



Introduction

The Chemistry Students' Union (CSU) is a student run organization acting as the representative voice for all undergraduate students enrolled in a chemistry course. We hold social and academic events which strive to bring together students who share an interest in the discipline. If you want to get involved, please contact us at csu@chem.utoronto.ca or check out our website www.chem.utoronto.ca/students/csu.

CSU Executive

CHM 138H1F Introduction to Organic Chemistry I

Instructor(s): K. Quinlan; A. Yudin

Enr: 409	Resp: 163							Retake: 57%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Quinlan:</u>								
Presents	0	1	3	6	25	43	18	5.6
Explains	0	1	1	15	23	36	21	5.6
Communicates	1	1	1	14	19	35	25	5.6
Teaching	1	1	6	10	19	42	18	5.5
<u>Yudin:</u>								
Presents	1	1	5	24	39	20	8	4.9
Explains	1	1	7	25	28	25	9	4.9
Communicates	0	0	8	20	33	34	11	5.2
Teaching	0	2	6	20	31	28	9	5.1
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	0	15	23	34	26	5.7
Difficulty	0	0	0	7	18	45	27	5.9
Learn Exp	2	1	5	32	29	21	7	4.8

Quinlan was extremely enthusiastic and clear. However, many complained of the greater difficulty of the test as compared to the in-class examples and textbook problems. Students liked how Yudin worked out many examples in class and felt he was enthusiastic.

Many also felt that the labs were too difficult and stressful.

Instructor(s): J. Chin

Enr: 409	Resp: 160							Retake: 57%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	5	10	18	27	22	15	4.9
Explains	0	1	3	13	22	33	23	5.5
Communicates	0	0	1	13	23	37	23	5.6
Teaching	0	0	3	9	24	41	20	5.6
Workload	0	0	0	11	27	37	23	5.7
Difficulty	0	0	1	5	20	40	31	6.0
Learn Exp	2	0	8	33	28	21	6	4.7

Students felt that Chin was warm, patient in addressing students' questions, and enthusiastic. They liked his examples but would have preferred it if he used power point slides rather than his overheads. A few felt that he was a bit unclear and could have been better organized.

The homework questions were poor preparation for the much harder tests and the labs were also difficult.

Instructor(s): K. Quinlan; A. Yudin

Enr: 318	Resp: 148							Retake: 45%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Quinlan:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	17	30	32	18	5.5
Explains	0	0	4	19	28	27	18	5.2

Communicates	0	0	3	14	33	28	19	5.4
Teaching	2	1	5	15	33	26	15	5.2
<u>Yudin:</u>								
Presents	0	1	6	20	33	26	11	5.1
Explains	0	2	3	19	35	27	9	5.1
Communicates	0	0	4	16	34	28	13	5.2
Teaching	2	0	7	18	35	21	12	5.0
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	1	14	26	33	22	5.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	9	23	37	28	5.8
Learn Exp	5	3	6	35	17	28	3	4.6

Quinlan communicated concepts clearly and effectively and was enthusiastic in lectures. She demonstrated ideas well and made the class enjoyable. Quinlan answered questions in class regularly. However, it was felt that the lecture material was not reflected in the tests.

Yudin was good at providing examples in lectures that assisted the understanding of difficult concepts. He was able to cover a large amount of material over a short period of time. Yudin answered questions well in class but many students felt that they would have benefitted from more office hours.

Labs were not useful or related to the course and some had issues with the teaching assistants. Also, the tutorials did not cover the material well enough.

Instructor(s): J. Chin

Enr: 318	Resp: 138							Retake: 47%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	2	2	12	23	23	23	12	4.8
Explains	0	0	6	15	25	32	19	5.4
Communicates	0	0	2	12	22	33	29	5.8
Teaching	0	0	3	17	22	37	16	5.4
Workload	0	0	0	13	27	37	20	5.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	9	23	34	31	5.8
Learn Exp	3	4	6	35	19	30	3	4.7

Chin was approachable and knowledgeable.

