ASSU ANTI-CALENDAR 67



Introduction

The Economics Students Association (ESA) is a student run union devoted to all economic students at UofT. Its mandate is to service the needs of all students enrolled in economic courses. If you would like to get involved with ECO, please drop by their office - SS 1091 or check out their website - http://economics.sa.utoronto.ca

Editor

ECO 100Y1Y Introduction to Economics

Instructor(s): W. Wolfson

| Enr: 350 | | Re | sp: 18 | 2 | | Reta | ake: 62% | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|----|------|----------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 1 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 23 | 28 | 31 | 5.6 |
| Explains | 1 | 1 | 3 | 15 | 24 | 30 | 22 | 5.4 |
| Communicates | 2 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 22 | 27 | 33 | 5.7 |
| Teaching | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 22 | 34 | 30 | 5.7 |
| Workload | 2 | 5 | 13 | 46 | 13 | 12 | 5 | 4.2 |
| Difficulty | 2 | 1 | 5 | 34 | 20 | 21 | 14 | 4.9 |
| Learn Exp | 2 | 3 | 7 | 31 | 18 | 21 | 13 | 4.8 |

Most students enjoyed the course and felt that Wolfson was very knowledgeable, funny, enthusiastic and entertaining. A number of students felt the tests were too difficult relative to the other sections. Others felt that the textbook was useless. Overall, students expressed a positive learning experience.

Instructor(s): J. Carr

| Enr: 412 | | Re | sp: 13 | 7 | | Reta | ake: 66% | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|----|------|----------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 8 | 7 | 21 | 27 | 22 | 9 | 3 | 3.9 |
| Explains | 2 | 1 | 8 | 24 | 29 | 16 | 15 | 4.9 |
| Communicates | 1 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 27 | 26 | 28 | 5.6 |
| Teaching | 0 | 2 | 7 | 17 | 32 | 30 | 9 | 5.1 |
| Workload | 4 | 5 | 25 | 56 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 3.6 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 3 | 6 | 53 | 17 | 14 | 4 | 4.4 |
| Learn Exp | 3 | 4 | 8 | 44 | 20 | 13 | 56 | 4.4 |

Many students felt that Carr was very enthusiastic and knowledgeable. Some thought he moved through the material too quickly. Many students commented that the lecture notes were somewhat disorganized. Some thought tests were hard but appreciated the short answer format. Overall, students liked the real-world examples used by Carr.

Instructor(s): J. Pesando

| Enr: 312 | | Resp: 185 Retake | | | | ke: 83% | | |
|----------|---|------------------|---|---|---|---------|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 30 | 60 | 6.5 |

| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 30 | 59 | 6.5 |
|--------------|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|-----|
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 26 | 58 | 6.4 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 27 | 61 | 6.5 |
| Workload | 0 | 1 | 7 | 49 | 20 | 14 | 6 | 4.6 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 1 | 2 | 17 | 37 | 29 | 11 | 5.2 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 20 | 28 | 31 | 5.7 |

Pesando was an excellent, outstanding instructor. His examples were clear and helpful. His tests were difficult. Most students also felt that more time for the tests should have been given and more tutorials held. Pesando was not available outside the classroom so personal help was very limited.

Instructor(s): G. Indart

| Enr: 282 | | Re | sp: 96 | 6 | | | Reta | ke: 82% |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|----|----|------|---------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 23 | 30 | 35 | 5.9 |
| Explains | 0 | 3 | 3 | 18 | 26 | 34 | 14 | 5.3 |
| Communicates | 0 | 2 | 3 | 15 | 23 | 34 | 21 | 5.5 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 27 | 35 | 26 | 5.7 |
| Workload | 2 | 2 | 3 | 55 | 25 | 8 | 2 | 4.4 |
| Difficulty | 1 | 1 | 1 | 34 | 35 | 21 | 5 | 4.9 |
| Learn Exp | 1 | 2 | 6 | 20 | 35 | 24 | 9 | 5.0 |

Indart was a thoughtful, considerate instructor who cared about students' concerns. Students liked his email feedback - he was approachable and tried to make class enjoyable. His lecture notes were helpful and well-organized. However, his examples were not clear at times and students would have liked more applications discussed in class. Students wanted the instructor to upload tutorial solutions on the course website.

ECO 105Y1Y Principles of Economics for Non-Specialists

Instructor(s): M. Hare

| Enr: 415 | Re | sp: 12 | .7 | | | Retake: 67% | | | |
|--------------|----|--------|----|----|----|-------------|----|------|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean | |
| Presents | 4 | 4 | 9 | 17 | 26 | 26 | 10 | 4.8 | |
| Explains | 2 | 4 | 11 | 22 | 29 | 22 | 7 | 4.7 | |
| Communicates | 2 | 4 | 10 | 17 | 24 | 24 | 17 | 5.0 | |
| Teaching | 1 | 1 | 3 | 24 | 29 | 27 | 11 | 5.1 | |
| Workload | 2 | 1 | 8 | 46 | 23 | 10 | 7 | 4.5 | |
| Difficulty | 1 | 4 | 8 | 50 | 21 | 10 | 4 | 4.3 | |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 6 | 14 | 23 | 24 | 19 | 11 | 4.7 | |

Some students found Hare an effective teacher. His notes and lectures were well-organized and clear. Hare was very enthusiastic. Most students found the tests were too long for the time allotted. The marking of the tests were too subjective and did not reflect what was taught.

ECO 200Y1Y Microeconomic Theory

Instructor(s): C. Serrano

| Enr: 144 | Resp: 68 Re | | | | | | Retak | e: 78% |
|--------------|-------------|---|----|----|----|----|-------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 5 | 13 | 36 | 36 | 7 | 5.3 |
| Explains | 0 | 2 | 2 | 19 | 32 | 36 | 5 | 5.1 |
| Communicates | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 32 | 47 | 7 | 5.4 |
| Teaching | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 29 | 52 | 8 | 5.5 |
| Workload | 0 | 3 | 12 | 54 | 18 | 10 | 1 | 4.3 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 1 | 7 | 47 | 23 | 16 | 4 | 4.6 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 5 | 33 | 25 | 29 | 5 | 5.0 |

Many students found Serrano's lecture notes helpful. The non-graded problems were extremely beneficial for tests preparation. Many students enjoyed the case study readings as they brought material into the real world. Students generally enjoyed Serrano's teaching style.

Instructor(s): C. Serrano

| Enr: 150 | | Re | esp: 63 | 3 | | Reta | ke: 78% | |
|--------------|---|----|---------|----|----|------|---------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 4 | 6 | 22 | 24 | 32 | 9 | 5.0 |
| Explains | 1 | 4 | 12 | 17 | 37 | 17 | 8 | 4.7 |
| Communicates | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 41 | 30 | 11 | 5.3 |
| Teaching | 1 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 31 | 39 | 7 | 5.2 |
| Workload | 1 | 4 | 9 | 63 | 12 | 4 | 3 | 4.1 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 3 | 6 | 65 | 15 | 7 | 1 | 4.2 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 4 | 6 | 40 | 26 | 22 | 0 | 4.6 |

Many students found the lecture notes and non-graded problem sets posted online extremely helpful for understanding the material and test preparation. However, some students pointed out that the material could have been better organized and more examples should have been used.

Some students felt that the case studies were a bit irrelevant to the material covered in the course, nevertheless, everyone agreed that they were very useful for connecting theory and real life applications.

Overall, students were satisfied with Serrano and found him enthusiastic and energetic.

