

CELL & SYSTEMS BIOLOGY STUDENTS' UNIONIntroduction

The Cell and Systems Biology Student Union (CSBSU) aims to better student life for all undergraduates enrolled in biology related courses. The CSBSU organizes fun events, from academic seminars and greenhouse tours to socials and movie nights, which are open to all students, staff, and faculty. Please visit the CSBSU in RW 123 or check out their website: <http://www.csbsu.csb.utoronto.ca>

CSBSU Executive

BIO 240H1F Molecular Biology

Instructor(s): M. Campbell; B. Chang

| Enr: 954 | Resp: 761 | | | | | | | Retake: 57% |
|------------------|-----------|---|----|----|----|----|----|-------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| <u>Campbell:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 27 | 33 | 26 | 5.7 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 22 | 38 | 29 | 5.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 27 | 55 | 6.3 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 20 | 37 | 31 | 5.9 |
| <u>Chang:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 1 | 3 | 7 | 21 | 34 | 21 | 10 | 4.9 |
| Explains | 2 | 3 | 10 | 22 | 33 | 19 | 7 | 4.7 |
| Communicates | 1 | 2 | 8 | 22 | 32 | 21 | 10 | 4.9 |
| Teaching | 1 | 2 | 6 | 22 | 32 | 25 | 8 | 4.9 |
| <u>Course:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 1 | 32 | 34 | 20 | 10 | 5.0 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 35 | 22 | 8 | 5.0 |
| Learn Exp | 1 | 1 | 4 | 37 | 30 | 18 | 5 | 4.7 |

Students described Campbell as an enthusiastic and engaging instructor. The analogies, examples and videos he used made the material more interesting and memorable. The students appreciated his recap of the previous lectures at the start of each class as well as his online presence.

Chang was described as an organized and knowledgeable instructor but some students felt that her lectures were a bit monotonous at times. Students commented that her expectations were unclear in regards to the level of detail and understanding required.

Students found the course to be well-organized, but some felt that the lecture topics were arranged in a confusing manner. However, the labs were valuable in reinforcing and extending the lecture material. Students felt that more tutorial times and days would have been helpful, as many could not attend the one session time that was available. Also, the effectiveness of fill-in-the-blank lecture notes was questioned. As well, many students complained that the midterm was not an accurate assessment of understanding since it was composed of a small number of questions that were very detail-oriented.

Instructor(s): M. French

| Enr: 290 | Resp: 214 | | | | | | | Retake: 55% |
|--------------|-----------|---|---|----|----|----|----|-------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 2 | 19 | 31 | 29 | 14 | 5.3 |
| Explains | 1 | 0 | 6 | 18 | 28 | 28 | 16 | 5.2 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 27 | 33 | 25 | 5.7 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 26 | 33 | 24 | 5.6 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 1 | 27 | 28 | 24 | 17 | 5.3 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 34 | 24 | 15 | 5.3 |
| Learn Exp | 3 | 1 | 5 | 41 | 21 | 20 | 6 | 4.6 |

Students found French to be very caring and genuinely concerned about students' difficulties. Some found the required readings to be excessive, with many points not discussed during lecture. The midterm was unanimously described as unfair or challenging, with emphasis on small details as opposed to major course concepts. Labs were thought to compliment the lecture material well.

BIO 241H1S Cell and Developmental Biology

Instructor(s): T. Harris; D. Desveaux

| Enr: 931 | Resp: 741 | | | | | | | Retake: 62% |
|------------------|-----------|---|---|----|----|----|----|-------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| <u>Harris:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 26 | 35 | 21 | 5.6 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 28 | 34 | 22 | 5.6 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 4 | 16 | 30 | 30 | 16 | 5.3 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 28 | 35 | 21 | 5.6 |
| <u>Desveaux:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 25 | 35 | 26 | 5.7 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 27 | 37 | 24 | 5.7 |
| Communicates | 0 | 1 | 2 | 16 | 28 | 33 | 18 | 5.4 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 27 | 35 | 25 | 5.7 |
| <u>Course:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 3 | 46 | 32 | 12 | 5 | 4.7 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 3 | 46 | 32 | 12 | 3 | 4.6 |
| Learn Exp | 1 | 0 | 3 | 43 | 30 | 14 | 6 | 4.7 |

Students described Harris as a good instructor who explained concepts clearly. His analogies were helpful in understanding the material; however, his lecture slides could have benefitted from better organization and less repetition.

Desveaux was described as an approachable and enthusiastic instructor. His lectures were organized and he explained concepts clearly and concisely. His use of animation and videos was effective and much appreciated.

BIO 241 was generally described as a good course, but the material could be a bit dry at times. Some students felt that the course was based on memorization rather than understanding. Labs and tutorials were well-structured and helpful, but could have been more interesting and engaging.

Instructor(s): M. French

| Enr: 211 | Resp: 142 | | | | | | | Retake: 68% |
|--------------|-----------|---|---|----|----|----|----|-------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 32 | 33 | 17 | 5.5 |
| Explains | 0 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 24 | 35 | 21 | 5.5 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 30 | 31 | 27 | 5.7 |
| Teaching | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 23 | 43 | 19 | 5.6 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 1 | 37 | 33 | 18 | 8 | 4.9 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 2 | 31 | 42 | 15 | 6 | 4.9 |
| Learn Exp | 1 | 1 | 6 | 39 | 32 | 11 | 6 | 4.6 |

Many students found French to be friendly, approachable, and entertaining. She explained concepts clearly and was readily available for help. Several students mentioned that she spoke too fast at times.

