

## COMPUTER SCIENCE STUDENTS' UNION

Introduction

The Computer Science Students' Union (CSSU) holds events for students who are in the Computer Science program. To get in touch with the CSSU, check out their website - [www.cssu.ca](http://www.cssu.ca), visit their office in the Bahen Centre, Rm 2283, or email them at [cssu@cdf.utoronto.ca](mailto:cssu@cdf.utoronto.ca).

Editor

**CSC 104H1F The Why and How of Computing**

Instructor(s): A. Rosenthal

	Enr: 98							Mean
	Resp: 48							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	2	8	14	33	27	14	5.2
Explains	0	0	4	20	35	29	10	5.2
Communicates	4	2	2	20	25	22	22	5.2
Teaching	0	0	2	16	37	22	20	5.4
Workload	2	12	14	52	14	4	0	3.8
Difficulty	4	8	12	46	12	12	2	4.0
Learn Exp	0	0	7	46	28	7	10	4.7

Most students found Rosenthal to be a good instructor, but a few questioned some of his teaching techniques and his time allocation. Students also felt that the textbook was useless, and complained about the lack of additional material such as lecture slides and handouts.

**CSC 108H1F Introduction to Computer Programming**

Instructor(s): P. Gries

	Enr: 90							Mean
	Resp: 57							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	7	18	29	44	6.1
Explains	0	0	1	3	14	33	46	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	0	5	9	85	6.8
Teaching	0	0	0	5	9	21	63	6.4
Workload	0	1	1	30	20	21	23	5.3
Difficulty	1	3	5	38	16	18	16	4.8
Learn Exp	4	0	2	9	23	28	30	5.6

An overwhelming majority of students found Gries to be an outstanding instructor who communicated with great clarity and enthusiasm. The students felt the assignments were too long.

Instructor(s): J. Campbell

	Enr: 48							Mean
	Resp: 33							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	3	3	24	21	48	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	3	15	36	45	6.2

Communicates	0	0	0	0	12	45	42	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	3	12	37	46	6.3
Workload	0	3	3	25	31	25	12	5.1
Difficulty	0	3	6	43	25	18	3	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	14	32	21	32	5.7

Most students found Campbell to be an excellent instructor who did a great job of presenting the material. There was a concern that the assignments were either too easy or too hard. The tests did not always reflect what was taught. The students complained about the written component of the course.

Instructor(s): J. Campbell

	Enr: 170							Mean
	Resp: 79							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	2	3	20	38	34	6.0
Explains	0	0	2	3	17	39	35	6.0
Communicates	0	0	1	3	15	29	49	6.2
Teaching	0	0	2	2	15	41	37	6.1
Workload	0	0	1	29	32	20	16	5.2
Difficulty	0	1	11	36	28	15	6	4.6
Learn Exp	1	0	1	17	38	33	6	5.2

Students found Campbell to be a very good instructor who communicated with enthusiasm and clearly answered all questions. The assignments were judged to be fun but sometimes too long.

**CSC 108H1S Introduction to Computer Programming**

Instructor(s): K. Reid

	Enr: 82							Mean
	Resp: 24							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	6	31	34	27	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	6	27	31	34	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	0	17	31	51	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	3	13	44	37	6.2
Workload	0	0	7	42	25	17	7	4.8
Difficulty	3	0	3	35	42	7	7	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	15	42	23	19	5.5

Reid was a very good instructor who was very easy to approach and monitored the bulletin boards.

**CSC 120H1S Computer Science for the Sciences**

Instructor(s): J. Campbell

	Enr: 35							Mean
	Resp: 18							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	22	27	50	6.3
Explains	0	0	0	0	5	55	38	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	5	44	50	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	0	5	44	50	6.4
Workload	0	5	16	33	27	11	5	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	11	33	44	5	5	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	6	40	33	20	5.6

Campbell was described as enthusiastic, fun and helpful. The course was described as enjoyable, but assignments were hard and labs were too long.

**CSC 148H1F Introduction to Computer Science**

Instructor(s): A. Jepson

	Enr: 58							Mean
	Resp: 28							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	3	7	17	50	21	5.8
Explains	0	3	3	3	14	46	28	5.8
Communicates	0	0	7	0	28	32	32	5.8
Teaching	0	3	0	3	28	35	28	5.8
Workload	0	0	0	22	33	25	18	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	3	11	40	25	18	5.4

Learn Exp 0 4 4 14 28 38 9 5.2

Students found Jepson to be a good instructor who made effective use of examples. The course was judged by many to contain difficult material. The tests and assignments took too long to get marked.

**CSC 148H1S Introduction to Computer Science**

Instructor(s): P. Gries

Enr: 67 Resp: 44 Retake: 76%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	6	18	39	34	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	0	9	51	39	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	2	23	74	6.7
Teaching	0	0	0	2	4	39	53	6.4
Workload	0	2	11	30	30	16	9	4.7
Difficulty	0	6	13	32	20	16	9	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	8	31	42	17	5.7

Gries explained concepts clearly and was very enthusiastic about computer science.