Instructor(s): S. Mechoulan

| Enr: 138 | | Re | esp: 30 | 6 | | Reta | ake: 81% | |
|--------------|---|----|---------|----|----|------|----------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 5 | 17 | 17 | 34 | 25 | 5.6 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 5 | 17 | 34 | 28 | 14 | 5.3 |
| Communicates | 2 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 34 | 28 | 14 | 5.3 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 45 | 25 | 14 | 5.3 |
| Workload | 2 | 8 | 13 | 58 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 3.8 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 2 | 11 | 61 | 16 | 8 | 0 | 4.2 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 20 | 16 | 12 | 4.9 |

Overall, students found the instructor efficient and well-prepared for lectures. Many mentioned that the problem sets and lecture notes online should be updated.

Instructor(s): S. Mechoulan

| Enr: 130 | | Re | esp: 34 | 1 | | Reta | ıke: 67% | |
|--------------|---|----|---------|----|----|------|----------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 5.6 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 27 | 39 | 15 | 5.5 |
| Communicates | 0 | 3 | 18 | 9 | 36 | 27 | 6 | 4.8 |
| Teaching | 0 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 40 | 28 | 12 | 5.2 |
| Workload | 0 | 12 | 9 | 50 | 15 | 9 | 3 | 4.1 |
| Difficulty | 3 | 3 | 3 | 37 | 34 | 12 | 6 | 4.6 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 4 | 29 | 41 | 16 | 8 | 5.0 |

Students agreed that the lecture slides were well-prepared and easy to study from. However, the lectures did not add much to them - as Mechoulan just read off the slides.

ECO 204Y1Y Microeconomic Theory and Applications

Instructor(s): S.A. Hussain

| Enr: 52 | | Re | sp: 39 | 9 | | Reta | ke: 91% | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|----|------|---------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 23 | 61 | 6.4 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 20 | 66 | 6.5 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 87 | 6.8 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 17 | 74 | 6.7 |
| Workload | 0 | 2 | 5 | 51 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 4.5 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 34 | 15 | 7 | 4.9 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18 | 28 | 50 | 6.2 |

Students found Hussain to be excellent, outstanding, and very caring of students. People felt the lectures were interesting, and never boring due to Hussain's good humour. A few felt the tests needed to be more like the problem sets.

Instructor(s): S.A. Hussain

| Enr: 72 | | Re | sp: 4 | 5 | | Reta | ıke: 67% | |
|--------------|---|----|-------|----|----|------|----------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 24 | 35 | 22 | 5.6 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 22 | 45 | 25 | 5.9 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 31 | 60 | 6.5 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 13 | 40 | 37 | 6.0 |
| Workload | 2 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 31 | 13 | 0 | 4.5 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 2 | 2 | 24 | 40 | 26 | 4 | 5.0 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 23 | 29 | 26 | 5.6 |

Most students found the lectures to be enjoyable, and the instructor to be humourous. Some felt the instructor was their favourite in university. A few found the tests difficult and felt the textbook did not prepare them for the tests.

Instructor(s): S.A. Hussain

| Enr: 46 | | Re | sp: 4 | 5 | | | Retal | ke: 75% |
|--------------|---|----|-------|----|----|----|-------|---------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 13 | 38 | 31 | 5.8 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 13 | 31 | 44 | 6.0 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 22 | 68 | 6.5 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 9 | 36 | 43 | 6.1 |
| Workload | 0 | 2 | 6 | 39 | 25 | 23 | 2 | 4.7 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 30 | 34 | 6 | 5.2 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 3 | 0 | 21 | 18 | 24 | 33 | 5.6 |

Most students found Hussain to be effective, approachable and enthusiastic. The lectures were interesting and well presented. The reading was found to be invaluable by most. The test was hard and it did not reflect the material covered.

Instructor(s): S.A. Hussain

| Enr: 71 | | Re | sp: 50 | C | | Retake: 6 7 36 44 28 54 28 66 18 66 22 2 20 12 30 30 | | ke: 77% |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|----|--|----|---------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 14 | 36 | 44 | 6.1 |
| Explains | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 28 | 54 | 6.2 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 28 | 66 | 6.6 |
| Teaching | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 18 | 66 | 6.4 |
| Workload | 2 | 0 | 2 | 44 | 26 | 22 | 2 | 4.7 |
| Difficulty | 2 | 0 | 4 | 18 | 42 | 20 | 12 | 5.1 |
| Learn Exp | 3 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 21 | 30 | 30 | 5.6 |

Most thought that Hussain was a great instructor who really put effort into teaching. He was enthusiastic, approachable and explained the material thoroughly. The material was very interesting and easy to understand. The only concern was that the test was a bit too hard and the answers provided were sometimes vague.

ECO 206Y1Y Microeconomic Theory

Instructor(s): L. Brandt

| Enr: 92 | | Re | sp: 36 | 6 | | | Retak | e: 78% |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|----|----|-------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 2 | 5 | 14 | 37 | 31 | 8 | 5.1 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 8 | 11 | 30 | 41 | 8 | 5.3 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 28 | 40 | 17 | 5.6 |
| Teaching | 2 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 22 | 41 | 16 | 5.4 |
| Workload | 0 | 2 | 0 | 60 | 28 | 5 | 2 | 4.4 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 2 | 5 | 41 | 38 | 5 | 5 | 4.6 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 3 | 0 | 40 | 25 | 18 | 11 | 4.9 |

Students felt Brandt was a good lecturer but did not give a break in the middle of a 2-hour lecture. The amount of time for tests was too short, but otherwise, the course was well-taught.

ASSU ANTI-CALENDAR 69

Instructor(s): L. Brandt

| Enr: 98 | | Re | esp: 4 | 9 | | Reta | ake: 73% | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|----|------|----------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 27 | 34 | 23 | 5.6 |
| Explains | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 31 | 33 | 29 | 5.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 26 | 32 | 34 | 5.9 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 18 | 37 | 29 | 5.8 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 23 | 4 | 2 | 4.4 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 6 | 51 | 31 | 8 | 2 | 4.5 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 27 | 19 | 8 | 4.9 |

Although most students felt that Brandt was clear and very good at explaining concepts and used good examples to explain the material, the tests were a bit harsh. Brandt also often went over the lecture time. Many students felt that the tutorials were helpful.

Instructor(s): B. Circi

| Enr: 77 | | Re | sp: 40 |) | | Reta | ike: 91% | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|----|------|----------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 25 | 42 | 25 | 5.8 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 40 | 32 | 6.0 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 27 | 32 | 37 | 6.1 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 45 | 27 | 6.0 |
| Workload | 0 | 2 | 2 | 62 | 20 | 7 | 5 | 4.4 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 2 | 62 | 17 | 10 | 7 | 4.6 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 42 | 15 | 15 | 5.2 |

Many students appreciated the considerable effort by the instructor in attending to student issues, and answering questions.

Instructor(s): B. Circi

| Enr: 86 | | Re | sp: 63 | 3 | | 35 28 5.9 | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|----|-----------|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 31 | 45 | 19 | 5.8 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 32 | 35 | 28 | 5.9 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 26 | 44 | 25 | 5.9 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 21 | 41 | 32 | 6.0 |
| Workload | 0 | 1 | 5 | 70 | 14 | 5 | 1 | 4.2 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 7 | 60 | 18 | 12 | 1 | 4.4 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 38 | 14 | 14 | 5.1 |

Most students thought that Circi was great - very nice, approachable and considerate. Students found the material useful and interesting.

Some students addressed the concern that more office hours should have been held.

7

Mean

5.9

56

5.6

ECO 208Y1Y Macroeconomic Theory

Instructor(s): D. Restuccia Enr: 56 Resp: 33 Retake: 78% 3 5 6 4 Presents 0 0 0 6 24 39 30 Explains 0 0 3 15 24 33 24 3 Communicates 0 0 18 21 30 27

| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 30 | 33 | 30 | 5.9 |
|------------|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|-----|
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 21 | 57 | 12 | 6 | 0 | 4.0 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 9 | 46 | 21 | 18 | 3 | 4.6 |
| Learn Exp | 4 | 0 | 4 | 20 | 25 | 29 | 16 | 5.2 |
| | | | | | | | | |

Students liked the instructor, but would have preferred that he had used the blackboard to explain concepts. The tutorials were useful.