Although many students commented that the workload was reasonable, there were too many details to memorize for certain concepts. The textbook was generally found to be useless as lecture and lab material were sufficient for test purposes.

Many complained there were too few wet labs and too many dry labs. Students mentioned that the lab component should have focussed more on topics discussed in lectures.

Overall, the course was enjoyable and very organized.

BIO 255Y1Y Cell and Molecular Biology with Advanced Laboratory

Instructor(s): M. Campbell; B. Chang

| Enr: 16 | Resp: 8 | | | | | | | Retake: 66% |
|------------------|---------|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| <u>Campbell:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 50 | 6.5 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|-----|
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 37 | 6.4 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 75 | 6.8 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 62 | 6.6 |
| <u>Chang:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 50 | 12 | 5.8 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 25 | 37 | 25 | 5.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 75 | 0 | 5.8 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 37 | 25 | 5.9 |
| <u>Course:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 28 | 14 | 0 | 4.6 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 4.7 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 40 | 5.8 |

Campbell was described as an overly enthusiastic, passionate and fair instructor. Some students described his enthusiasm as one of the key factors in developing their love for molecular biology. He provided clear instructions regarding examination material.

Some students complained about Chang's lack of clarity regarding examination material.

The course was regarded as detailed, but interesting as well. Some students liked having readings complimenting lecture material.

Instructor(s): D. Desveaux; T. Harris

| Enr: 15 | Resp: 11 | | | | Retake: 90% | | | |
|------------------|----------|---|---|----|-------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| <u>Desveaux:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 54 | 9 | 27 | 5.5 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 27 | 18 | 5.6 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 45 | 18 | 18 | 5.4 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 45 | 18 | 18 | 5.4 |
| <u>Harris:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 27 | 36 | 27 | 5.8 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 54 | 18 | 5.9 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 27 | 36 | 18 | 5.5 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 36 | 27 | 18 | 5.5 |
| <u>Course:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 9 | 18 | 9 | 4.7 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 18 | 18 | 9 | 4.8 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 42 | 14 | 28 | 5.6 |

Students felt that the course was solid but the tests were based heavily on being able to regurgitate information. On the other hand, the labs were the highlight of the course and very enjoyable.

Instructor(s): M. French

| Enr: 7 | Resp: 6 | | | | Retake: 83% | | | |
|--------------|---------|---|----|----|-------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 20 | 40 | 6.0 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 20 | 40 | 6.0 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 40 | 5.8 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 20 | 40 | 6.0 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 16 | 0 | 16 | 4.7 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 33 | 0 | 16 | 4.8 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 16 | 33 | 33 | 5.8 |

BIO 260H1S Concepts in Genetics

Instructor(s): P. McCourt; W. Moeder

| Enr: 124 | Resp: 59 | | | | Retake: 60% | | | |
|-----------------|----------|---|----|----|-------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| <u>McCourt:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 3 | 3 | 8 | 12 | 22 | 37 | 12 | 5.1 |
| Explains | 1 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 18 | 34 | 32 | 5.8 |
| Communicates | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 15 | 28 | 47 | 6.1 |
| Teaching | 1 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 10 | 48 | 23 | 5.7 |
| <u>Moeder:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 3 | 1 | 15 | 21 | 29 | 22 | 5 | 4.6 |
| Explains | 5 | 0 | 21 | 31 | 29 | 8 | 3 | 4.2 |
| Communicates | 1 | 8 | 31 | 26 | 21 | 7 | 3 | 3.9 |
| Teaching | 5 | 5 | 14 | 35 | 31 | 7 | 1 | 4.1 |

Course:

| | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|-----|
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 26 | 7 | 5 | 4.6 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 32 | 23 | 7 | 5.0 |
| Learn Exp | 1 | 3 | 9 | 35 | 25 | 21 | 1 | 4.5 |

Most of the students felt that McCourt was a good lecturer, showed passion for the material, and often engaged students in class discussion. This helped students to critically analyze the material, but sometimes the discussion went on too long. A few students felt McCourt was a little disorganized and unfair.

The assignment questions were challenging and were strictly marked. It was also weighed a lot.

Moeder often read word for word from the slides. Moreover, his lecture slides were too small to read. Despite this, students found him to be a nice and kind instructor.

BIO 270H1F Animal Physiology I

Instructor(s): D. Lovejoy; W. Ju

| Enr: 518 | Resp: 119 | | | | Retake: 83% | | | |
|-----------------|-----------|---|----|----|-------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| <u>Lovejoy:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 6 | 1 | 7 | 10 | 24 | 35 | 14 | 5.1 |
| Explains | 4 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 23 | 31 | 28 | 5.6 |
| Communicates | 4 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 27 | 41 | 5.8 |
| Teaching | 3 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 21 | 38 | 22 | 5.5 |
| <u>Ju:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 45 | 37 | 6.2 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 47 | 31 | 6.1 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 21 | 39 | 34 | 6.0 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 20 | 41 | 36 | 6.1 |
| <u>Course:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 13 | 60 | 16 | 4 | 2 | 4.2 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 1 | 11 | 66 | 10 | 6 | 1 | 4.1 |
| Learn Exp | 1 | 1 | 3 | 40 | 29 | 15 | 8 | 4.8 |

Students enjoyed Lovejoy's enthusiasm and sense of humour, but found that his interesting stories sometimes strayed too much from the course material. While Lovejoy was found to be knowledgeable, some students felt that his lectures would have benefitted from better preparation with an emphasis on overall concepts instead of minute details.