Instructor(s): P. Gries

Enr: 115 Resp: 52 Retake: 81%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	13	23	30	32	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	5	25	34	34	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	0	7	23	69	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	1	17	34	46	6.2
Workload	0	1	3	50	25	17	1	4.6
Difficulty	1	0	11	40	25	13	7	4.6
Learn Exp	0	2	0	27	22	29	18	5.3

Students found Gries to be an enthusiastic and highly helpful instructor. He presented and delivered the course in a clear and enjoyable manner.

**CSC 150H1F Accelerated Introduction to Computer Science**

Instructor(s): K. Reid

Enr: 32 Resp: 21 Retake: 85%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	4	28	19	28	19	5.3
Explains	0	0	4	19	28	28	19	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	0	9	33	57	6.5
Teaching	0	0	4	0	23	57	14	5.8
Workload	0	0	4	28	38	23	4	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	9	19	33	33	4	5.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	33	33	16	16	5.2

Students found Reid to be a great instructor who spent a bit of extra time helping students understand the material. The assignments were criticized for not always directly corresponding to the material taught in lectures.

**CSC 165H1F Mathematical Expression and Reasoning for Computer Science**

Instructor(s): R. Krueger

Enr: 59 Resp: 30 Retake: 64%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	3	0	3	13	43	36	6.0
Explains	0	0	3	3	16	33	43	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	3	3	20	73	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	3	6	46	43	6.3
Workload	6	0	20	43	16	10	3	4.1
Difficulty	0	3	16	26	33	10	10	4.6
Learn Exp	0	3	0	26	19	30	19	5.3

Krueger presented the material in a fun and easy to learn way. He was very enthusiastic and helpful throughout the course and very approachable and friendly during office hours.

The course assignments, while fair, were assigned too late and little time was given to complete them. The material was interesting and very relevant to the program and provided a strong understanding of problem solving. The tutorials were useful but the time of the tutorial was very awkward (had to wait 6 hours between lecture and tutorial).

**CSC 165H1S Mathematical Expression and Reasoning for Computer Science**

Instructor(s): D. Heap

Enr: 90 Resp: 42 Retake: 77%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	4	7	14	47	26	5.8
Explains	0	2	0	9	19	43	24	5.8
Communicates	0	0	2	2	9	35	50	6.3
Teaching	0	0	2	4	7	45	40	6.2
Workload	2	2	14	38	30	9	2	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	9	40	19	21	9	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	18	26	39	15	5.5

Most students described Heap as a very good instructor who was extremely helpful answering students' questions. He was very approachable and has a unique, funny method of teaching. He made the course material enjoyable to learn.

The course material was interesting as it presented a more mathematical aspect of computer science.

Instructor(s): D. Heap

Enr: 46 Resp: 23 Retake: 42%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	13	0	0	17	39	17	13	4.7
Explains	13	0	4	18	36	9	18	4.6
Communicates	13	0	4	34	8	30	8	4.5
Teaching	13	0	0	13	30	21	21	5.0
Workload	8	4	0	43	21	17	4	4.3
Difficulty	8	4	8	26	17	30	4	4.5
Learn Exp	5	5	10	35	30	15	0	4.2

Heap was described as a very knowledgeable and organized instructor who interacted with students well. The course material was described as difficult.

**CSC 207H1F Software Design**

Instructor(s): J. Clarke; M. Craig

Enr: 21 Resp: 11 Retake: 72%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Clarke:</u>								
Presents	0	0	27	36	9	18	9	4.5
Explains	0	0	0	27	36	18	18	5.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	45	18	36	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	27	27	36	9	5.3
<u>Craig:</u>								
Presents	0	0	27	9	18	27	18	5.0
Explains	0	0	0	27	0	36	36	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	18	36	45	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	18	18	45	18	5.6
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	9	63	0	27	0	4.5
Difficulty	0	9	18	36	18	18	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	9	63	0	18	9	4.5

The instructors showed a genuine interest in the material taught and were helpful in answering questions in class and on the bulletin board. The material covered a large breadth of topics in software design which posed a problem as some were less important than others. Feedback on assignments was somewhat vague and unhelpful.

## 48 COMPUTER SCIENCE

Instructor(s): M. Craig; J. Clarke

Enr: 72                      Resp: 48                      Retake: 62%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<b>Craig:</b>								
Presents	0	4	10	22	29	27	6	4.8
Explains	0	2	10	27	33	20	6	4.8
Communicates	0	0	8	20	33	20	16	5.2
Teaching	2	0	10	25	37	18	6	4.8
<b>Clarke:</b>								
Presents	14	12	33	20	14	2	2	3.2
Explains	8	6	16	43	16	6	2	3.8
Communicates	2	2	4	23	36	17	14	5.0
Teaching	6	6	14	33	27	8	4	4.1
<b>Course:</b>								
Workload	0	0	2	60	20	10	6	4.6
Difficulty	0	4	10	56	18	6	4	4.2
Learn Exp	4	6	4	46	25	9	2	4.2

Craig was enthusiastic but a few felt she was unapproachable. While helpful and approachable, some students complained that she was sometimes unprepared for lectures. She made good use of examples.

Clarke received mixed reviews ranging from helpful and approachable to sarcastic and unfocused. Some students complained that his lectures did not fully explain key concepts.

The course taught a wide range of topics that were important for future courses, although documentation writing requirements were not clearly defined. Overall, the assignments were well-designed and relevant but setting up the proper version of Java, Python and Eclipse was important. The midterm and exam were well-received but the provided API was deemed insufficient by some students.