Instructor(s): G. Gagnon

| Enr: 67 | | Re | esp: 30 | 6 | | Retak | e: 73% | |
|--------------|---|----|---------|----|----|-------|--------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 5 | 11 | 33 | 36 | 8 | 5 | 4.5 |
| Explains | 2 | 0 | 8 | 30 | 47 | 5 | 5 | 4.6 |
| Communicates | 0 | 2 | 11 | 25 | 34 | 17 | 8 | 4.8 |

| Teaching | 2 | 0 | 2 | 19 | 47 | 22 | 5 | 5.0 |
|------------|---|---|----|----|----|----|---|-----|
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 14 | 68 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 2 | 63 | 27 | 5 | 0 | 4.4 |
| Learn Exp | 3 | 3 | 6 | 53 | 16 | 10 | 6 | 4.3 |

Gagnon was a knowledgeable instructor who was good at explaining models and examples in class.

ECO 209Y1Y Macroeconomic Theory and Policy (for Commerce)

Instructor(s): G. Indart

| Enr: 65 | | Re | sp: 20 | 6 | | | Retal | ke: 72% |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|----|----|-------|---------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 15 | 57 | 19 | 5.9 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 34 | 34 | 15 | 5.5 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 15 | 46 | 19 | 5.7 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 34 | 34 | 26 | 5.8 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 3 | 42 | 38 | 7 | 7 | 4.7 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 42 | 23 | 7 | 5.1 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 4 | 31 | 13 | 27 | 22 | 5.3 |

Overall, Indart was a good instructor. Students appreciated the discussion of the economic case studies! However, some students complained about tricky tests that did not reflect the material covered in class.

Many appreciated the website - it was very helpful. Good course and instructor overall.

Instructor(s): G. Indart

| Enr: 71 | | Re | sp: 4′ | 1 | | Retake: 50% | | | |
|--------------|----|----|--------|----|----|-------------|----|------|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 26 | 41 | 24 | 5.8 | |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 4 | 17 | 34 | 26 | 17 | 5.3 | |
| Communicates | 4 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 21 | 35 | 14 | 5.1 | |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 4 | 19 | 19 | 39 | 17 | 5.4 | |
| Workload | 2 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 35 | 10 | 5 | 4.6 | |
| Difficulty | 2 | 0 | 2 | 30 | 41 | 15 | 7 | 4.8 | |
| Learn Exp | 11 | 3 | 0 | 25 | 37 | 18 | 3 | 4.4 | |

Students found Indart organized, approachable and caring about students. Many found the lecture notes very helpful and thought that they were prepared with a lot of effort and expertise. They liked the real life examples and case studies. A number of students found the test hard and material covered in the course guite difficult.

Instructor(s): J. Carr

| Enr: 69 | | Re | esp: 28 | 8 | | Retake: 6 7 22 7 21 25 35 35 22 29 3 0 3 0 | | ke: 52% |
|--------------|---|----|---------|----|----|--|----|---------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 3 | 14 | 25 | 25 | 22 | 7 | 4.7 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 3 | 25 | 25 | 21 | 25 | 5.4 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 21 | 35 | 35 | 6.0 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 37 | 22 | 29 | 5.7 |
| Workload | 7 | 7 | 14 | 67 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3.6 |
| Difficulty | 3 | 0 | 7 | 53 | 32 | 3 | 0 | 4.2 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 10 | 31 | 21 | 15 | 21 | 5.1 |

Students enjoyed the experience, and felt the instructor was very enthusiastic and knowledgeable. However, some thought that the lecture notes were too messy. The use of many examples and practical applications was appreciated by students, as was the friendly nature and style of the instructor.

Instructor(s): G. Indart

| Enr: 68 | | Re | sp: 3 | 5 | Retake: 40% | | | |
|--------------|---|----|-------|----|-------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 28 | 31 | 25 | 5.7 |
| Explains | 2 | 2 | 2 | 25 | 22 | 25 | 17 | 5.1 |
| Communicates | 0 | 5 | 2 | 17 | 25 | 34 | 14 | 5.2 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 34 | 31 | 17 | 5.4 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 2 | 40 | 31 | 22 | 2 | 4.8 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 28 | 34 | 20 | 5.6 |

| Learn Exp | 0 | 6 | 12 | 29 | 22 | 22 | 6 | 4.6 |
|-----------|---|---|----|----|----|----|---|-----|
|-----------|---|---|----|----|----|----|---|-----|

Students appreciated the effort and concern that Indart put into the course. Some students liked the news cases incorporated into the material, but a few did not want that material on tests. Some felt that the instructor was difficult to understand at times, and that the textbook was not useful.

Instructor(s): R. Ghaeli

| Enr: 74 | | Re | esp: 18 | В | Retake: 71% | | | |
|--------------|---|----|---------|----|-------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 5 | 5 | 33 | 22 | 11 | 22 | 4.9 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 11 | 27 | 16 | 22 | 22 | 5.2 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 38 | 16 | 27 | 5.0 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 22 | 38 | 16 | 5.5 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 29 | 52 | 11 | 0 | 5 | 4.0 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 16 | 44 | 22 | 11 | 5 | 4.4 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 8 | 8 | 33 | 25 | 8 | 16 | 4.7 |

Most students found Ghaeli organized, approachable and the lecture material interesting. Students felt that the test was difficult and failed to reflect the material covered.

ECO 210H1F Mathematical Methods for Economic Theory

Instructor(s): H. Macartney

| Enr: 24 | | Re | esp: 2 | 1 | Retake: 72% | | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|-------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 4 | 14 | 33 | 23 | 23 | 5.5 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 28 | 42 | 9 | 5.3 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 19 | 19 | 23 | 5.3 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 23 | 38 | 19 | 5.6 |
| Workload | 4 | 0 | 23 | 33 | 19 | 14 | 4 | 4.2 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 4 | 33 | 28 | 33 | 0 | 4.9 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 26 | 26 | 6 | 5.0 |

Most students felt that the instructor was very good at explaining concepts and answering questions. He genuinely seemed to care about his students.

ECO 220Y1Y Quantitative Methods in Economics

Instructor(s): J. Murdock

| Enr: 117 | | Re | sp: 60 | C | Retake: 38% | | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|-------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 38 | 49 | 6.3 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 10 | 42 | 35 | 6.0 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 28 | 54 | 6.4 |
| Teaching | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 47 | 35 | 6.1 |
| Workload | 1 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 31 | 24 | 17 | 5.3 |
| Difficulty | 1 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 19 | 31 | 24 | 5.5 |
| Learn Exp | 2 | 2 | 6 | 18 | 39 | 20 | 9 | 4.9 |

Many students found the instructor to be very enthusiastic, energetic, helpful and well organized. A lot of students complained that there were too many evaluations (quizzes & tests) and that they did not reflect the level of difficulty of practice problems and lectures.

Instructor(s): J. Murdock

| Enr: 101 | | Re | sp: 52 | 2 | Retake: 54% | | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|-------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 44 | 42 | 6.2 |
| Explains | 2 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 14 | 43 | 29 | 5.8 |
| Communicates | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 10 | 40 | 40 | 6.0 |
| Teaching | 2 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 10 | 10 | 39 | 6.0 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 6 | 29 | 23 | 29 | 10 | 5.1 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 29 | 29 | 23 | 5.6 |
| Learn Exp | 2 | 0 | 5 | 17 | 43 | 15 | 15 | 5.1 |

Many students appreciated the effort and hard work of the instructor.