The lectures were informative but could have been more organized and relevant to labs.

Instructor(s): S. Browning; K. Quinlan

Enr: 200	Resp: 113							Retake: 46%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Browning:</u>								
Presents	0	0	1	2	21	37	36	6.0
Explains	0	0	6	10	18	37	27	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	4	7	32	55	6.4
Teaching	0	0	1	4	13	39	40	6.1
<u>Quinlan:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	3	21	37	35	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	3	13	35	45	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	3	10	29	55	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	2	11	37	46	6.3
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	0	23	28	28	18	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	1	19	21	32	25	5.6
Learn Exp	1	3	9	26	30	23	5	4.8

Browning was generally well-liked and quite enthusiastic about the material. Students would have appreciated a greater use of examples.

Quinlan was described as an enthusiastic instructor who used examples very well to illustrate difficult concepts. She was very attentive to students' questions.

The lectures were generally enjoyed. Labs were thought of as often unrelated to lecture material. Tests were very challenging, and not enough time was given.

30 CHEMISTRY

CHM 138H1S Introduction to Organic Chemistry I

Instructor(s): S. Browning; M. Nitz

Enr: 391 Resp: 215 Retake: 57%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------

Browning:

Presents	3	2	1	7	28	31	24	5.5
Explains	2	4	3	13	23	32	20	5.3
Communicates	2	1	3	6	18	33	35	5.8
Teaching	3	2	2	8	22	33	26	5.5

Nitz:

Presents	1	3	3	12	31	28	18	5.3
Explains	1	2	3	11	21	36	23	5.5
Communicates	3	2	2	10	32	30	18	5.3
Teaching	2	2	2	11	26	34	19	5.4

Course:

Workload	1	0	0	30	26	23	16	5.2
Difficulty	2	0	1	22	23	30	19	5.3
Learn Exp	8	2	3	38	23	16	5	4.4

Students complained that the tests did not correlate well with material covered in class.

Students felt Browning was enthusiastic and clear. A good lecturer! However, some felt that he did not go through enough examples.

Students felt Nitz used many examples to explain the concepts. He answered questions thoroughly however the labs were a little disorganized.

Instructor(s): M. Nitz; S. Browning

Enr: 189 Resp: 74 Retake: 56%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------

Nitz:

Presents	0	1	2	9	20	39	27	5.7
Explains	0	0	4	2	24	31	37	6.0
Communicates	0	0	4	8	29	37	20	5.6
Teaching	0	0	1	13	20	43	21	5.7

Browning:

Presents	0	0	1	8	12	40	37	6.1
Explains	0	2	2	12	20	29	32	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	2	21	35	40	6.1
Teaching	0	1	1	8	18	33	36	5.9

Course:

Workload	0	0	1	26	32	28	10	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	27	18	37	16	5.4
Learn Exp	0	0	1	27	39	26	4	5.0

Nitz was found to be an engaging and exciting instructor. His practice problems were appreciated and his attention to students' questions was enjoyed. He was knowledgeable and interesting.

Students found Browning an enthusiastic lecturer, showed great attention to students' questions. He was seen as a very knowledgeable and extremely interesting lecturer.

Students felt that the course was good overall, but many students thought the tests were too difficult and too rushed. They would have liked harder practice problems. The labs were appreciated but did not always relate to the lecture material.

CHM 139H1S Chemistry: Physical Principles

Instructor(s): R. Jockusch; S. Browning

Enr: 371 Resp: 161 Retake: 49%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------

Jockusch:

Presents	2	1	4	18	38	24	9	5.0
Explains	3	1	5	16	27	31	13	5.1
Communicates	3	1	1	19	25	33	14	5.2
Teaching	3	2	2	19	33	28	10	5.0

Browning:

Presents	3	1	1	15	31	30	15	5.2
Explains	5	1	3	18	27	32	10	5.0
Communicates	4	0	1	12	23	29	27	5.5

Teaching	5	3	4	18	23	29	15	5.0
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	0	20	32	21	23	5.4
Difficulty	0	1	0	20	29	27	20	5.4
Learn Exp	4	7	6	43	18	13	5	4.3

Jockusch was a little disorganized at times in her lectures, however her tests were reflective of materials presented in lectures.