### CSC 207H1S Software Design

Instructor(s): J. Clarke

Enr: 51                      Resp: 28                      Retake: 70%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	14	17	21	28	17	5.2
Explains	0	0	7	17	25	32	17	5.4
Communicates	0	0	3	10	7	50	28	5.9
Teaching	0	0	7	14	14	28	35	5.7
Workload	0	0	25	55	14	3	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	0	14	70	11	3	0	4.0
Learn Exp	0	4	8	30	26	21	8	4.8

Some students found the course material dry.

### CSC 209H1F Software Tools and Systems Programming

Instructor(s): P. Gries

Enr: 42                      Resp: 22                      Retake: 85%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	13	13	18	13	40	5.5
Explains	0	0	4	18	13	13	50	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	0	22	18	59	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	4	31	13	50	6.1
Workload	0	0	0	22	45	22	9	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	18	45	13	22	5.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	15	26	36	21	5.6

Gries was very energetic and enthusiastic and was clearly knowledgeable about the material. He made an effort to ensure students understood the material and encouraged questions.

The material was very complex and not always presented in an organized manner. The pace of the course was quite fast and some complex topics were rushed.

### CSC 209H1S Software Tools and Systems Programming

Instructor(s): K. Reid

Enr: 14                      Resp: 7                      Retake: 83%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	57	28	14	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	0	14	57	28	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	14	14	71	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	14	28	57	6.4
Workload	0	0	0	57	28	14	0	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	42	57	0	0	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	50	33	16	5.7

Reid was described as a great instructor.

Instructor(s): K. Reid

Enr: 79                      Resp: 20                      Retake: 80%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	15	25	35	25	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	26	10	47	15	5.5
Communicates	0	0	5	10	5	55	25	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	15	15	50	20	5.8
Workload	0	0	0	30	35	15	20	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	5	20	40	20	15	5.2
Learn Exp	0	0	5	35	11	35	11	5.1

Reid was described as a very helpful and easily approachable instructor. She always made herself available to help out students during and outside of her many office hours. Students felt she had a genuine interest for helping and teaching her students.

The course material was quite complex and many students believed it would have benefitted from labs rather than tutorials.

### CSC 236H1F Introduction to the Theory of Computation

Instructor(s): F. Pitt

Enr: 35                      Resp: 28                      Retake: 35%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	3	3	21	35	35	6.0
Explains	3	0	3	10	25	25	32	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	3	14	28	53	6.3
Teaching	0	0	3	10	17	32	38	5.9
Workload	0	0	0	21	38	25	17	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	14	10	50	28	5.9
Learn Exp	4	0	8	43	26	8	8	4.5

Most students thought Pitt was a good instructor who communicated with clarity and enthusiasm. The course work was judged by many to be difficult.

Instructor(s): F. Pitt

Enr: 47                      Resp: 23                      Retake: 52%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	13	17	69	6.6
Explains	0	0	0	0	21	26	52	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	4	30	65	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	21	30	47	6.3
Workload	0	0	0	43	30	26	0	4.8
Difficulty	0	4	4	17	47	13	13	5.0
Learn Exp	0	0	5	15	42	26	10	5.2

An outstanding instructor who did a great job delivering the material and helping students throughout the semester. The course material was difficult and assignments and the midterm were challenging.

### CSC 236H1S Introduction to the Theory of Computation

Instructor(s): F. Pitt

Enr: 40                      Resp: 25                      Retake: 60%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	4	24	72	6.7

Explains	0	0	0	0	8	20	72	6.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	8	16	76	6.7
Teaching	0	0	0	0	4	24	72	6.7
Workload	0	0	0	24	32	36	8	5.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	24	36	24	16	5.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	25	12	31	31	5.7

Students felt the high number of exercise assignments and tests were an asset to the course and resulted in better overall success.

**CSC 258H1F Computer Organization**

Instructor(s): E. Hohner

Enr: 41                      Resp: 28                      Retake: 88%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	3	0	10	21	32	32	5.8
Explains	0	0	7	7	7	46	32	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	0	14	25	59	6.4
Teaching	0	0	3	7	14	35	39	6.0
Workload	0	3	7	64	21	3	0	4.1
Difficulty	3	0	3	71	14	7	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	4	0	8	29	41	16	5.5

Students appreciated Hohner's enthusiasm and enjoyed the course. However, many felt that the textbook wasn't very useful and would have liked better course notes.

**CSC 258H1S Computer Organization**

Instructor(s): E. Hohner

Enr: 91                      Resp: 39                      Retake: 89%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	2	5	46	17	28	5.6
Explains	0	2	0	5	41	28	23	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	5	25	33	35	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	2	35	30	30	5.9
Workload	0	2	10	52	26	5	2	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	13	44	28	7	5	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	3	9	48	25	12	5.4

Hohner was a very helpful and knowledgeable instructor who presented material in a clear manner. Adding more online material/course notes would have been helpful.

The course material was very interesting however, the labs/tutorials often seemed distant from lectures.