Ju was described as a good instructor who was organized and knowledgeable. His lectures were clear and concise, with an emphasis on important concepts and test material. Students found him to be very helpful and attentive and appreciated his tutorials and presence on Blackboard.

The course was described as interesting and the material was current and relevant. However, some students felt that the labs did not relate very well to lectures. Many students commented on the strict marking and vague expectations for the lab reports and assignments.

BIO 271H1S Animal Physiology II

Instructor(s): J. Peever; C. Youngson

| Enr: 474 | Resp: 162 | | | | Retake: 88% | | | |
|------------------|-----------|---|----|----|-------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| <u>Peever:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 33 | 40 | 15 | 5.5 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 22 | 46 | 22 | 5.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 20 | 46 | 25 | 5.8 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 25 | 43 | 22 | 5.8 |
| <u>Youngson:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 22 | 45 | 26 | 5.9 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 16 | 49 | 25 | 5.9 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 24 | 42 | 25 | 5.8 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 18 | 49 | 25 | 5.9 |
| <u>Course:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Workload | 0 | 3 | 13 | 74 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 3.9 |
| Difficulty | 1 | 2 | 15 | 68 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 3.9 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 2 | 1 | 39 | 33 | 16 | 7 | 4.8 |

Students described Peever as a good instructor with good teach-

24 CELLS & SYSTEMS BIOLOGY

ing strategies but felt that he could have been more approachable. He emphasized important material by repetition, but some people found it too repetitive. He kept the lectures interesting using anecdotes and real-life examples to explain concepts. His end-of-lecture summaries were much appreciated.

Youngson was described as a good instructor who was organized and articulate. Some of the lectures were a bit boring, but she made up for it with her enthusiasm and friendliness. She taught at a good pace and explained concepts clearly and thoroughly.

Generally students enjoyed the course and found the material interesting and applicable. The pre-lab presentations were not useful.

CSB 200Y1Y Current Topics in Molecular Biology

Instructor(s): K. Yoshioka; E. Larsen

| Enr: 45 | Resp: 19 | | | | | | Retake: 70% | |
|------------------|----------|----|----|----|----|----|-------------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| <u>Yoshioka:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 0 | 5 | 0 | 11 | 29 | 41 | 11 | 5.4 |
| Explains | 0 | 5 | 0 | 22 | 22 | 38 | 11 | 5.2 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 5 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 11 | 5.1 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 11 | 5 | 33 | 44 | 5 | 5.3 |
| <u>Larsen:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 10 | 5 | 42 | 10 | 21 | 10 | 0 | 3.6 |
| Explains | 0 | 10 | 5 | 26 | 31 | 26 | 0 | 4.6 |
| Communicates | 0 | 15 | 5 | 5 | 26 | 36 | 10 | 4.9 |
| Teaching | 0 | 10 | 10 | 26 | 26 | 15 | 10 | 4.6 |
| <u>Course:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Workload | 5 | 11 | 22 | 50 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 3.5 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 17 | 11 | 58 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 3.6 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 25 | 8 | 0 | 4.4 |

Students described Yoshioka as a good instructor who was interesting and enthusiastic. Her presentations were organized and she explained material with good use of examples.

Larsen was described as an enthusiastic instructor, but her lectures were sometimes difficult to follow.

Some students felt that the expectations for tests and assignments were unclear. As well, some people found that some sections of the course were too technical for non-science students and placed them at an unfair disadvantage.

Instructor(s): A. Bruce

| Enr: 48 | Resp: 30 | | | | | | Retake: 62% | |
|--------------|----------|---|----|----|----|----|-------------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 31 | 44 | 10 | 5.5 |
| Explains | 0 | 3 | 3 | 20 | 26 | 43 | 3 | 5.1 |
| Communicates | 0 | 3 | 0 | 16 | 20 | 36 | 23 | 5.6 |
| Teaching | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 37 | 44 | 6 | 5.3 |
| Workload | 6 | 6 | 20 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.5 |
| Difficulty | 3 | 7 | 7 | 53 | 21 | 3 | 3 | 4.1 |
| Learn Exp | 4 | 0 | 4 | 32 | 44 | 8 | 8 | 4.7 |

Bruce was described as a well-organized, caring and approachable instructor who showed motivation about the material. However, some students found Bruce's lectures to be too fast-paced, not giving enough time for writing notes. Students suggested that Bruce make her lectures more interactive.

The course was regarded as highly detailed and difficult for those with no science background. The tutorials were found to be unnecessary and sometimes not helpful. Some students preferred a reference textbook as a better study aid than the overwhelming number of slides.

CSB 327H1F Extracellular Matrix Biology and Pathology

Instructor(s): M. Ringuette

| Enr: 229 | Resp: 116 | | | | | | Retake: 65% | |
|--------------|-----------|---|---|----|----|----|-------------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 3 | 6 | 17 | 24 | 33 | 15 | 5.2 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 4 | 15 | 34 | 26 | 17 | 5.3 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 20 | 37 | 38 | 6.1 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|-----|
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 36 | 31 | 23 | 5.7 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 8 | 48 | 30 | 8 | 4 | 4.5 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 3 | 45 | 27 | 15 | 8 | 4.8 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 1 | 7 | 39 | 24 | 11 | 16 | 4.9 |

Ringuette was described as a good lecturer, who was enthusiastic about the material. He was described as approachable, was often available to answer questions and open to feedback from students.