Browning was very entertaining and well versed instructor. Lectures were a great learning environment, however they were not cohesive with the laboratory part of the course and Browning's tests were difficult.

Overall, the course served as a general introductory course.

Instructor(s): S. Whittington

Enr: 371 Resp: 161 Retake: 53%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------

Presents	2	0	2	17	27	28	20	5.4
Explains	2	0	5	14	27	27	22	5.4
Communicates	3	2	6	18	23	28	17	5.1
Teaching	2	0	2	10	31	28	23	5.5
Workload	0	1	1	28	31	15	21	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	3	24	32	23	16	5.2
Learn Exp	3	5	5	43	22	13	8	4.5

Whittington was an approachable and knowledgeable instructor. He presented concepts concisely and effectively. However some students suggested the aid of a microphone to help project his often soft voice.

Instructor(s): S. Browning; R. Jockusch

Enr: 230 Resp: 91 Retake: 50%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------

Browning:

Presents	2	1	1	13	24	35	23	5.5
Explains	3	2	6	10	28	29	18	5.2
Communicates	0	1	3	4	24	36	30	5.8
Teaching	1	2	6	12	18	34	25	5.5

Jockusch:

Presents	0	0	3	13	26	37	21	5.7
Explains	0	0	1	13	22	28	34	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	8	28	37	25	5.8
Teaching	0	0	2	8	26	37	24	5.7

Course:

Workload	0	0	1	15	28	31	23	5.6
Difficulty	0	1	3	18	27	38	11	5.3
Learn Exp	1	2	8	26	34	21	4	4.8

Overall students enjoyed the course, even though it was as challenging and stressful at times. More support would have been appreciated in order to have made the labs less stressful. Most students felt that there was not enough time was given to complete the tests.

Browning was enthusiastic and an engaging instructor. His passion for chemistry was clear. Students would have appreciated it if he spoke louder in class.

Jockusch was enthusiastic and passionate about the material. However, students would have appreciated if lecture slides were posted in advance. However, the notes were very well organized and easy to understand.

Instructor(s): S. Whittington

Enr: 230 Resp: 76 Retake: 55%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------

Presents	1	0	5	4	24	38	26	5.7
Explains	1	0	8	9	25	32	22	5.5
Communicates	2	0	2	8	24	36	26	5.7
Teaching	1	0	1	8	25	33	28	5.8
Workload	0	0	0	21	30	25	22	5.5
Difficulty	0	0	4	24	27	32	11	5.2
Learn Exp	1	0	8	33	24	22	8	4.8

Students generally felt that Whittington performed effectively as a university instructor. He made difficult concepts easy to understand. However most students thought he was too soft spoken - a microphone would have been helpful.

Instructor(s): D. Stone; D. Segal

Enr: 327		Resp: 56						Retake: 56%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
<u>Stone:</u>									
Presents	1	5	9	12	25	27	18	5.1	
Explains	1	3	3	16	23	34	16	3.3	
Communicates	0	0	3	9	25	34	27	5.7	
Teaching	0	1	5	7	24	37	24	5.6	
<u>Segal:</u>									
Presents	5	7	12	25	22	20	5	4.4	
Explains	7	9	14	27	14	22	3	4.1	
Communicates	7	9	15	39	11	13	3	3.9	
Teaching	11	5	25	22	20	11	3	3.8	
<u>Course:</u>									
Workload	0	1	1	26	37	28	3	5.0	
Difficulty	0	0	5	26	32	32	3	5.0	
Learn Exp	4	2	6	41	27	16	0	4.3	

Students found Stone to be organized and enthusiastic. They felt he should have posted lecture slides earlier. Students said that Segal was hard to follow.