**CSC 263H1F Data Structures and Analysis**

Instructor(s): R. Krueger

Enr: 32                      Resp: 15                      Retake: 85%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	13	6	13	66	6.3
Explains	0	0	0	6	13	20	60	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	6	0	33	60	6.5
Teaching	0	0	6	0	20	20	53	6.1
Workload	0	0	0	26	33	13	26	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	26	6	53	13	5.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	13	53	6	26	5.5

Students enjoyed the way the instructor presented the material, but overwhelmingly felt that they were not given enough time to complete the assignments.

**CSC 263H1F Data Structures and Analysis**

Instructor(s): J. Campbell

Enr: 28                      Resp: 20                      Retake: 44%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	5	5	10	40	40	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	15	25	35	25	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	5	20	45	30	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	0	30	25	45	6.2

Workload	0	0	0	57	31	0	10	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	21	68	0	10	5.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	50	25	18	6	4.8

Students felt Campbell was an interesting instructor who made a dry and difficult course enjoyable.

Instructor(s): J. Campbell

Enr: 62                      Resp: 33                      Retake: 38%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	9	15	36	39	6.1
Explains	0	0	3	12	27	42	15	5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	6	33	39	21	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	3	21	57	18	5.9
Workload	0	0	0	24	39	33	3	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	18	45	27	9	5.3
Learn Exp	0	0	3	41	27	27	0	4.8

Campbell was a very approachable and helpful instructor who clearly presented the course material. She was available for office hours and happily answered students' questions.

Students found the course material interesting however, they would have liked more in-depth coverage of some topics. Tutorials were rushed and didn't always cover what was planned. Students felt that their experience would have greatly benefitted by having mark breakdowns on the assignments.

**CSC 290H1F Communication Skills for Computer Scientists**

Instructor(s): L. Blume

Enr: 24                      Resp: 17                      Retake: 92%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	0	41	58	6.6
Explains	0	0	0	0	0	52	47	6.5
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	29	70	6.7
Teaching	0	0	0	0	5	47	47	6.4
Workload	5	0	11	35	17	0	29	4.8
Difficulty	11	17	11	52	0	0	5	3.4
Learn Exp	0	7	15	7	7	53	7	5.1

Students found Blume enthusiastic and well-organized. The workload was felt to be above average.

**CSC 300H1S Computers and Society**

Instructor(s): D. Heap

Enr: 43                      Resp: 19                      Retake: 88%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	5	33	27	33	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	5	16	33	44	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	5	11	27	55	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	0	22	38	38	6.2
Workload	0	0	23	58	11	5	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	0	23	70	5	0	0	3.8
Learn Exp	0	0	7	21	14	35	21	5.4

Heap was described as an incredibly interesting and engaging instructor. Many took the course because of Heap's good reputation and were not disappointed.

Students enjoyed the course material as it took a more social view of technology and was a fresh change from most CS courses. Students felt there were too many assignments, however, the unique nature of them was an enjoyable way to apply the knowledge gained from the material.

**CSC 301H1F Introduction to Software Engineering**

Instructor(s): G. Wilson

Enr: 111                      Resp: 55                      Retake: 61%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	1	3	18	20	40	16	5.4
Explains	0	1	5	5	14	49	23	5.7

## 50 COMPUTER SCIENCE

Communicates	0	0	0	0	3	43	52	6.5
Teaching	0	0	5	16	23	38	16	5.4
Workload	0	0	1	10	25	32	29	5.8
Difficulty	0	0	1	34	23	30	9	5.1
Learn Exp	2	2	12	20	29	22	10	4.8

Wilson was very enthusiastic, interested and knowledgeable in the topics covered. Unfortunately, the material seemed scarce and unclear.

The course seemed unorganized and the material was not well reflected in the assignments. The assignments were more programming/algorithm focused and the elements of design seemed to be ignored while marking. There were many interesting and useful topics covered but overall, the course would have greatly benefitted from clear assignments and a better defined curriculum.

### CSC 301H1S Introduction to Software Engineering

Instructor(s): G. Wilson

Enr: 25	Resp: 16							Retake: 76%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	6	43	37	12	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	6	37	31	25	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	12	56	31	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	6	37	31	25	5.8
Workload	0	0	0	56	25	18	0	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	68	18	12	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	6	0	20	40	20	13	5.1

Students felt that the course material was interesting but the midterm should have reflected the material more. Overall, an enjoyable course.

### CSC 302H1S Engineering Large Software Systems

Instructor(s): S. Easterbrook

Enr: 81	Resp: 21							Retake: 68%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	15	50	35	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	0	19	52	28	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	15	55	30	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	0	30	40	30	6.0
Workload	0	0	5	25	55	15	0	4.8
Difficulty	0	5	0	60	35	0	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	6	46	33	6	6	4.6

### CSC 309H1F Programming on the Web

Instructor(s): W. Liu

Enr: 30	Resp: 17							Retake: 86%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	5	47	35	11	5.5
Explains	5	0	0	5	35	52	0	5.2
Communicates	0	0	0	0	17	47	35	6.2
Teaching	0	5	0	0	29	47	17	5.6
Workload	0	0	6	12	12	31	37	5.3
Difficulty	0	5	5	29	35	17	5	4.7
Learn Exp	15	0	0	15	30	23	15	4.8

Liu was perceived to be very knowledgeable and enthusiastic, and responded promptly to emails. The universal opinion was that the assignments were very lengthy.