His teaching was a little disorganized at times. Overall, most students enjoyed the course and found the material interesting.

CSB 328H1F Developmental Biology

Instructor(s): D. Godt; U. Tepass

| Enr: 76 | Resp: 55 | | | | | | Retake: 58% | |
|----------------|----------|---|---|----|----|----|-------------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| <u>Godt:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 1 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 30 | 37 | 11 | 5.3 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 29 | 38 | 18 | 5.6 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 29 | 42 | 18 | 5.7 |
| Teaching | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 27 | 42 | 14 | 5.5 |
| <u>Tepass:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 1 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 43 | 29 | 7 | 5.2 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 38 | 36 | 20 | 5.7 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 33 | 35 | 20 | 5.6 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 33 | 42 | 14 | 5.6 |
| <u>Course:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 1 | 50 | 33 | 11 | 3 | 4.6 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 1 | 44 | 38 | 11 | 3 | 4.7 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 2 | 41 | 26 | 17 | 12 | 5.0 |

Most students felt that Godt and Tepass made a good teaching team. Both were very knowledgeable and effective lecturers. The course material was interesting and was taught in an easy to understand manner. In particular, the use of illustrations to make concepts more clear was helpful.

CSB 329H1S Evolution of Development

Instructor(s): E. Larsen; R. Winklbauer

| Enr: 19 | Resp: 15 | | | | | | Retake: 73% | |
|--------------------|----------|---|----|----|----|----|-------------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| <u>Larsen:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 40 | 33 | 13 | 5.5 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 40 | 26 | 5.9 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 46 | 46 | 6.3 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 13 | 46 | 33 | 6.0 |
| <u>Winklbauer:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 40 | 33 | 20 | 5.7 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 40 | 33 | 20 | 5.7 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 46 | 46 | 6.3 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 13 | 46 | 26 | 5.8 |
| <u>Course:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 28 | 57 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 3.9 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 28 | 57 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 3.9 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 15 | 7 | 38 | 5.5 |

Students described Larsen as a good instructor who was enthusiastic and extremely knowledgeable. The discussions in her class were informative but were sometimes repetitive.

Winklbauer was also described as a good instructor who was knowledgeable and enthusiastic. Students would have liked more discussion in his section of the course.

The course and labs were interesting. However, tutorials seemed unrelated at times. Students felt that the course would have benefitted from more structure and a revised marking scheme that reflected the amount of work involved. Also, students would have liked more feedback and to have had their work graded within a reasonable time.

CSB 330H1S Techniques in Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology

Instructor(s): A. Bruce; T. Harris

| Enr: 21 | Resp: 18 | | | | | | Retake: 94% | |
|----------------|----------|---|----|----|----|----|-------------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| <u>Bruce:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 22 | 50 | 16 | 5.7 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 22 | 50 | 22 | 5.9 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 27 | 38 | 27 | 5.9 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 22 | 44 | 27 | 5.9 |
| <u>Harris:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 55 | 27 | 6.1 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 61 | 22 | 6.0 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 44 | 38 | 6.2 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 55 | 33 | 6.2 |
| <u>Course:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 11 | 38 | 38 | 11 | 0 | 4.5 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 5 | 44 | 38 | 11 | 0 | 4.6 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 40 | 26 | 13 | 5.3 |

Bruce showed great enthusiasm but her expectations were not always clear.

Harris was described as a very good instructor.

Students described this as a wonderful course that helped expand laboratory skills, critical analysis of scientific papers, and active participation in discussions. Some students felt that the term test and marking was not representative of what was learned.

CSB 331H1S Advanced Cell Biology I: Cell Adhesion and Migration

Instructor(s): M. Ringuette

| Enr: 130 | Resp: 47 | | | | | | Retake: 68% | |
|--------------|----------|---|---|----|----|----|-------------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 31 | 34 | 14 | 5.4 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 34 | 39 | 13 | 5.5 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 19 | 31 | 40 | 6.0 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 29 | 31 | 19 | 5.5 |
| Workload | 0 | 2 | 9 | 63 | 14 | 4 | 4 | 4.2 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 2 | 54 | 21 | 14 | 7 | 4.7 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 3 | 51 | 25 | 16 | 3 | 4.6 |

Students found Ringuette to be an enthusiastic, friendly and organized lecturer. Students appreciated that Ringuette made the "sometimes dry" material more interesting.

Students would have appreciated if the tests covered material from all sections, as opposed to a heavy focus on a few topics and minor details.

Overall, students enjoyed the course. Many recommended taking CSB 327 prior to this course to help with the background knowledge.