Students appreciated the material, although some felt that too much was covered in each lecture.

| Instructor(s): | V. | Yu |
|----------------|----|----|
| | | |

| Enr: 118 | | Re | esp: 4 | 1 | Retake: 66% | | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|-------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 5.9 |
| Explains | 0 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 32 | 35 | 5.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 17 | 40 | 32 | 5.9 |
| Teaching | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 12 | 40 | 37 | 5.9 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 12 | 60 | 10 | 7 | 10 | 4.4 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 5 | 42 | 35 | 12 | 5 | 4.7 |
| Learn Exp | 3 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 36 | 23 | 6 | 4.9 |

Most students liked Yu. However, the level of difficult of the tests was beyond that demonstrated in the lectures. More tutorials and office hours, and perhaps a different TA would have been better. Yu communicated material clearly.

ECO 227Y1Y Quantitative Methods in Economics

Instructor(s): A. Melino

| Enr: 46 | | Re | esp: 10 | 6 | Retake: 20% | | | |
|--------------|---|----|---------|----|-------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 12 | 25 | 31 | 25 | 6 | 4.9 |
| Explains | 0 | 6 | 25 | 6 | 37 | 12 | 12 | 4.6 |
| Communicates | 0 | 6 | 6 | 12 | 37 | 25 | 12 | 5.1 |
| Teaching | 0 | 6 | 6 | 25 | 25 | 37 | 0 | 4.8 |
| Workload | 6 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 6 | 37 | 25 | 5.4 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 37 | 56 | 6.5 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 7 | 15 | 46 | 23 | 0 | 7 | 4.2 |

Students felt that this was a difficult course and some said that the material was too advanced.

Instructor(s): A. Melino

| Enr: 35 | | Re | esp: 1 | 1 | Retake: 22% | | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|-------------|----|---|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 9 | 18 | 36 | 36 | 0 | 5.0 |
| Explains | 0 | 9 | 9 | 27 | 36 | 18 | 0 | 4.5 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 9 | 27 | 18 | 45 | 0 | 5.0 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 27 | 36 | 0 | 5.0 |
| Workload | 9 | 0 | 18 | 45 | 18 | 9 | 0 | 3.9 |
| Difficulty | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 63 | 9 | 5.4 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 16 | 66 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 |

The course material was quite challenging with abstract concepts involved. Melino, however, was nice and patient. The tests were very difficult and students felt that more examples should have been provided.

ECO 230Y1Y International Economic Institutions and Policy

Instructor(s): G. Duranton

| Enr: 66 | | Re | esp: 4 | 5 | Retake: 20% | | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|-------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 8 | 35 | 22 | 24 | 8 | 4.9 |
| Explains | 6 | 4 | 13 | 22 | 17 | 26 | 8 | 4.6 |
| Communicates | 0 | 6 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 29 | 9 | 4.7 |
| Teaching | 6 | 2 | 11 | 22 | 27 | 20 | 9 | 4.6 |
| Workload | 0 | 2 | 4 | 40 | 37 | 24 | 11 | 4.6 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 4 | 22 | 37 | 24 | 11 | 5.2 |
| Learn Exp | 5 | 2 | 5 | 41 | 32 | 11 | 0 | 4.3 |

Although many students enjoyed Duranton as a lecturer, the majority thought the term test was too difficult and did not properly represent what was taught in class. Furthermore, many students found the tutorials, for the most part, unhelpful. Students also reported having difficult initially understanding the instructor, but his lecture slides were well-organized and well-presented which eased that issue.

Instructor(s): G. Duranton

| Enr: 46 | | Re | sp: 24 | 4 | | ake: 50% | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|----|----------|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 4 | 0 | 4 | 33 | 16 | 29 | 12 | 5.0 |
| Explains | 4 | 0 | 4 | 25 | 33 | 16 | 16 | 5.0 |
| Communicates | 4 | 0 | 8 | 25 | 33 | 12 | 16 | 4.9 |
| Teaching | 4 | 0 | 4 | 29 | 37 | 16 | 8 | 4.8 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 4 | 37 | 45 | 4 | 8 | 4.8 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 43 | 26 | 8 | 5.2 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 5 | 58 | 17 | 5 | 11 | 4.6 |

Students thought the tutorials were useless as the TA was not qualified. Duranton was not available for academic consultation. Some students found that tests did not appropriately reflect the material taught. Noneconomics majors found that the course involved too much calculation, which was also not explained well.

ECO 239Y1Y Labour Markets and Policies

Instructor(s): J. Kantarevic

| Enr: 42 | | Re | esp: 28 | 3 | | Retal | ke: 100% | |
|--------------|---|----|---------|----|----|-------|----------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 21 | 57 | 10 | 5.6 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 29 | 51 | 14 | 5.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 17 | 50 | 17 | 5.7 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 42 | 28 | 6.0 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 10 | 60 | 10 | 14 | 3 | 4.4 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 17 | 53 | 21 | 7 | 0 | 4.2 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 25 | 37 | 16 | 5.5 |

Students liked Kantarevic a lot. He was always well-prepared and made sure that everyone understood the material. A lot of students found the assignments very hard, but they turned out to be helpful for midterm preparation.

However, more case studies and relevant real-world examples would have been beneficial.

ECO 251H1S Special Topics in Economics: Chinese Economy

Instructor(s): L. Brandt

| Enr: 71 | | Re | sp: 33 | 3 | | Retake: 96% 7 Mean 9 5.3 31 6.0 31 6.2 25 6.0 | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|----|---|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 34 | 37 | 9 | 5.3 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 37 | 31 | 6.0 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 56 | 31 | 6.2 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 53 | 25 | 6.0 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 25 | 34 | 9 | 5.2 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 3 | 51 | 29 | 16 | 0 | 4.6 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 36 | 27 | 5.9 |

Most people found the course interesting and enjoyed it. The information taught was too much for 2 hours a week. Readings were heavy and difficult to understand based on entry-level economics courses. Slides or notes posted would have been helpful. Some suggested that there should have been one midterm and one paper, instead of two papers.

ECO 301Y1Y European Economic History, 1250-1750

Instructor(s): J. Munro

| Enr: 50 | | Re | sp: 16 | 3 | | Reta | ıke: 43% | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|----|------|----------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 25 | 31 | 31 | 5.8 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 5.5 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 12 | 31 | 43 | 6.1 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 18 | 50 | 25 | 5.9 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 12 | 25 | 12 | 5.0 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 43 | 25 | 6 | 5.1 |
| Learn Exp | 9 | 0 | 9 | 45 | 18 | 9 | 9 | 4.3 |

Munro was very knowledgeable with a high level of enthusiasm. The course reader was helpful and easy to read. However, there was no

textbook for the course which was unfortunate.

ECO 302H1F Comparative Economic Institutions in History

Instructor(s): A. Rotstein

| Enr: 18 | Resp: 15 Retake: 9 | | | | | ke: 91% | | |
|--------------|--------------------|---|----|----|----|---------|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 33 | 33 | 26 | 5.7 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 33 | 26 | 33 | 5.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 13 | 26 | 46 | 6.0 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 26 | 60 | 6.5 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 6 | 60 | 20 | 13 | 0 | 4.4 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 20 | 33 | 26 | 20 | 0 | 4.5 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 5.7 |

Students felt that Rotstein was one of the best instructors in the department. He was exceptionally encouraging, knowledgeable and enthusiastic. The reading was relevant to the lectures and very interesting. He not only gave organized lectures, but also encouraged participation and discussion in class.

Students enjoyed the course a lot and their university experience was greatly enhanced.

ECO 303Y1Y The Economic History of Modern Europe to 1914 Instructor(s): J. Munro

| Enr: 64 | | Re | esp: 1 | 9 | | | Retake: 68% | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|----|----|-------------|------|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 36 | 42 | 6.1 | |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 26 | 15 | 52 | 6.2 | |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 15 | 63 | 6.4 | |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 31 | 47 | 6.2 | |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 5 | 57 | 21 | 10 | 5 | 4.5 | |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 10 | 47 | 21 | 10 | 10 | 4.6 | |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 5 | 5 | 22 | 44 | 22 | 0 | 4.7 | |

Most students found the lectures well-organized and interesting. The instructor was enthusiastic and approachable.