### CSC 309H1S Programming on the Web

Instructor(s): E. De Lara

Enr: 68	Resp: 30							Retake: 65%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	20	26	23	16	13	4.8
Explains	0	0	6	36	23	20	13	5.0
Communicates	3	0	26	23	23	16	6	4.4
Teaching	3	3	30	20	26	10	6	4.2
Workload	0	0	0	27	24	24	24	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	3	72	17	6	0	4.3

Learn Exp	0	0	13	30	17	39	0	4.8
-----------	---	---	----	----	----	----	---	-----

This course was slammed by students for everything from being disorganized to archaic and rehashed assignments. Assignments were described as confusing and cumulative and the website was frequently broken. Both the instructor and TA did not answer students' emails or questions, and tutorials were in fact, not held.

### CSC 318H1S The Design of Interactive Computational Media

Instructor(s): I. Posner

Enr: 36	Resp: 27							Retake: 56%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	3	3	11	46	19	15	5.2
Explains	3	3	0	11	30	26	23	5.3
Communicates	0	0	0	11	26	30	30	5.8
Teaching	0	3	7	19	34	26	7	5.0
Workload	0	0	0	32	36	16	16	5.2
Difficulty	8	8	28	44	8	4	0	3.5
Learn Exp	0	5	0	20	25	30	20	5.3

Students felt the assignment handouts were unclear, and the assignments were very long. The material had some very interesting topics but the "Green" theme was not favourable.

### CSC 320H1S Introduction to Visual Computing

Instructor(s): K. Kutulakos

Enr: 30	Resp: 8							Retake: 100%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	0	25	75	6.8
Explains	0	0	0	0	0	25	75	6.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	12	12	75	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	37	62	6.6
Workload	0	0	0	37	50	12	0	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	37	37	25	0	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	28	42	28	6.0

Kutulakos taught the class very well, responded to emails quickly and had great slides.

### CSC 321H1S Introduction to Neural Networks and Machine Learning

Instructor(s): G. Hinton

Enr: 41	Resp: 22							Retake: 90%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	9	9	31	50	6.2
Explains	0	0	9	9	13	31	36	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	22	77	6.8
Teaching	0	0	0	9	13	31	45	6.1
Workload	0	9	18	54	4	9	4	4.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	36	31	18	13	5.1
Learn Exp	0	0	10	15	15	26	31	5.5

Hinton was regarded as an interesting and very knowledgeable instructor who answered students' questions well and communicated great enthusiasm. Lectures were informative and entertaining but students should sit up front if they want to hear everything.

Assignments were fairly simple and did not cover the full range of material for tests. The lectures were also very uniform, spending the same time on a subject regardless of its difficulty. Discussion groups held outside of lectures were very interesting and enhanced the learning experience.

### CSC 324H1S Principles of Programming Languages

Instructor(s): A. Tafliovich

Enr: 73	Resp: 21							Retake: 75%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	4	9	28	33	23	5.6
Explains	0	0	4	14	28	38	14	5.4



Communicates	0	4	0	0	23	38	33	5.9
Teaching	0	0	4	4	19	52	19	5.8
Workload	0	0	0	14	42	23	19	5.5
Difficulty	0	0	4	33	19	28	14	5.1
Learn Exp	0	0	13	26	33	26	0	4.7

**CSC 330H1F Logical Specifications**

Instructor(s): M. Chechik

Enr: 32	Resp: 19							Retake: 77%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	5	10	5	36	42	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	15	21	26	36	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	21	5	21	52	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	10	10	42	36	6.1
Workload	0	10	5	52	21	5	5	4.2
Difficulty	0	10	5	52	21	0	10	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	29	35	29	5	5.1

Chechik was an enthusiastic instructor who was well-organized and related well to students' needs and concerns.

**CSC 336H1F Numerical Methods**

Instructor(s): K. Jackson

Enr: 67	Resp: 34							Retake: 65%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	2	0	23	32	41	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	0	11	32	55	6.4
Communicates	0	0	0	2	17	47	32	6.1
Teaching	0	0	2	2	11	44	38	6.1
Workload	0	0	0	79	11	8	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	11	64	17	5	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	3	0	44	25	11	14	4.9

Students were impressed by the organization of the lectures and felt the instructor made the best of what they thought to be a dry topic. Many students found the midterm to be difficult.

**CSC 343H1F Introduction to Databases**

Instructor(s): J. Mylopoulos

Enr: 45	Resp: 22							Retake: 66%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	9	13	63	13	0	4.8
Explains	0	0	9	19	52	19	0	4.8
Communicates	4	0	9	40	27	13	4	4.5
Teaching	0	0	0	31	40	27	0	5.0
Workload	4	4	0	72	4	13	0	4.1
Difficulty	4	4	13	54	18	4	0	3.9
Learn Exp	0	0	10	30	30	20	10	4.9

Students found the lectures to be very dense and questioned the marking scheme of the midterm.

Instructor(s): F. Baron

Enr: 31	Resp: 20							Retake: 78%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	10	25	35	20	10	4.9
Explains	5	5	15	25	15	20	15	4.6
Communicates	0	0	10	5	45	25	15	5.3
Teaching	0	5	10	10	30	40	5	5.1
Workload	0	0	5	35	40	20	0	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	15	50	30	5	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	6	6	18	37	25	6	4.9

Students recognized the instructor's enthusiasm, but would have appreciated more examples and less reading from lecture slides.