Instructor(s): J. Murphy

Enr: 327		Resp: 94						Retake: 50%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	2	1	4	12	28	30	20	5.4	
Explains	2	2	7	10	30	24	22	5.3	
Communicates	3	2	3	13	26	31	19	5.3	
Teaching	3	1	5	19	22	28	20	5.2	
Workload	0	0	1	27	32	29	9	5.2	
Difficulty	0	0	2	26	32	27	11	5.2	
Learn Exp	1	2	1	41	26	16	8	4.7	

Some students felt that the instructor could have done more that reading off the slides.

Students said that the tests did not correlate well with the lecture material.

Instructor(s): D. Stone; D. Segal

Enr: 330		Resp: 45						Retake: 53%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
<u>Stone:</u>									
Presents	6	0	2	13	29	27	20	5.2	
Explains	4	0	0	11	31	29	22	5.5	
Communicates	4	0	0	11	22	31	29	5.6	
Teaching	4	0	0	11	23	32	27	5.6	
<u>Segal:</u>									
Presents	20	6	6	24	15	20	6	4.0	
Explains	13	15	8	26	20	6	8	3.8	
Communicates	15	13	11	20	22	11	6	3.8	
Teaching	18	6	11	25	16	13	6	3.8	
<u>Course:</u>									
Workload	2	0	2	32	27	25	9	5.0	
Difficulty	2	0	2	20	18	41	13	5.3	
Learn Exp	8	5	2	44	30	2	5	4.1	

Students felt that Stone was a good instructor who created a positive learning environment. He was enthusiastic and many students appreciated his humour and energy.

Students thought Segal was an enthusiastic instructor. However, some students felt that her powerpoint slides could have been more organized.

Students found the textbook and most tests very useful in studying for the tests. Overall, they felt that lectures from both instructors could have

been better organized.

Instructor(s): J. Murphy

Enr: 330		Resp: 68						Retake: 47%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	1	2	1	27	38	20	7	4.9	
Explains	2	1	4	15	32	32	5	5.0	
Communicates	2	1	5	22	30	29	7	4.9	
Teaching	1	1	6	24	40	15	10	4.9	
Workload	3	0	1	19	28	31	15	5.3	
Difficulty	1	1	1	15	30	28	20	5.4	
Learn Exp	4	2	10	43	20	14	4	4.4	

CHM 151Y1Y Chemistry: The Molecular Science

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

Enr: 104		Resp: 60						Retake: 91%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	0	6	26	33	33	5.9	
Explains	0	0	0	6	18	31	43	6.1	
Communicates	0	0	0	0	10	16	72	6.6	
Teaching	0	0	0	1	18	31	48	6.3	
Workload	0	0	3	31	29	31	5	5.0	
Difficulty	1	1	1	27	34	22	10	5.0	
Learn Exp	0	0	0	8	31	31	29	5.8	

Miller was described as a very good instructor, a real inspiration to pursue a career in chemistry. Students found class demos and Prep 101 extremely useful and helpful. The fireside chats were interesting and interactive and a good way to learn more about the current research in chemistry.

Instructor(s): V. Dong; D. Stephan

Enr: 104		Resp: 58						Retake: 92%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
<u>Dong:</u>									
Presents	0	0	0	1	22	31	43	6.2	
Explains	0	0	0	3	14	33	49	6.3	
Communicates	0	0	0	5	19	31	43	6.1	
Teaching	0	0	0	1	10	26	61	6.5	
<u>Stephan:</u>									
Presents	0	0	8	19	33	17	21	5.2	
Explains	0	0	14	17	22	28	17	5.2	
Communicates	0	0	5	18	27	27	20	5.4	
Teaching	0	0	5	21	19	35	19	5.4	
<u>Course:</u>									
Workload	0	1	3	35	24	31	3	4.9	
Difficulty	1	0	3	27	33	25	7	5.0	
Learn Exp	0	2	0	2	29	38	27	5.8	

Dong was described as an excellent instructor who showed a lot of enthusiasm and the students were involved in class discussions. Most students thought the idea of a tablet PC and the posting of notes after class was excellent.