CSB 332H1S Neurobiology of the Synapse

Instructor(s): W. Ju

| Enr: 289 | Resp: 91 | | | | | | Retake: 78% | |
|--------------|----------|---|---|----|----|----|-------------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 24 | 38 | 29 | 5.9 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 29 | 40 | 20 | 5.7 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 24 | 41 | 27 | 5.9 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 27 | 34 | 29 | 5.8 |
| Workload | 2 | 2 | 4 | 70 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 4.1 |
| Difficulty | 2 | 3 | 5 | 56 | 18 | 12 | 1 | 4.3 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 4 | 1 | 45 | 22 | 15 | 10 | 4.7 |

Students agreed that Ju genuinely cared about student concerns and was always available to answer questions. Many thought his teaching was very good, using examples to explain core concepts when necessary.

The first term test was much too long to complete in an hour.

CSB 325H1F Endocrine Physiology

Instructor(s): D. Barsyte

| Enr: 329 | Resp: 72 | | | | | | Retake: 31% | |
|--------------|----------|----|----|----|----|----|-------------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 12 | 12 | 16 | 30 | 21 | 2 | 2 | 3.5 |
| Explains | 5 | 14 | 21 | 25 | 18 | 11 | 2 | 3.8 |
| Communicates | 7 | 1 | 11 | 26 | 29 | 21 | 2 | 4.5 |
| Teaching | 7 | 10 | 23 | 24 | 23 | 5 | 5 | 3.9 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 2 | 42 | 26 | 20 | 8 | 4.9 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 1 | 29 | 23 | 33 | 11 | 5.2 |
| Learn Exp | 9 | 16 | 18 | 32 | 7 | 9 | 5 | 3.6 |

Barsyte was described as a very knowledgeable instructor. Students however, would have appreciated slower paced lectures (as she spoke too fast a lot of the time). Her slides were also a little disorganized, but she was available to answer questions one-on-one.

The material was difficult and students would have appreciated getting their term test marks back sooner. The textbook was also of little relevance, as it either contradicted lecture material, or covered material not related to lectures.

Overall, students found the material interesting, but difficult.

CSB 340H1F Plant Development

Instructor(s): T. Berleth

| Enr: 24 | Resp: 16 | | | | | | Retake: 56% | |
|--------------|----------|---|----|----|----|----|-------------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 6 | 0 | 6 | 31 | 25 | 12 | 18 | 4.8 |
| Explains | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 37 | 43 | 6 | 5.2 |
| Communicates | 6 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 25 | 12 | 37 | 5.4 |
| Teaching | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 43 | 12 | 5.2 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 12 | 50 | 18 | 18 | 0 | 4.4 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 43 | 31 | 0 | 5.1 |
| Learn Exp | 8 | 8 | 0 | 16 | 50 | 8 | 8 | 4.5 |

For the most part, students enjoyed both the course and the instructor. Students felt Berleth was inspiring and very enthusiastic about the material, although, at times, he spoke too fast or mumbled.

The course would have benefitted from better scheduling such that lectures weren't rushed. Slides contained little text and were not made available before the lecture, which students would have preferred.

CSB 343H1F Animal Energetics

Instructor(s): R. Stephenson

| Enr: 155 | Resp: 139 | | | | | | Retake: 76% | |
|--------------|-----------|---|---|----|----|----|-------------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 1 | 2 | 7 | 23 | 26 | 17 | 21 | 5.1 |
| Explains | 0 | 1 | 2 | 14 | 26 | 26 | 28 | 5.6 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 5.7 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 25 | 28 | 27 | 5.6 |
| Workload | 0 | 3 | 9 | 62 | 17 | 4 | 1 | 4.1 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 2 | 6 | 65 | 16 | 6 | 1 | 4.2 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 3 | 37 | 27 | 20 | 11 | 5.0 |

Stephenson was described as enthusiastic and knowledgeable. His lectures were enjoyable and interesting, and he explained concepts clearly; however, many students felt that he spoke too fast at times.

The material covered many diverse and interesting topics, and the majority of students enjoyed the course. Students felt lectures would have been easier to understand if slides were posted before the lecture and included the textbook figures for easier annotations and studying. Some students also suggested having a structured set of required readings. While many liked the best 2 out of 3 test marking scheme, students felt that the term test questions were deliberately tricky and did not reflect the level of understanding and detail conveyed in the lectures.

26 CELLS & SYSTEMS BIOLOGY

CSB 346H1S Neurobiology of Respiration

Instructor(s): J. Peever

Enr: 311

Resp: 156

Retake: 82%

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
|--------------|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|------|
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 27 | 43 | 17 | 5.7 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 29 | 38 | 23 | 5.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 40 | 40 | 6.2 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 20 | 47 | 21 | 5.8 |
| Workload | 0 | 2 | 7 | 63 | 19 | 1 | 3 | 4.2 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 1 | 2 | 49 | 37 | 5 | 3 | 4.5 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 4 | 32 | 31 | 21 | 10 | 5.0 |

Students found Peever to be a friendly, enthusiastic and engaging instructor. He was very clear and organized when lecturing.

However, students would have appreciated more office hours, and more time for completing assignments and tests, as many students ran out of time.

Marking was sometimes unfair, as minor details such as dates were asked when students were told to focus on overall concepts.

Overall, students felt Peever performed effectively as an instructor, and many enjoyed the course.