ECO 307H1F Issues in Canadian and US Economic History to 1914

Instructor(s): J. Crean

| Enr: 17 | | Re | esp: 8 | | | Retake: 50% | | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|----|-------------|----|------|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 42 | 28 | 14 | 5.4 | |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 12 | 25 | 50 | 6.1 | |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 62 | 25 | 6.1 | |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 50 | 25 | 6.0 | |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 25 | 50 | 0 | 4.8 | |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 12 | 12 | 0 | 4.4 | |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 37 | 12 | 5.1 | |

Students found Crean very knowledgeable about the concepts. Crean was approachable, helpful and enthusiastic. A very informative course with a lot of reading to do.

ECO 310Y1Y Industrial Organization and Public Policy

Instructor(s): J. Murdock

| Enr: 49 | | Re | sp: 39 | 9 | | Reta | ıke: 62% | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|----|------|----------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 33 | 53 | 6.4 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 23 | 28 | 43 | 6.1 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 30 | 64 | 6.6 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 33 | 61 | 6.6 |
| Workload | 0 | 2 | 5 | 17 | 41 | 25 | 7 | 5.1 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 25 | 38 | 17 | 5.5 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 6 | 60 | 15 | 5.7 |

Most students described Murdock as an excellent instructor who explained the material in a clear and organized way. Students appreciated the ample amount of evaluations offered in the course.

However, some students found the course much harder than others in the department. The reason was the difficult and confusing problem sets that were irrelevant to midterms and quizzes. They made some students feel frustrated

Overall, Murdock was an awesome and enthusiastic instructor.

Instructor(s): J. Murdock

| Enr: 32 | | Re | sp: 12 | 2 | | Reta | ke: 75% | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|----|------|---------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 23 | 58 | 6.4 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 17 | 41 | 29 | 5.9 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5 | 29 | 52 | 6.2 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 41 | 41 | 6.2 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 6 | 37 | 31 | 18 | 6 | 4.8 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 6 | 25 | 25 | 43 | 0 | 5.1 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 42 | 14 | 0 | 4.7 |

Murdock was extremely well organized and passionate about the material she was teaching. Take-home tests were useful in developing critical thinking skills. Tutorials were very helpful as well.

Overall, very interesting material and an effective instructor.

ECO 313H1F Environmental Economics and Policies

Instructor(s): M. Turner

| Enr: 76 | | Re | esp: 27 | 7 | | Retak | ke: 52% | |
|--------------|---|----|---------|----|----|-------|---------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 7 | 29 | 22 | 33 | 7 | 5.0 |
| Explains | 0 | 3 | 15 | 23 | 26 | 26 | 3 | 4.7 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 7 | 22 | 33 | 22 | 14 | 5.1 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 11 | 34 | 19 | 30 | 3 | 4.8 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 3 | 37 | 40 | 14 | 3 | 4.8 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 22 | 37 | 7 | 5.2 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 5 | 5 | 47 | 11 | 23 | 5 | 4.6 |

Many students felt that the course readings were dry and too hard. A textbook would have been helpful as well as more lectures posted online. A few students noticed that the course was fun at the beginning, but then it became a bit confusing and uninteresting.

Problem sets helped to keep up with the course. Overall, Turner was very knowledgeable and tried to deliver the most within 13 weeks.

ECO 314H1F Energy and Resource Economics

Instructor(s): M. Turner

| Enr: 82 | | Re | esp: 37 | 7 | | Reta | ke: 38% | |
|--------------|---|----|---------|----|----|------|---------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 8 | 5 | 27 | 21 | 29 | 8 | 4.8 |
| Explains | 0 | 2 | 8 | 32 | 29 | 21 | 5 | 4.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 2 | 2 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 21 | 5.3 |
| Teaching | 2 | 0 | 16 | 24 | 27 | 21 | 8 | 4.7 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 8 | 61 | 19 | 8 | 2 | 4.4 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 5 | 24 | 37 | 18 | 13 | 5.1 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 3 | 14 | 50 | 17 | 14 | 0 | 4.2 |

The course involved a lot of math and the midterm was extremely difficult. Turner was described as funny and enthusiastic. Many appreciated his cynical nature and good sense of humour.

ECO 320H1F Economic Analysis of Law

Instructor(s): D. Dewees

| Enr: 91 | | Re | sp: 5 | 5 | | Reta | ke: 80% | |
|--------------|---|----|-------|----|----|------|---------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 20 | 40 | 29 | 5.8 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 16 | 43 | 27 | 5.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 27 | 32 | 23 | 5.6 |
| Teaching | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 25 | 43 | 25 | 5.9 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 5 | 56 | 29 | 1 | 7 | 4.5 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 5 | 52 | 20 | 12 | 9 | 4.7 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 29 | 36 | 6 | 5.2 |

Dewees was very knowledgeable and helpful. He explained concepts very effectively and the lectures were clear and organized. He used a lot of useful, current and interesting examples. The midterm was weighted heavily and more time was needed for the test, since there were a lot of questions, some students thought that the readings were too long, but still interesting.

Generally, it was a great course and the students enjoyed it.

ECO 320H1F Economic Analysis of Law

Instructor(s): D. Dewees

| Enr: 86 | | Re | sp: 48 | 3 | | | Retake: 82% | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|----|----|-------------|------|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 12 | 42 | 36 | 6.1 | |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 35 | 33 | 5.9 | |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 25 | 39 | 31 | 6.0 | |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 43 | 39 | 6.2 | |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 6 | 40 | 34 | 14 | 4 | 4.7 | |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 6 | 42 | 31 | 19 | 0 | 4.6 | |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 37 | 24 | 24 | 5.6 | |

Students found Dewees knowledgeable, organized an approachable. The slides were very helpful. Practice questions and tutorials would have been useful. Some students found the textbook too detailed, often irrelevant to class discussions and too expensive. People were generally happy with the course.

ECO 321Y1Y Canadian Economic History since 1500

Instructor(s): A. Rotstein

| Enr: 94 | | Re | sp: 5 | 5 | | Reta | ke: 64% | |
|--------------|---|----|-------|----|----|------|---------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 1 | 20 | 32 | 26 | 18 | 5.4 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 30 | 37 | 22 | 5.7 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 21 | 36 | 26 | 5.8 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 29 | 48 | 18 | 5.8 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 5 | 73 | 19 | 1 | 0 | 4.2 |
| Difficulty | 1 | 1 | 7 | 69 | 15 | 3 | 0 | 4.1 |
| Learn Exp | 2 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 19 | 26 | 14 | 5.1 |

Most students felt hat Rotstein was a very good teacher, very clear and knowledgeable about the subject. He seemed to genuinely care about the students and was willing to help them. A few felt that outlines of the readings for each lecture would have been helpful as well as a course website.

Instructor(s): A. Rotstein

| Enr: 93 | | Resp: 41 | | | | | Retake: 64% | | | |
|--------------|---|----------|----|----|----|----|-------------|------|--|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean | | |
| Presents | 0 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 31 | 31 | 18 | 5.4 | | |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 23 | 43 | 17 | 5.6 | | |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 5 | 17 | 17 | 41 | 17 | 5.5 | | |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 28 | 33 | 28 | 5.8 | | |
| Workload | 0 | 7 | 7 | 53 | 23 | 5 | 2 | 4.2 | | |
| Difficulty | 0 | 7 | 12 | 58 | 12 | 5 | 2 | 4.0 | | |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 10 | 14 | 32 | 32 | 10 | 5.2 | | |

Many students felt that Rotstein communicated ideas very well and made the course material interesting. A few felt that although the concepts were well-explained, at times Rotstein was repetitive and not very organized. Some students felt a course website would have been helpful.