Stephan was a good and approachable instructor. However some of the students felt that he should have shown more energy and enthusiasm. The lectures notes contained a lot of up-to-date research topics and they were not so well-organized.

The lectures were very interesting and the tutorials were useful in studying for the tests. Overall, the students really enjoyed the course.

CHM 217H1F Introduction to Analytical Chemistry

Instructor(s): D. Stone

Enr: 102		Resp: 69						Retake: 59%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	1	2	4	20	28	23	18	5.2	
Explains	1	1	2	16	27	30	38	5.9	
Communicates	1	0	1	5	22	30	38	5.9	
Teaching	0	0	2	10	27	42	16	5.6	
Workload	0	0	0	16	24	33	24	5.7	

32 CHEMISTRY

Difficulty	0	0	1	29	43	18	7	5.0
Learn Exp	0	2	6	34	30	14	14	4.9

Overall, students thought that the course was very useful and applicable to real life. The labs were time consuming, but related well to the course content. Stone was described as a very enthusiastic and good instructor. However, some students thought the course was taught at a fast pace.

CHM 220H1F Physical Chemistry for Life Sciences

Instructor(s): A. Dhirani

Enr: 435	Resp: 225							Retake: 26%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	5	4	14	30	28	11	4	4.2
Explains	4	5	18	30	22	11	6	4.2
Communicates	4	2	7	19	28	24	13	4.9
Teaching	4	5	10	28	28	18	5	4.5
Workload	2	1	12	53	17	6	5	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	27	36	19	14	5.2
Learn Exp	4	6	20	48	14	3	2	3.8

Overall students felt the instructor was enthusiastic, knowledgeable and patient in explaining difficult concepts, although some felt his explanations were somewhat unclear. The textbook was felt to be useless. The posted problems were thought to be insufficient and irrelevant in preparing students for the term tests which were too long and ambiguous.

CHM 221H1S Physical Chemistry: The Molecular Viewpoint

Instructor(s): R. Van Zon; J. Schofield

Enr: 49	Resp: 30							Retake: 28%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Van Zon:</u>								
Presents	6	6	16	23	26	10	10	4.3
Explains	3	10	23	30	20	6	6	4.0
Communicates	0	0	10	36	36	6	10	4.7
Teaching	3	0	23	23	30	6	13	4.5
<u>Schofield:</u>								
Presents	0	0	24	17	27	10	20	4.9
Explains	3	3	26	26	23	10	6	4.2
Communicates	0	0	10	40	40	30	60	4.6
Teaching	0	0	16	26	36	6	13	4.7
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	3	3	6	53	13	13	6	4.4
Difficulty	3	0	0	6	36	20	33	5.7
Learn Exp	4	8	30	30	17	0	8	3.8

Van Zon was described as enthusiastic and good at answering questions. Students felt he was at times a bit disorganized and spoke too quickly. Students would have appreciated a slower pace and more focus on the mathematics involved in the material.

Students generally liked Schofield as an instructor. They thought he was approachable, clear, and fairly organized. He sometimes moved through difficult material very quickly and had trouble explaining difficult concepts.

Students felt that the course was hard but rewarding. The problem sets were not highly relevant to the material on the test, and the text was not helpful. The students would have appreciated further explanation of the mathematics relevant to the material.