**CSC 350H1F Numerical Algebra and Optimization**

Instructor(s): T. Fairgrieve

Enr: 20	Resp: 15							Retake: 85%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	13	33	53	6.4
Explains	0	0	0	0	13	33	53	6.4
Communicates	0	0	0	6	6	43	40	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	6	13	40	40	6.1
Workload	0	0	0	71	14	7	7	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	53	40	6	0	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	50	7	28	14	5.1

Students found the instructor to be fair and knowledgeable, and his lectures easy to follow. His availability during the exam week was also appreciated.

The consensus was that the assignments were very long.

**CSC 363H1F Computational Complexity and Computability**

Instructor(s): F. Pitt

Enr: 34	Resp: 24							Retake: 42%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	8	29	62	6.5
Explains	0	0	0	0	16	33	50	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	25	75	6.8
Teaching	0	0	0	4	0	33	62	6.5
Workload	0	0	0	26	39	21	13	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	4	12	29	37	16	5.5
Learn Exp	0	0	10	20	35	25	10	5.1

Pitt was extremely enthusiastic about the material. Many students believed that Pitt was the best in the department.

Students thought the course was very challenging, with too many exercises and marking somewhat too harsh.

**CSC 363H1S Computational Complexity and Computability**

Instructor(s): F. Pitt

Enr: 43	Resp: 24							Retake: 40%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	4	8	37	50	6.3
Explains	0	0	4	0	8	29	58	6.4
Communicates	0	0	4	0	4	16	75	6.6
Teaching	0	0	4	0	8	25	62	6.4
Workload	0	0	0	4	34	39	21	5.8
Difficulty	0	0	4	13	39	13	30	5.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	23	23	53	0	5.3

Students found the course material difficult but interesting and well presented.

**CSC 365H1S Enriched Computational Complexity and Computability**

Instructor(s): S. Cook

Enr: 15	Resp: 9							Retake: 100%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	33	11	55	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	0	11	44	44	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	33	66	6.7
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	11	88	6.9
Workload	0	11	0	55	33	0	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	11	22	44	22	0	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	0	37	62	6.6

Cook invented a large part of the theory taught in this course. Students consistently recommended taking this course with an excellent instructor.

## 52 COMPUTER SCIENCE

### CSC 369H1F Operating Systems

Instructor(s): K. Reid

	Enr: 53							Mean
	Resp: 29							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	3	6	34	34	20	5.6
Explains	0	0	6	10	41	34	6	5.2
Communicates	0	0	0	0	25	35	39	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	7	35	28	28	5.8
Workload	0	0	0	3	13	34	48	6.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	10	17	34	37	6.0
Learn Exp	0	0	4	36	13	31	13	5.1

By far the majority of the class felt that Reid exceeded their expectations. It was noted that her level of excitement was second to none. Her ability to communicate difficult material in an open and even fun manner allowed students to truly enjoy lectures.

Generally, the course material was considered to be above normal difficulty. Group assignments were long and time consuming. Many felt that the lecture material and assignments should have related more directly.

### CSC 369H1S Operating Systems

Instructor(s): A. Demke-Brown

	Enr: 43							Mean
	Resp: 21							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	4	0	0	0	23	33	38	5.9
Explains	4	0	0	9	14	38	33	5.8
Communicates	4	0	0	14	14	33	33	5.7
Teaching	4	0	0	9	9	42	33	5.8
Workload	0	0	0	4	9	14	71	6.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	14	9	19	57	6.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	13	6	46	33	6.0

Demke-Brown was praised by the students. Her teaching style, availability and friendly/approachable manner was highly respected. This course was extremely difficult and she made the course material manageable.

The assignments were very long and time consuming. Many students were overwhelmed by the assignments, but generally, all the material was extremely important for serious computer science students.

### CSC 373H1F Algorithm Design & Analysis

Instructor(s): D. Corneil

	Enr: 44							Mean
	Resp: 24							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	4	4	8	12	37	33	5.8
Explains	0	4	0	8	37	25	25	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	16	29	54	6.4
Teaching	0	0	4	8	20	41	25	5.8
Workload	0	0	4	20	29	20	25	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	8	25	25	41	6.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	16	44	16	22	5.4

### CSC 373H1S Algorithm Design & Analysis

Instructor(s): A. Borodin

	Enr: 33							Mean
	Resp: 12							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	8	0	0	58	16	0	16	4.4
Explains	0	8	0	41	25	16	8	4.7
Communicates	0	0	8	8	8	50	25	5.8
Teaching	8	0	8	8	41	16	16	4.9
Workload	0	0	8	58	16	16	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	50	25	8	16	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	22	11	22	22	22	5.1

### CSC 375H1F Enriched Algorithm Design & Analysis

Instructor(s): A. Borodin

	Enr: 6							Mean
	Resp: 5							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	20	0	0	40	40	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	20	0	20	60	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	0	20	40	40	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	20	0	20	60	6.2
Workload	0	0	0	0	80	0	20	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	40	40	0	20	5.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	25	50	25	6.0

### CSC 384H1F Introduction to Artificial Intelligence

Instructor(s): F. Bacchus

	Enr: 42							Mean
	Resp: 38							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	8	2	8	20	28	22	8	4.6
Explains	8	5	10	24	24	21	5	4.4
Communicates	8	2	5	30	22	22	8	4.6
Teaching	8	5	5	16	36	22	5	4.6
Workload	2	0	0	39	34	13	10	4.8
Difficulty	2	0	8	33	33	16	5	4.7
Learn Exp	13	0	10	31	31	13	0	4.1

Bacchus was judged by many to be unenthusiastic and unhelpful. He read the lectures slides which contained many typos and mistakes. The assignments did not reflect what was taught in lectures, and they required many clarifications. The students felt that there was a lot of material taught in a very short amount of time.