CSB 347H1S Comparative Cellular Physiology

Instructor(s): L. Buck

Enr: 270

Resp: 86

Retake: 64%

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
|--------------|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|------|
| Presents | 0 | 1 | 5 | 18 | 30 | 28 | 15 | 5.2 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 2 | 21 | 30 | 30 | 15 | 4 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 16 | 32 | 42 | 6.1 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 27 | 39 | 25 | 5.8 |
| Workload | 0 | 1 | 9 | 61 | 17 | 9 | 0 | 4.2 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 2 | 56 | 27 | 12 | 1 | 4.5 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 3 | 55 | 22 | 16 | 1 | 4.6 |

Buck was an enthusiastic and approachable instructor. His tests were fair, but questions were sometimes too ambiguous and long. Students would have appreciated more organized slides during the lectures and more office hours.

CSB 349H1S Eukaryotic Gene Expression

Instructor(s): V. Tropepe

Enr: 184

Resp: 119

Retake: 37%

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
|--------------|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|------|
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 4 | 16 | 26 | 33 | 18 | 5.5 |
| Explains | 0 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 26 | 31 | 24 | 5.6 |
| Communicates | 0 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 19 | 37 | 25 | 5.7 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 28 | 37 | 19 | 5.6 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 28 | 33 | 21 | 5.6 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 37 | 31 | 16 | 5.5 |
| Learn Exp | 2 | 3 | 10 | 28 | 25 | 24 | 5 | 4.7 |

Students thought that Tropepe was a good lecturer who explained concepts well, but should have had more office hours to address questions.

In regards to lecture material, students thought there should have been a much greater emphasis on molecular techniques as they were the focus of both tests.

Tutorials were met by a majority of students with disdain. The in-class assignments were often rushed and were worth too much. Students expressed that there was disparity between TA marking and found that the amount of work necessary for the PBL project did not reflect its worth.

CSB 350H1S Laboratory in Molecular Plant Biology

Instructor(s): D. Christendat; M. Neumann

Enr: 39

Resp: 33

Retake: 86%

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
|---------------------|---|---|----|----|----|----|---|------|
| <u>Christendat:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 3 | 6 | 27 | 27 | 12 | 18 | 6 | 4.2 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 18 | 33 | 21 | 21 | 6 | 4.6 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|-----|
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 30 | 39 | 15 | 5.5 |
| Teaching | 0 | 3 | 12 | 27 | 24 | 21 | 12 | 4.8 |
| <u>Neumann:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 24 | 45 | 24 | 5.9 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 30 | 45 | 18 | 5.7 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 27 | 36 | 27 | 5.8 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 25 | 37 | 34 | 6.0 |
| <u>Course:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 6 | 36 | 39 | 9 | 9 | 4.8 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 6 | 60 | 18 | 15 | 0 | 4.4 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 18 | 36 | 22 | 5.6 |

Christendat was described as an enthusiastic and friendly instructor. Students, however, felt his lectures were sometimes disorganized and he was not always clear about his expectations.

Neumann was described as a friendly and approachable instructor. Students enjoyed her lectures and found that she was organized and clear about her expectations.

Students would have appreciated it if the lab reports were worth more, as a lot of work was required.

Overall, students enjoyed the hands on experience and found the course a valuable learning experience.

CSB 352H1S Bioinformatics Methods

Instructor(s): N. Provart

Enr: 77

Resp: 45

Retake: 77%

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
|--------------|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|------|
| Presents | 2 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 38 | 13 | 18 | 5.1 |
| Explains | 2 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 29 | 13 | 13 | 4.7 |
| Communicates | 2 | 0 | 2 | 22 | 27 | 18 | 27 | 5.4 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 22 | 29 | 18 | 5.4 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 20 | 51 | 20 | 4 | 2 | 4.2 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 18 | 45 | 29 | 2 | 4 | 4.3 |
| Learn Exp | 2 | 5 | 5 | 35 | 27 | 15 | 10 | 4.7 |

Provart was a good instructor. However, students felt that he read off the slides too often, and rushed through lectures at the end.

Students enjoyed the labs and their application to future grad studies in bioinformatics but would have appreciated more background knowledge so that everyone was prepared.

CSB 425H1S Endocrinology of Transformation

Instructor(s): D. Lovejoy

Enr: 9

Resp: 8

Retake: 87%

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
|--------------|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|------|
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 37 | 12 | 25 | 5.4 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 50 | 25 | 6.0 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 12 | 75 | 6.6 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 25 | 50 | 6.2 |
| Workload | 0 | 12 | 12 | 50 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 3.9 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 4.4 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 16 | 16 | 33 | 5.5 |

Lovejoy was described as a very enthusiastic instructor who cared about students understanding the material. He allowed a lot of room for questions and debates. Students felt that the discussions and the small class size added to a more personal learning experience. In general, it was a very informative and enjoyable course.

CSB 428H1F Advanced Cell Biology: Cell Polarity and Cytoskeletal Dynamics

Instructor(s): U. Tepass; T. Harris

Enr: 17

Resp: 14

Retake: 75%

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
|----------------|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|------|
| <u>Tepass:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 5.8 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 38 | 15 | 5.7 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 23 | 46 | 15 | 5.6 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 50 | 21 | 5.9 |

Harris:

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|-----|
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 38 | 30 | 23 | 5.7 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 38 | 7 | 5.5 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 23 | 46 | 15 | 5.6 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 35 | 28 | 5.9 |

Course:

| | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|-----|
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 28 | 14 | 28 | 5.4 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 28 | 21 | 14 | 5.1 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 9 | 18 | 36 | 18 | 18 | 5.2 |

It was evident that both Tepass and Harris were experts in their field. Both brought much enthusiasm to the lectures and encouraged the class to engage in discussion.