CHM 225Y1Y Introduction to Physical Chemistry

Instructor(s): R. Kapral

Enr: 57	Resp: 40							Retake: 65%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	7	25	47	20	5.8
Explains	0	0	7	5	23	43	20	5.6
Communicates	0	0	2	7	12	47	30	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	2	20	45	32	6.1
Workload	2	2	12	37	30	7	7	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	7	12	30	37	12	5.3

Learn Exp	0	0	0	27	27	34	10	5.3
-----------	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	-----

The instructor was well-liked, explained, the material clearly, and made the material interesting. However some felt there was too much theory and not enough practical applications of the material taught.

They would have preferred the course to have been more qualitative and less mathematical.

Instructor(s): J. Schofield; R. Van Zon

Enr: 52	Resp: 37							Retake: 46%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Schofield:</u>								
Presents	0	8	19	19	36	13	2	4.4
Explains	0	13	22	25	27	8	2	4.0
Communicates	2	5	16	27	22	19	5	4.4
Teaching	2	2	11	28	37	5	11	4.6
<u>Van Zon:</u>								
Presents	2	0	19	41	27	8	0	4.2
Explains	2	5	18	27	27	18	0	4.3
Communicates	2	0	16	22	30	22	5	4.7
Teaching	2	0	20	20	40	8	8	4.5
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	5	14	41	26	11	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	11	32	32	23	5.7
Learn Exp	0	4	12	33	20	20	8	4.7

Some students felt that the mathematical depth of the course material was too great and many felt the problem sets were too difficult.

Students felt Van Zon was somewhat unclear, but that he was always willing to help and always available to answer questions. He was well organized.

CHM 238Y1Y Introduction to Inorganic Chemistry

Instructor(s): G. Ozin

Enr: 79	Resp: 42							Retake: 42%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	4	14	26	21	24	7	4.7
Explains	2	4	14	26	26	12	12	4.6
Communicates	0	4	0	9	24	26	34	5.7
Teaching	0	2	4	24	39	17	12	5.0
Workload	0	0	2	21	12	39	24	5.6
Difficulty	0	0	2	17	29	41	9	5.4
Learn Exp	12	3	9	40	12	21	0	4.0

The students found Ozin to be an enthusiastic instructor who showed passion for the material. However some students felt he went too quickly over some of the subject, trying to cover too much in a limited time.

The course material was seen as challenging. Students would have appreciated if the examinations were more conceptual as opposed to rigorous memorization. The labs were very time consuming, with too much time spent on pre and post lab work.

CHM 247H1S Introductory Organic Chemistry II

Instructor(s): M. Winnik; J. Chin

Enr: 265	Resp: 171							Retake: 39%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Winnik:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	6	27	43	20	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	4	19	42	32	6.0
Communicates	1	0	0	3	15	27	51	6.2
Teaching	0	0	1	4	15	45	32	6.0
<u>Chin:</u>								
Presents	3	2	7	16	26	29	14	5.1
Explains	1	1	5	20	25	32	13	5.2
Communicates	1	1	4	21	26	25	19	5.2
Teaching	1	1	3	12	31	32	15	5.3
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	1	0	0	19	41	25	11	5.2
Difficulty	0	1	1	15	40	26	14	5.3
Learn Exp	3	3	3	39	34	13	2	4.5

Winnik was liked by his students and he was enthusiastic. Students appreciated the examples he provided to help the students understand the material.

Students liked Chin. However they would have liked him more if he had been more organized and slowed down. His notes could have been clearer.

Instructor(s): V. Dong

Enr: 265	Resp: 156							Retake: 39%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	1	0	2	8	19	35	32	5.8
Explains	0	0	1	11	20	31	33	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	10	23	34	30	5.8
Teaching	0	0	1	5	24	44	23	5.8
Workload	1	0	0	16	47	23	10	5.2
Difficulty	1	0	2	13	42	29	10	5.2
Learn Exp	3	2	5	43	30	12	2	4.4

Dong was described as an outstanding and helpful instructor. Her notes were always organized and clear.