Instructor(s): K. Furlong

| Enr: 84 | | Re | sp: 36 | 3 | | Retake: 57% 6 7 Mean 32 29 5.7 32 26 5.7 32 26 5.7 32 24 6.1 32 29 5.9 | | |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--|----------|------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents Explains Communicates Teaching Workload | 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 3 | 2 0 0 9 | 11 11 5 2 61 | 23 29 17 35 16 | 32 32 | 26 44 | 5.7 6.1 |

| Difficulty | 0 | 3 | 18 | 48 | 21 | 9 | 0 | 4.2 |
|------------|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|-----|
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 28 | 4 | 0 | 4.4 |

Students generally liked the lectures - they found them clear, concise and engaging. However, some found the notes too dense and suggested that they could have been simplified and presented in a bullet format.

Instructor(s): K. Furlong

| Enr: 86 | | Re | esp: 39 | 9 | | Retake: 57% | | | |
|--------------|---|----|---------|----|----|-------------|----|------|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean | |
| Presents | 2 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 34 | 31 | 21 | 5.5 | |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 28 | 31 | 28 | 5.8 | |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 15 | 42 | 31 | 5.9 | |
| Teaching | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 23 | 52 | 15 | 5.7 | |
| Workload | 0 | 5 | 12 | 61 | 17 | 2 | 0 | 4.0 | |
| Difficulty | 0 | 7 | 10 | 66 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 3.9 | |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 7 | 34 | 19 | 30 | 7 | 5.0 | |

Furlong was very knowledgeable and enthusiastic. While some students liked the class presentations which provided an interactive learning experience and helped them understand the concepts, others felt that the instructor could have explained the material to the class instead.

ECO 324Y1Y Development Economics

Instructor(s): G. Bobonis

| Enr: 44 | | Re | esp: 30 | C | | Retak | e: 48% | |
|--------------|---|----|---------|----|----|-------|--------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 3 | 6 | 16 | 40 | 23 | 10 | 0 | 4.0 |
| Explains | 3 | 0 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 16 | 0 | 4.3 |
| Communicates | 3 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 46 | 33 | 6 | 5.2 |
| Teaching | 3 | 0 | 10 | 40 | 23 | 20 | 3 | 4.5 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 6 | 46 | 33 | 6 | 6 | 4.6 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 3 | 33 | 23 | 33 | 6 | 5.1 |
| Learn Exp | 5 | 10 | 10 | 21 | 36 | 10 | 5 | 4.3 |

Students thought the course material was interesting and relevant. However, many felt that the required readings were too long, and that having pop quizzes was a bad idea. Some students really enjoyed the lengthy class discussions, and the amount of participation in lectures. Some also appreciated that the material required a firm understanding of the topics rather than just memorization.

ECO 325H1F Advanced Economic Theory - Macro

Instructor(s): L. Fuster

| Enr: 66 | | Re | esp: 23 | 3 | | Reta | ıke: 40% | |
|--------------|---|----|---------|----|----|------|----------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 8 | 0 | 17 | 39 | 21 | 13 | 5.0 |
| Explains | 0 | 4 | 4 | 17 | 43 | 26 | 4 | 5.0 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 4 | 17 | 8 | 52 | 17 | 5.6 |
| Teaching | 0 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 30 | 34 | 17 | 5.4 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 34 | 34 | 0 | 5.0 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 17 | 52 | 21 | 5.9 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 12 | 12 | 25 | 31 | 18 | 0 | 4.3 |

Fuster was very helpful and tried hard to explain the material efficiently. However, some students found her slides poorly organized and incomplete, which caused some trouble when studying. Students felt that more examples should have given with more explanations.

The midterm was challenging, both because of the unclear wording of the questions and the difficulty of the material.

Overall, a hard and demanding course. Studying everyday was recommended.

ECO 325H1S Advanced Economic Theory - Macro

Instructor(s): M. Alexopoulos

| Enr: 67 | Resp: 35 | | | | | | Reta | ke: 53% |
|----------|----------|---|---|---|----|----|------|---------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 28 | 34 | 22 | 5.6 |

| Explains | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 28 | 37 | 25 | 5.8 |
|--------------|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|-----|
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 25 | 25 | 42 | 6.1 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 37 | 37 | 6.1 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 40 | 22 | 8 | 5.1 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 35 | 32 | 14 | 5.4 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 4 | 22 | 45 | 27 | 0 | 5.0 |

Alexopoulos was very nice, approachable and helpful. She made the course very interesting by the use of real-world examples.

ECO 326H1F Advanced Economic Theory - Micro

Instructor(s): C. Stewart

| Enr: 63 | | Re | sp: 37 | 7 | | | Reta | Retake: 64% | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|----|----|------|-------------|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 35 | 35 | 24 | 5.8 | |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 40 | 29 | 21 | 5.6 | |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 29 | 35 | 21 | 5.6 | |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 27 | 48 | 16 | 5.7 | |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 24 | 37 | 21 | 5.6 | |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 16 | 29 | 35 | 5.8 | |
| Learn Exp | 3 | 3 | 0 | 21 | 25 | 39 | 7 | 5.1 | |

Students said that Stewart was a good instructor. His problem sets were helpful and fairly graded, and the midterm reflected the material taught. The course was hard, but Stewart explained concepts clearly and was very helpful. As one student pointed out, he was "surprisingly good for a young prof."

ECO 327Y1Y Applied Economics

Instructor(s): M. Burda

| Enr: 50 | Resp: 23 | | | | | | Reta | ke: 78% |
|--------------|----------|---|---|----|----|----|------|---------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 21 | 26 | 34 | 5.7 |
| Explains | 0 | 4 | 4 | 13 | 30 | 30 | 17 | 5.3 |
| Communicates | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 30 | 34 | 17 | 5.3 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 4 | 18 | 13 | 45 | 18 | 5.5 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 4 | 43 | 26 | 21 | 4 | 4.8 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 4 | 0 | 34 | 39 | 17 | 4 | 4.8 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 35 | 28 | 0 | 4.9 |

Most students found the lectures well organized and interesting. The instructor was approachable and enthusiastic. The lecture notes were very effective. Most students disliked the bell curving down of grades because the class average was too high.

Instructor(s): D. Benjamin

| Enr: 43 | | Re | sp: 2' | 1 | | | Retak | e: 78% |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|----|----|-------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 19 | 42 | 33 | 6.0 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 35 | 35 | 5.9 |
| Communicates | 0 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 47 | 28 | 5.8 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 28 | 52 | 6.1 |
| Workload | 0 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 23 | 28 | 33 | 5.7 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 23 | 28 | 33 | 5.7 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 25 | 16 | 33 | 5.3 |

Students thought the course was hard and the term paper time-consuming. Everyone found Benjamin very helpful and approachable.

ECO 328Y1Y International Economics

Instructor(s): P. Morrow

| Enr: 98 | | Re | esp: 3 | 9 | Retake: 94% | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents Explains Communicates Teaching | 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 | 0 5 5 2 | 28 20 25 17 | 23 35 25 30 | 43 38 43 48 | 6.2 6.1 6.3 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 10 | 63 | 15 | 10 | 0 | 4.3 |

ASSU ANTI-CALENDAR 73

| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 18 | 52 | 26 | 2 | 0 | 4.1 |
|------------|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|-----|
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 33 | 16 | 30 | 5.5 |

An enthusiastic instructor, Morrow was well-organized and gave many real life examples to help explain ideas. In general, students really enjoyed the class. A number of students reported that Morrow was the best instructor they have had. Students also said they would have liked more problem sets especially because past tests were not available.

| Instructor(s): | P. Morrow |
|----------------|-----------|
|----------------|-----------|

| Enr: 99 | | Re | sp: 68 | 3 | Retake: 84% | | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|-------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 32 | 36 | 16 | 5.5 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 34 | 34 | 21 | 5.7 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 24 | 37 | 33 | 6.0 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 25 | 47 | 22 | 5.9 |
| Workload | 1 | 0 | 7 | 78 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 4.0 |
| Difficulty | 1 | 0 | 4 | 69 | 21 | 3 | 0 | 4.2 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 27 | 21 | 11 | 5.1 |

Morrow gave very organized lectures and explained difficult concepts effectively by using interesting material. Supplementary reading and the textbooks were both very useful. He was enthusiastic and friendly. More practice questions would have been appreciated.