Overall, the students found the value of the course material high and would recommend this class to others.

CSB 429H1S Germ Cell Biology

Instructor(s): D. Godt

| Enr: 20 | Resp: 19 | | | | | | | Retake: 84% |
|--------------|----------|---|---|----|----|----|----|-------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 26 | 26 | 5.8 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 50 | 16 | 5.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 52 | 26 | 6.0 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 47 | 31 | 6.1 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 5 | 63 | 26 | 5 | 0 | 4.3 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 5 | 63 | 21 | 10 | 0 | 4.4 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 50 | 18 | 0 | 4.9 |

Godt was described as an enthusiastic instructor who was passionate about what she taught. She seemed to genuinely care about her students and tried to ensure that they understood the material. Her feedback and encouragements were helpful and much appreciated.

The course was well-structured and discussion and critical thinking was encouraged.

CSB 430H1F Developmental Neurobiology

Instructor(s): V. Tropepe

| Enr: 23 | Resp: 19 | | | | | | | Retake: 94% |
|--------------|----------|---|---|----|----|----|----|-------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 47 | 31 | 6.1 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 36 | 47 | 6.3 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 44 | 50 | 6.4 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 52 | 42 | 6.3 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 4.3 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 36 | 5 | 5 | 4.6 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 41 | 35 | 11 | 5.5 |

Students raved about the instructor for being a superb lecturer, engaging, interacting with students, and answering all questions. He was approachable and organized, offering constructive criticism and performing well in the small class size.

The material was interesting. Students would have liked recommended readings to help with some of the material.

CSB 435H1S Regulatory Networks and Systems in Molecular Biology

Instructor(s): A. Moses

| Enr: 19 | Resp: 14 | | | | | | | Retake: 61% |
|--------------|----------|---|----|----|----|----|----|-------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 35 | 42 | 14 | 5.6 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 28 | 50 | 14 | 5.7 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 35 | 42 | 6.2 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 64 | 14 | 5.9 |
| Workload | 7 | 0 | 14 | 64 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 3.9 |
| Difficulty | 7 | 0 | 7 | 46 | 30 | 7 | 0 | 4.2 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 7 | 35 | 50 | 7 | 0 | 4.6 |

Moses was an outstanding instructor who taught the course well. He listened to student suggestions and tried to implement them into the

course. The course was new this year, so some students felt that it needed more structure and a clearer set of expectations. Many felt that the test was too long. Also, students felt it would have been helpful to have lecture notes provided prior to class, so that it would be easier to concentrate and participate. Otherwise, it was an interesting course.

CSB 445H1F Biology of Sleep

Instructor(s): R. Stephenson

| Enr: 4 | Resp: 4 | | | | | | | Retake: 100% |
|--------------|---------|---|----|----|----|-----|----|--------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 25 | 50 | 0 | 5.0 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 25 | 50 | 0 | 5.2 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 25 | 50 | 6.0 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 5.5 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 50 | 25 | 5.8 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 5.5 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 6.0 |

Students found Stephenson to be an enthusiastic and helpful lecturer.

CSB 450H1S Plant Proteomics in Systems Biology

Instructor(s): D. Christendat

| Enr: 16 | Resp: 13 | | | | | | | Retake: 54% |
|--------------|----------|---|----|----|----|----|----|-------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 53 | 7 | 7 | 4.9 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 30 | 23 | 7 | 5.0 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 38 | 30 | 15 | 5.5 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 53 | 23 | 7 | 5.2 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 15 | 38 | 15 | 5.4 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 30 | 38 | 7 | 5.3 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 11 | 33 | 33 | 11 | 11 | 4.8 |

Students felt that Proteomic examples were interesting, but hoped for more relevant examples of current research in the field. Also, students felt that not everyone had the same background knowledge in the class, and would have appreciated some review in the beginning lectures. Students felt Christendat was a fair lecturer, but would have appreciated fewer readings.

CSB 452H1F Plant-Microorganism Interactions

Instructor(s): K. Yoshioka; D. Desveaux

| Enr: 27 | Resp: 20 | | | | | | | Retake: 77% |
|------------------|----------|---|---|----|----|----|----|-------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| <u>Yoshioka:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 31 | 15 | 31 | 5.5 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 30 | 25 | 40 | 6.0 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 25 | 50 | 6.2 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 60 | 20 | 6.1 |
| <u>Desveaux:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 30 | 20 | 35 | 5.8 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 36 | 31 | 6.0 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 35 | 50 | 6.3 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 42 | 31 | 6.1 |
| <u>Course:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Workload | 0 | 5 | 0 | 63 | 26 | 0 | 5 | 4.3 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 5 | 73 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 4.2 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 43 | 25 | 6 | 5.1 |

Students found Yoshioka to be enthusiastic and knowledgeable. She did have trouble explaining some of the concepts clearly, but she was approachable and answered questions informatively.

Some students noted the obvious dedication Desveaux had towards lecture topics, and he explained the material very well. However, he tried to cover too much information in the time provided, leaving excessive amount of slides untouched. Desveaux also spoke at a quick pace - but he was good at answering questions.

Overall, the students thought the course was excellent. Course organization could be improved, but the material covered was interesting and applicable to real world situations.