### CSC 384H1S Introduction to Artificial Intelligence

Instructor(s): F. Bacchus

	Enr: 26							Mean
	Resp: 9							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	0	88	11	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	0	11	88	0	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	11	33	44	11	5.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	33	55	11	5.8
Workload	0	0	22	44	33	0	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	11	77	11	0	0	4.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	28	57	0	14	5.0

Bacchus was praised by students but the lecture slides were inadequate and contained some mistakes. The course material goes from useful and interesting in the first half to dreadfully boring in the second half (with the exception of planning).

### CSC 410H1S Software Testing and Verification

Instructor(s): M. Chechik

	Enr: 42							Mean
	Resp: 27							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	7	3	7	29	40	11	5.3
Explains	3	0	11	11	37	29	7	5.0
Communicates	0	0	3	18	14	29	33	5.7
Teaching	3	0	7	11	25	37	14	5.3
Workload	0	0	0	29	25	22	22	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	48	25	18	7	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	20	37	29	12	0	4.3

Students felt the midterm was too long but found the course material generally interesting.

### CSC 411H1F Machine Learning and Data Mining

Instructor(s): A. Hertzmann

	Enr: 26							Mean
	Resp: 21							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	30	50	20	5.9

Explains	0	0	0	20	20	35	25	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	0	20	55	25	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	0	35	40	25	5.9
Workload	0	0	5	25	45	15	10	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	25	25	30	20	5.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	11	22	44	22	5.8

Hertzmann was very popular among students for his enthusiastic lecturing, excellent demos and comprehensive lecture notes. The course is known for having dense and difficult material but the instructor presented it in a clear, organized fashion and was accessible for help and questions.

The course was demanding in terms of mathematics, statistics/probability and even numerical methods. Students needed strong stats skills for the assignments but found the course work challenging and interesting. Assignments tended to reuse code from earlier work so portability and completeness was important.

**CSC 418H1F Computer Graphics**

Instructor(s): K. Singh

Enr: 50                      Resp: 24                      Retake: 85%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	8	12	25	45	8	5.3
Explains	0	4	0	12	12	50	20	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	8	16	41	33	6.0
Teaching	0	4	0	4	20	50	20	5.8
Workload	0	0	0	54	31	13	0	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	4	42	28	19	4	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	16	22	44	16	5.6

Students enjoyed the lectures and responded to the instructor's enthusiasm. They found the workload and difficulty to be a little above average.

**CSC 418H1S Computer Graphics**

Instructor(s): A. Ecker

Enr: 44                      Resp: 15                      Retake: 33%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	20	0	20	40	20	0	0	3.4
Explains	7	7	14	57	14	0	0	3.6
Communicates	0	14	35	28	14	7	0	3.6
Teaching	21	7	21	35	14	0	0	3.1
Workload	0	0	0	28	7	42	21	5.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	28	21	35	14	5.4
Learn Exp	0	22	0	33	11	33	0	4.3

Most students were disappointed in the course and the instructor who was described as unorganized, unenthusiastic and generally unprepared to teach this course.

**CSC 420H1S Introduction to Image Understanding**

Instructor(s): S. Dickinson

Enr: 16                      Resp: 12                      Retake: 100%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	0	41	58	6.6
Explains	0	0	0	0	0	66	33	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	16	83	6.8
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	33	66	6.7
Workload	0	0	0	41	25	8	25	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	41	33	16	8	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	10	60	30	6.2

Dickinson was described as an extremely helpful and knowledgeable instructor. Many students were taken by the instructor's enthusiasm and passion for the course. Overall, he was considered an outstanding instructor.

The course material, while difficult, was very interesting. Assignments, again while quite long, were engaging, challenging and relevant to the course.

**CSC 448H1S Formal Languages and Automata**

Instructor(s): C. Rackoff

Enr: 9                      Resp: 6                      Retake: 100%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	0	66	33	6.3
Explains	0	0	0	0	0	50	50	6.5
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	16	83	6.8
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	66	33	6.3
Workload	0	0	0	66	16	16	0	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	50	16	33	0	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	50	0	50	0	5.0

**CSC 458H1F Computer Networks**

Instructor(s): P. Marbach

Enr: 25                      Resp: 18                      Retake: 41%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	11	38	33	16	5.6
Explains	0	0	11	11	27	38	11	5.3
Communicates	0	0	0	5	38	22	33	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	27	27	33	11	5.3
Workload	0	0	0	38	11	27	22	5.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	27	27	16	27	5.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	64	14	0	21	4.8