Instructor(s): P. Morrow

| Enr: 98 | Resp: 73 | | | | | | Retake: 88% | | |
|--------------|----------|---|----|----|----|----|-------------|------|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 22 | 43 | 28 | 5.9 | |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 32 | 43 | 28 | 5.9 | |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 21 | 35 | 38 | 6.1 | |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 18 | 47 | 28 | 6.0 | |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 10 | 64 | 17 | 8 | 0 | 4.2 | |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 4 | 69 | 19 | 5 | 1 | 4.3 | |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 3 | 22 | 43 | 20 | 9 | 5.1 | |

Students liked Morrow and appreciated his sense of humour. There were too many slides and too many errors on the slides. Students found examples given in class helpful, but students would have appreciated more practice questions.

Instructor(s): G. Gagnon

| Enr: 84 | | Re | esp: 4 | 5 | Retake: 57% | | | |
|--------------|----|----|--------|----|-------------|----|---|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 11 | 4 | 16 | 16 | 21 | 28 | 0 | 4.2 |
| Explains | 4 | 9 | 9 | 16 | 32 | 27 | 0 | 4.5 |
| Communicates | 11 | 4 | 11 | 20 | 16 | 27 | 6 | 4.4 |
| Teaching | 6 | 6 | 4 | 22 | 24 | 31 | 4 | 4.6 |
| Workload | 0 | 2 | 8 | 62 | 17 | 8 | 0 | 4.2 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 2 | 2 | 44 | 24 | 22 | 4 | 4.8 |
| Learn Exp | 8 | 2 | 20 | 29 | 29 | 2 | 5 | 4.0 |

Some students found Gagnon a very knowledgeable and effective instructor. However, many complained about his unclear handwriting and fast pace of lecturing. A course website with lecture notes posted in advance would have been very helpful. Also, more applications of the course material would have made it less dry and mathematically oriented.

ECO 336Y1Y Public Economics

Instructor(s): M. Smart

| Enr: 52 | | Resp: 34 | | | | | Retake: 53% | | | |
|--------------|---|----------|---|----|----|----|-------------|------|--|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean | | |
| Presents | 2 | 2 | 5 | 32 | 23 | 17 | 14 | 4.8 | | |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 44 | 23 | 17 | 5.4 | | |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 5 | 14 | 38 | 26 | 14 | 5.3 | | |
| Teaching | 0 | 3 | 6 | 21 | 27 | 21 | 21 | 5.2 | | |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 6 | 60 | 27 | 6 | 0 | 4.3 | | |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 30 | 18 | 9 | 4.9 | | |

| Learn Exp | 3 | 3 | 3 | 33 | 29 | 18 | 7 | 4.7 |
|-----------|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|-----|
| | | | | | | | | |

Smart was regarded to be knowledgeable, helpful and humourous, although sometimes a little less than approachable. Students appreciated the instructor's concern for students' learning, as well as class discussions.

ECO 339Y1Y Economics of Labour

Instructor(s): M. Gunderson

| Enr: 98 | | Re | esp: 5 | 9 | Retake: 80% | | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|-------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 38 | 41 | 8 | 5.5 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 33 | 36 | 21 | 5.7 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 31 | 42 | 14 | 5.6 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 31 | 43 | 19 | 5.8 |
| Workload | 0 | 1 | 12 | 69 | 7 | 7 | 1 | 4.1 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 3 | 75 | 14 | 3 | 3 | 4.3 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 2 | 51 | 22 | 13 | 11 | 4.8 |

Students enjoyed the instructor's lectures, and felt that the course was practical and useful. People commented favourably on the instructor's very good teaching style, and use of real world examples. Overall, a very positive learning experience.

ECO 340H1S Economics of Income Distribution

Instructor(s): F. Reid

| Enr: 148 | Resp: 79 | | | | | | Retake: 87% | | | |
|--------------|----------|----|----|----|----|----|-------------|------|--|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean | | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 22 | 48 | 27 | 6.0 | | |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 41 | 31 | 6.0 | | |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 23 | 48 | 24 | 5.9 | | |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 47 | 33 | 6.1 | | |
| Workload | 0 | 12 | 18 | 63 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3.6 | | |
| Difficulty | 1 | 2 | 26 | 60 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 3.8 | | |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 31 | 31 | 4 | 5.1 | | |

Students liked Reid; they found him organized, effective and enthusiastic. They appreciated the fair tests and grading policy. The topics covered in the course were interesting and close to real world examples.

Overall, an enjoyable course to take and awesome learning experience.

ECO 342Y1Y Twentieth Century Economic History

Instructor(s): J. Cohen

Instructor(s): P. Satchu

| Enr: 86 | | Re | sp: 43 | 3 | | Retake: 75% | | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|----|-------------|----|------|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 4 | 25 | 25 | 30 | 13 | 5.2 | |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 25 | 32 | 25 | 5.7 | |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 23 | 48 | 20 | 5.8 | |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 30 | 39 | 27 | 5.9 | |
| Workload | 4 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 16 | 9 | 0 | 4.2 | |
| Difficulty | 2 | 2 | 9 | 64 | 9 | 1 | 10 | 4.1 | |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 35 | 35 | 11 | 5.4 | |

Most students felt that Cohen was a very good, knowledgeable, and helpful instructor. Lectures were pleasant and he stimulated great class discussions. However, a few students complained that there was too much reading and it could be boring at times. Also, the lectures could have been more organized if slides were provided before the lectures.

ECO 352H1F Special Topics in Economics: Economics of Entrepreneurship

| Instructor(s). R. | Satur | u | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------|----|--------|---|--------------|----|----|------|
| Enr: 31 | | Re | sp: 29 |) | Retake: 100% | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 72 | 6.5 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 86 | 6.9 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 96 | 7.0 |

| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 24 | 72 | 6.7 |
|------------|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|-----|
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 10 | 31 | 13 | 37 | 6 | 5.0 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 3 | 21 | 25 | 35 | 14 | 5.4 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 95 | 7.0 |

Students found the course extremely valuable and many thought it was the best course they have taken at UofT.

Satchu was an excellent instructor who had high expectations of his students. Many said that he brought out the best in them.

ECO 358H1F Financial Economics I

Instructor(s): G. Jump

| Enr: 93 | | Re | esp: 49 | 9 | Retake: 86% | | | |
|--------------|---|----|---------|----|-------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 32 | 38 | 12 | 5.5 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 35 | 41 | 18 | 5.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 28 | 34 | 30 | 5.9 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 59 | 20 | 6.0 |
| Workload | 0 | 4 | 10 | 46 | 24 | 14 | 0 | 4.3 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 12 | 40 | 26 | 18 | 2 | 4.6 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 3 | 21 | 34 | 28 | 12 | 5.2 |

Students found Jump a very knowledgeable, approachable and very good instructor. He knew the material very well and explained the concepts effectively using clear examples. The tests were fair, but some students complained that too much weight was put on the final exam (60%). The textbook wasn't very useful. However, people generally appreciated his passion for teaching and they enjoyed the learning experience.

