload	0	2	16	62	15	2	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	1	7	59	21	8	1	4.3
Learn Exp	0	1	1	48	26	12	9	4.8

Overall, Woolley was a very good lecturer who explained concepts clearly. Students raved about the interesting course material. Woolley was well liked by the students and was attentive to students' questions.

A small few found the notes to be disorganized.

#### CHM 479H1S Biological Chemistry

Instructor(s): M. Nitz

Enr: 45	Resp: 26							Retake: 73%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	7	7	69	15	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	7	26	46	19	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	3	15	53	26	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	0	19	46	34	6.2
Workload	5	0	5	55	25	10	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	40	40	20	0	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	50	30	6	12	4.8

Generally, students thought that Nitz was a very good instructor who explained the material well. He answered questions very well and was very knowledgeable. Some students thought that the tests were worded poorly but were fair. Generally, students liked the course.

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

Enr: 45	Resp: 27							Retake: 68%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Woolley:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	3	14	51	29	6.1
Explains	0	0	3	7	11	48	29	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	7	23	34	34	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	0	7	59	33	6.3
<u>Zamble:</u>								
Presents	0	0	3	11	22	48	14	5.6
Explains	0	0	7	25	18	25	22	5.3
Communicates	0	0	0	7	30	30	30	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	7	18	48	25	5.9
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	4	0	4	56	28	8	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	48	36	16	0	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	4	40	27	18	9	4.9

Students found the instructor very approachable and very enthusiastic. Woolley was very helpful and available for individual appointments.

Zamble was great and helpful. However, some students thought that at times, Zamble spoke too fast. Some students suggested the instructor should have had more explanations/text in her printed notes.