**CSC 458H1S Computer Networks**

Instructor(s): Y. Ganjali

Enr: 17                      Resp: 10                      Retake: 90%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	10	60	30	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	0	20	50	30	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	10	50	40	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	0	20	50	30	6.1
Workload	0	0	0	30	40	30	0	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	50	30	20	0	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	22	33	33	11	5.3

**CSC 465H1F Formal Methods in Software Design**

Instructor(s): E. Hehner

Enr: 11                      Resp: 7                      Retake: 57%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	14	14	57	14	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	42	42	0	14	4.9
Communicates	0	0	0	0	14	14	71	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	14	0	71	14	5.9
Workload	0	0	14	42	14	14	14	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	0	28	28	28	14	5.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	33	16	33	16	5.3

The class found Hehner to be very friendly and extremely helpful. Given the small class size he was available for every student who needed help.

Students found the class and material very useful and practical. However, the majority felt that the assignments were generally difficult and a tad too long.

**CSC 469H1F Operating Systems Design and Implementation**

Instructor(s): A. Demke-Brown

Enr: 15                      Resp: 8                      Retake: 100%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	0	62	37	6.4
Explains	0	0	0	0	12	62	25	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	25	75	6.8
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	50	50	6.5
Workload	0	0	0	37	25	37	0	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	25	50	25	0	5.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	33	33	33	6.0



## 54 COMPUTER SCIENCE

Very useful and interesting course material.

### CSC 485H1F Computational Linguistics

Instructor(s): G. Hirst

	Enr: 13							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	20	30	50	6.3
Explains	0	0	0	10	20	40	30	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	0	10	40	50	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	0	20	40	40	6.2
Workload	0	0	0	60	10	30	0	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	10	50	30	0	10	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	20	20	40	20	5.6

The class found Hirst to be very approachable both inside and outside of class. His use of printed material was found to be helpful. All-in-all, a great instructor.

### CSC 486H1F Knowledge Representation and Reasoning

Instructor(s): H. Levesque

	Enr: 7							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	20	40	40	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	0	40	40	20	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	40	20	40	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	0	40	40	20	5.8
Workload	0	0	0	60	40	0	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	60	40	0	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	50	50	0	5.5

### CSC 490H1F Capstone Design Project

Instructor(s): S. Engles

	Enr: 20							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	10	5	21	42	21	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	10	10	57	21	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	0	5	5	89	6.8
Teaching	0	0	0	5	10	42	42	6.2
Workload	0	0	0	10	52	26	10	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	10	47	31	0	10	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	11	22	27	38	5.9

Most students agreed that Engles was very energetic and helpful when it came to the course material. They also said he was always available for extra help.

### CSC 490H1S Capstone Design Project

Instructor(s): G. Wilson

	Enr: 26							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	27	40	31	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	4	18	54	22	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	0	9	40	50	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	0	9	59	31	6.2
Workload	0	4	0	36	22	36	0	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	52	19	28	0	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	7	0	64	28	6.1

### CSC 491H1F Capstone Design Project

Instructor(s): K. Singh

	Enr: 7							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	60	40	0	5.4
Explains	0	0	0	20	40	20	20	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	0	20	40	40	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	0	40	60	0	5.6
Workload	0	0	0	0	0	20	80	6.8

Difficulty	0	0	0	0	20	60	20	6.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	0	75	25	6.2

## DIASPORA & TRANSNATIONAL STUDIES

### DTS 200Y1Y Introduction to Diaspora and Transnational Studies I

Instructor(s): A. Shternshis; R. Berns-McGowan

	Enr: 46							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<u>Shternshis:</u>								
Presents	0	0	10	20	26	16	26	5.3
Explains	0	0	3	23	26	16	30	5.5
Communicates	0	0	6	13	20	24	34	5.7
Teaching	0	0	0	10	27	31	31	5.8
<u>Berns-McGowan:</u>								
Presents	0	3	7	14	35	14	25	5.2
Explains	0	3	0	17	14	32	32	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	0	14	25	60	6.5
Teaching	0	0	7	7	14	25	44	5.9
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	10	66	20	3	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	3	20	50	23	3	0	4.0
Learn Exp	4	4	8	17	30	13	21	4.9

Both instructors were good, approachable instructors who communicated well. Students were mixed on their opinions of the course - ranging from "amazing course" to "disappointing".

### DTS 401H1F Advanced Topics in Diaspora and Transnationalism (Critical Approaches to Diaspora Studies)

Instructor(s): A. Quayson

	Enr: 16							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	8	8	41	41	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	8	16	50	25	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	50	50	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	8	8	41	41	6.2
Workload	0	0	0	10	30	30	30	5.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	30	30	10	30	5.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	28	42	28	6.0

Overall, a very good and interesting seminar.

### DTS 402H1S Advanced Topics in Diaspora and Transnationalism (Critical Approaches to Diaspora Studies)

Instructor(s): K. MacDonald

	Enr: 11							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	14	14	14	28	28	0	4.4
Explains	0	14	0	14	42	14	14	4.9
Communicates	0	0	0	0	42	14	42	6.0
Teaching	0	0	14	28	28	0	28	5.0
Workload	0	0	0	28	28	28	14	5.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	0	71	14	14	5.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	0	75	25	6.2

A challenging but instructive course.