Most students found the material valuable. However, the course load was relatively high and students would have appreciated more if the grading would have appreciated more if the grading of lab reports had been more consistent.

Instructor(s): V. Dong

Enr: 357	Resp: 133							Retake: 40%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	2	8	24	38	25	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	11	18	36	31	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	2	18	27	50	6.2
Teaching	0	0	2	5	21	45	24	5.8
Workload	0	0	0	27	28	22	21	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	15	38	23	23	5.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	34	36	22	6	5.0

Students felt that there was too much material to learn. Most students enjoyed Dong's lecturing style and said that she was helpful and organized.

Instructor(s): M. Winnik; J. Chin

Enr: 357	Resp: 133							Retake: 40%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Winnik:</u>								
Presents	0	0	2	8	24	38	25	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	11	1	36	31	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	2	18	27	50	6.2
Teaching	1	0	1	9	17	39	30	5.8
<u>Chin:</u>								
Presents	6	2	15	21	24	15	14	4.6
Explains	5	2	8	31	18	24	9	4.7
Communicates	3	1	4	24	24	26	14	5.0
Teaching	5	1	7	24	25	22	12	4.8
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	0	28	28	27	16	5.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	16	37	29	16	5.5
Learn Exp	0	0	2	43	31	17	4	4.8

Students felt that Winnik displayed enthusiasm, and was clear. They also appreciated his humour.

Some felt that Chin did not adequately explain and emphasize important concepts, but felt he was warm and approachable.

Many felt that the labs could have been better disorganized and that more time was needed for the tests.

Instructor(s): C. Kutas

Enr: 119	Resp: 35							Retake: 57%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	5	17	40	28	8	5.2
Explains	0	0	2	28	28	14	25	5.3

Communicates	2	0	2	25	28	25	14	5.1
Teaching	0	0	0	25	40	20	14	5.2
Workload	0	0	8	25	22	25	17	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	8	25	25	22	17	5.1
Learn Exp	3	0	7	26	42	11	7	4.7

The course was interesting, however, difficult. There were copious amounts of material covered. Time should have been allotted for the midterms.

The instructor showed a good understanding of the material - however, more examples of mechanisms should have been provided in class. She spoke too quickly at times making the material harder to follow.

CHM 249H1F Organic Chemistry

Instructor(s): M. Lautens

Enr: 65	Resp: 52							Retake: 81%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	3	11	32	25	26	5.6
Explains	0	0	1	5	19	30	42	6.1
Communicates	0	0	1	1	15	40	40	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	5	17	36	40	6.1
Workload	0	2	0	34	22	38	4	5.1
Difficulty	0	1	0	23	33	33	7	5.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	23	25	35	15	5.4

Most students thought Lautens was a fantastic instructor, very clear and easy to follow. Students enjoyed his old-fashioned teaching on the board rather than power point slides. Most students thought that he was approachable during office hours and there was not one question he could not answer.

Students really enjoyed the course. The tests were hard, but really emphasized the concepts learned in class. Most students really liked the oral exam, as it helped them explore other reactions in synthetic chemistry. The labs correlated well with the course material. Some of the students wanted more practice problems.

CHM 310H1S Environmental Chemistry

Instructor(s): S. Mabury

Enr: 71	Resp: 43							Retake: 75%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	2	14	38	33	11	5.4
Explains	0	0	0	9	26	42	21	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	2	7	9	80	6.7
Teaching	0	0	0	2	11	40	45	6.3
Workload	0	2	5	53	25	5	7	4.5
Difficulty	2	0	5	42	34	7	10	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	3	38	19	19	19	5.1

The instructor was extremely passionate about the material and students found it infectious. However he spoke too fast and hence become unclear at times.

The course was interesting, however, the test was too long. More examples provided in class would have been appreciated. The students really appreciated the fact that Mabury provided audio recordings of the lectures.