ECO 359H1S Financial Economics II: Corporate Finance

Instructor(s): E. Malinova

| Enr: 56 | | Re | esp: 3 | 7 | Retake: 72% | | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|-------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 8 | 21 | 27 | 35 | 8 | 5.1 |
| Explains | 0 | 2 | 10 | 16 | 18 | 35 | 16 | 5.2 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 40 | 21 | 21 | 5.5 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 29 | 35 | 18 | 5.5 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 27 | 11 | 2 | 4.6 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 2 | 37 | 27 | 21 | 10 | 5.0 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 3 | 0 | 36 | 26 | 20 | 13 | 5.0 |

Many students appreciated the time the instructor took to get to know students on an individual level. Some felt that the tests did not reflect the material taught in lectures, or on the problem sets, and that more pre-test help could have been given. Overall, a positive learning experience.

Instructor(s): E. Malinova

| Enr: 64 | Resp: 35 | | | | | | Retake: 89% | | | |
|--------------|----------|---|---|----|----|----|-------------|------|--|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean | | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 5 | 14 | 14 | 55 | 8 | 5.5 | | |
| Explains | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 31 | 31 | 22 | 5.5 | | |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 20 | 40 | 30 | 5.9 | | |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 14 | 44 | 35 | 6.1 | | |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 8 | 51 | 34 | 5 | 0 | 4.4 | | |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 8 | 37 | 40 | 14 | 0 | 4.6 | | |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 4 | 39 | 21 | 17 | 17 | 5.0 | | |

A number of students said Malinova was one of the best instructors they have met at UofT. She was very enthusiastic, nice and approachable. She was always available for extra office hours and individual consultation. She genuinely cared for the students and tried her best to help and explain the material. A few students felt that she sometimes rushed through the lectures.

ECO 360Y1Y Economic Growth and Technological Change Instructor(s): M. Hare

| Retake: 80% |
|-------------|
| |
| 7 Mean |
| 9 5.3 |
| 12 5.4 |
| 15 5.5 |
| 28 5.8 |
| 0 4.7 |
| 0 4.4 |
| 22 5.4 |
| |

Most students thought Hare was a good instructor. The general opinion was that the workload was too heavy. The course had no web page, and the instructor did not communicate via email. Lecture slides would have been helpful as well as more feedback on the examinations.

ECO 369Y1Y Health Economics

Instructor(s): M. Denny

| Enr: 54 | | Re | esp: 38 | В | Retake: 53% | | | |
|--------------|---|----|---------|----|-------------|----|---|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 2 | 5 | 22 | 27 | 27 | 13 | 0 | 4.1 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 16 | 22 | 30 | 27 | 2 | 4.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 5 | 8 | 41 | 19 | 19 | 5 | 4.6 |
| Teaching | 0 | 2 | 8 | 22 | 27 | 36 | 2 | 4.9 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 11 | 80 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 4.0 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 2 | 8 | 68 | 11 | 5 | 2 | 4.2 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 4 | 16 | 44 | 12 | 24 | 0 | 4.4 |

Some students found the instructor effective and interesting. Most students found the marking scheme was unbalanced and the test too difficult.

ECO 370Y1Y Economics of Organizations

Instructor(s): A. Hosios

| Enr: 44 | | Re | sp: 32 | 2 | Retake: 81% | | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|-------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 3 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 16 | 22 | 38 | 5.6 |
| Explains | 0 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 18 | 25 | 40 | 5.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 25 | 59 | 6.3 |
| Teaching | 0 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 34 | 50 | 6.2 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 3 | 56 | 28 | 3 | 9 | 4.6 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 3 | 40 | 31 | 9 | 15 | 4.9 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 4 | 0 | 22 | 18 | 22 | 31 | 5.5 |

Most students believed that the instructor was superb, very interesting and humourous. However, they felt that the material was quite difficult, but easily grasped and understood through the good teaching of the instructor.

ECO 380H1F Managerial Economics I: Competitive Strategy

Instructor(s): C. Serrano

| Enr: 38 | | Re | sp: 24 | 4 | Retake: 63% | | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|-------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 4 | 0 | 8 | 16 | 37 | 25 | 8 | 4.9 |
| Explains | 8 | 0 | 8 | 12 | 50 | 12 | 8 | 4.7 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 4 | 16 | 45 | 16 | 16 | 5.2 |
| Teaching | 4 | 4 | 4 | 21 | 34 | 21 | 8 | 4.8 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 27 | 18 | 0 | 4.6 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 4 | 54 | 25 | 16 | 0 | 4.5 |
| Learn Exp | 4 | 9 | 9 | 42 | 9 | 19 | 4 | 4.2 |

Serrano was a very qualified instructor for this course and he was able to explain the hard concepts in a very simplified and clear way. The material, topics were interesting and practical, although sometimes too much mathematics and calculation were involved. Almost everyone suggested that all four assignments be graded, instead of only two.

Generally, students felt they learned a lot.

ECO 382H1S Population Economics and Business Strategy

Instructor(s): D. Foot

| Enr: 43 | | Re | esp: 36 | 3 | | ake: 86% | | |
|--------------|---|----|---------|----|----|----------|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 14 | 40 | 40 | 6.1 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 37 | 54 | 6.5 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 31 | 65 | 6.6 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 38 | 52 | 6.4 |
| Workload | 0 | 5 | 20 | 55 | 11 | 2 | 2 | 3.9 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 8 | 32 | 41 | 11 | 2 | 2 | 3.8 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 13 | 39 | 39 | 6.1 |

Most of the students found the course very interesting and useful. Foot was described as enthusiastic, engaging and helpful. Many appreciated the real-life applications of the material taught in the course.

However, some noticed that the material got repetitive towards the end. A few students wanted more theory taught.

ECO 416H1S Macroeconometric Models for Policy Analysis and Forecasting

| Instructor(s): D.F | P. Dui | ngan | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------------|------|----|----|----|----|----|------|--|
| Enr: 13 | Resp: 8 Retake: 75% | | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 37 | 25 | 25 | 5.5 | |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 25 | 37 | 25 | 5.8 | |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 50 | 37 | 6.2 | |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 37 | 37 | 6.1 | |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 4.5 | |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 50 | 12 | 0 | 4.8 | |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 14 | 14 | 28 | 42 | 0 | 5.0 | |

It was a pleasure to take this course from such a knowledgeable and enthusiastic instructor. Lectures were useful and intuitive, and examples were provided after theoretical models were explained. Plenty of office hours were also very helpful in answering students' questions. However, students felt that a strong background in 200 and 300-level courses was needed to do well in the course.

ECO 425H1S Economics and Demographics

Instructor(s): D. Foot

| Enr: 13 | | Re | esp: 1 | 1 | Retake: 100% | | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|--------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 36 | 45 | 6.3 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 45 | 36 | 6.1 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 18 | 72 | 6.6 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 72 | 6.7 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 27 | 9 | 0 | 4.5 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 10 | 70 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 4.3 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 25 | 50 | 6.2 |

Everyone was pleased with the course. Foot's lectures were interesting and were taught with a lot of enthusiasm.

ECO 429Y1Y History of Economic Thought

Instructor(s): K. Furlong

| Enr: 63 | | Re | sp: 32 | 2 | Retake: 68% | | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|-------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 21 | 40 | 28 | 5.9 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 28 | 37 | 25 | 5.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 45 | 38 | 6.2 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 25 | 50 | 21 | 5.9 |
| Workload | 0 | 3 | 3 | 53 | 28 | 9 | 3 | 4.5 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 40 | 15 | 6 | 4.9 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 3 | 0 | 30 | 23 | 23 | 19 | 5.2 |

Furlong was a very good, enlightening and knowledgeable instructor. He gave clear, organized and helpful notes. Some students suggested using more smaller assignments, rather than term papers. Also, more topics should have been provided so there was more flexibility in essays.