28 CELLS & SYSTEMS BIOLOGY

CSB 459H1F Plant Molecular Biology and Biotechnology

Instructor(s): D. Goring; K. Yoshioka

| Enr: 34 | Resp: 26 | | | | | | | Retake: 91% |
|------------------|----------|---|---|----|----|----|----|-------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| <u>Goring:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 26 | 42 | 26 | 5.9 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 57 | 30 | 6.2 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 60 | 32 | 6.2 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 16 | 44 | 32 | 6.0 |
| <u>Yoshioka:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 34 | 38 | 15 | 5.5 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 48 | 16 | 5.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 48 | 44 | 6.4 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 64 | 16 | 6.0 |
| <u>Course:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Workload | 0 | 4 | 0 | 37 | 50 | 8 | 0 | 4.6 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 52 | 12 | 0 | 4.8 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 47 | 21 | 15 | 5.4 |

Students felt that overall, the course was well taught. The course material was interesting and the small class size facilitated peer-to-peer interactions.

CSB 460H1S Plant Signal Transduction

Instructor(s): P. McCourt

| Enr: 23 | Resp: 17 | | | | | | | Retake: 57% |
|--------------|----------|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 5 | 0 | 5 | 29 | 23 | 17 | 17 | 4.9 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 35 | 29 | 17 | 5.5 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 5.8 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 11 | 17 | 23 | 29 | 17 | 5.2 |
| Workload | 0 | 11 | 11 | 64 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 3.8 |
| Difficulty | 5 | 0 | 5 | 52 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 4.1 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 30 | 0 | 10 | 4.6 |

McCourt was described by some students as intellectually stimulating but somewhat unorganized. Students would have appreciated review slides or notes for his section.

CSB 472H1S Computational Genomics and Bioinformatics

Instructor(s): D. Guttman; N. Provart

| Enr: 27 | Resp: 21 | | | | | | | Retake: 50% |
|-----------------|----------|---|----|----|----|----|----|-------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| <u>Guttman:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 28 | 28 | 5.7 |
| Explains | 4 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 19 | 47 | 19 | 5.6 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 33 | 38 | 9 | 5.3 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 42 | 38 | 4 | 5.3 |
| <u>Provart:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 57 | 14 | 14 | 5.1 |
| Explains | 4 | 0 | 4 | 19 | 38 | 19 | 14 | 5.0 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 4 | 23 | 33 | 33 | 4 | 5.1 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 4 | 14 | 52 | 23 | 4 | 5.1 |
| <u>Course:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 21 | 36 | 15 | 5.4 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 22 | 33 | 16 | 5.4 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 20 | 40 | 26 | 13 | 0 | 4.3 |

Guttman was organized with his lecture material. He explained concepts clearly.

Provart was described as a very approachable instructor who was available after class to answer questions. However, he presented his lecture slides very quickly and included an overwhelming amount of information and detail for a short course.

The course was generally interesting and presented the students with a strong bioinformatics toolbox. Some students felt that the lectures would have benefitted by being taught in the computer lab while the programs were being explained, allowing students to learn contextually. Also, some found that the PERL programming section in tutorials was difficult, espe-

cially for those with no computer science background. More office hours and feedback on assignments would have been appreciated.

CSB 473H1S Chemical Genomics

Instructor(s): D. Desveaux; P. McCourt

| Enr: 19 | Resp: 16 | | | | | | | Retake: 87% |
|------------------|----------|---|---|----|----|----|----|-------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| <u>Desveaux:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 62 | 12 | 5.9 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 56 | 37 | 6.3 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 25 | 68 | 6.6 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 43 | 6.4 |
| <u>McCourt:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 31 | 6 | 5.4 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 50 | 37 | 6.2 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 68 | 6.7 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 43 | 6.4 |
| <u>Course:</u> | | | | | | | | |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 12 | 6 | 18 | 4.8 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 43 | 18 | 12 | 5.2 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 23 | 30 | 38 | 6.0 |

Desveaux was described as an interesting and dedicated instructor. McCourt was described as a very good instructor who was clear and informative. McCourt challenged students which kept them searching for ideas.

Students thought the course was an amazing learning experience which broadened and challenged their thinking. A few students found the workload relatively high.

CSB 482Y1Y Developmental Biology Seminar

Instructor(s): E. Larsen

| Enr: 10 | Resp: 8 | | | | | | | Retake: 75% |
|--------------|---------|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 37 | 12 | 25 | 5.1 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 25 | 12 | 25 | 5.2 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 50 | 25 | 6.0 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 25 | 25 | 5.8 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 25 | 62 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 4.0 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 4.2 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 40 | 0 | 20 | 5.0 |

Students found Larsen to be a good instructor who was always available for discussion and answering questions.

Students enjoyed the weekly discussions and described the course as interesting.

Instructor(s): R. Winklbauer

| Enr: 10 | Resp: 9 | | | | | | | Retake: 100% |
|--------------|---------|----|----|----|----|----|----|--------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 22 | 22 | 5.7 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 25 | 37 | 6.0 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 33 | 55 | 6.4 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 37 | 50 | 6.4 |
| Workload | 11 | 0 | 11 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.6 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 12 | 0 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.8 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 16 | 33 | 5.8 |

Students agreed that Winklbauer was a very good and enthusiastic lecturer. The course was very thought provoking.

NEW: Tuition payment or fees deferral must be made by Wednesday, August 19th!!

NEW: Fall Break – November 12-13
– no classes will be held