CHM 317H1S Introduction to Instrumental Methods of Analysis

Instructor(s): R. Jockusch

Enr: 58	Resp: 40							Retake: 48%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	2	2	5	20	27	32	10	5.1
Explains	2	0	5	23	28	23	15	5.1
Communicates	0	0	0	22	23	27	25	5.6
Teaching	0	2	2	20	20	40	15	5.4
Workload	0	0	2	15	17	32	32	5.8
Difficulty	0	0	5	30	32	20	12	5.1
Learn Exp	0	0	3	31	34	18	12	5.1

Jockusch was very approachable and helpful. She was enthusiastic

34 CHEMISTRY

about the course material. The material was presented well which was needed for difficult concepts.

The course was challenging but useful. The workload was high but helped in the preparation for exams. The lab component was difficult and students felt it should have been worth more of the course mark.

CHM 325H1S Introduction to Inorganic and Polymer Materials Chemistry

Instructor(s): G. Ozin

	Resp: 24							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	9	36	18	36	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	9	27	31	31	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	0	18	18	63	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	4	22	27	45	6.1
Workload	0	0	19	33	19	23	4	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	47	19	33	0	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	5	35	23	17	17	5.1

Students thought this was a great course and would have liked more lecture hours. Practice questions would have been appreciated.

Students found Ozin to be a valuable instructor who was interesting.

CHM 326H1F Introductory Quantum Mechanics and Spectroscopy

Instructor(s): S. Whittington

	Resp: 13							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	0	7	92	6.9
Explains	0	0	0	0	7	38	53	6.5
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	38	61	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	23	76	6.8
Workload	0	0	43	38	7	0	7	3.8
Difficulty	0	0	30	23	23	15	7	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	8	16	41	33	6.0

Whittington was described as a fantastic instructor, one of the best students had ever had. He conveyed enthusiasm to the class, and helped make difficult concepts clear.

The students felt this was a very good course made better by the excellent instructor. Some students felt that having "spectroscopy" in the course title was misleading, as none, was covered.

CHM 327H1S Experimental Physical Chemistry

Instructor(s): C. Goh

	Resp: 15							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	6	6	13	13	46	13	0	4.3
Explains	6	6	6	6	46	26	0	4.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	26	40	33	6.1
Teaching	6	6	6	13	20	40	6	4.8
Workload	6	0	33	53	6	0	0	3.5
Difficulty	0	0	28	50	21	0	0	3.9
Learn Exp	8	8	8	33	25	8	8	4.2

The lecturer was described as a friendly and helpful instructor who provided guidance and advice to the students.

CHM 328H1S Modern Physical Chemistry

Instructor(s): R. Van Zon; J. Schofield

	Resp: 22							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<u>Van Zon:</u>								
Presents	4	4	4	27	45	9	4	4.5
Explains	4	4	4	38	33	9	4	4.4
Communicates	0	0	0	31	36	27	4	5.0
Teaching	4	4	4	13	45	27	0	4.7

Schofield:

Presents	0	4	4	31	50	9	0	4.5
Explains	4	4	4	38	38	9	0	4.3
Communicates	0	0	4	33	42	14	4	4.8
Teaching	0	0	9	18	54	18	0	4.8
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	0	66	28	0	4	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	23	33	19	23	5.4
Learn Exp	10	10	10	47	21	0	10	4.1

Students felt that Van Zon was an effective teacher although sometimes he had trouble explaining difficult concepts.

Students said that they felt Schofield was approachable and friendly. Further explanations of the more challenging concepts was needed.

Most students felt the material was interesting but very challenging. Students did not like the grading scheme. The text was described as poor.

CHM 338H1F Intermediate Inorganic Chemistry

Instructor(s): D. Stephan

	Resp: 17							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	5	11	52	29	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	5	11	47	35	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	6	31	62	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	5	11	35	47	6.2
Workload	0	0	0	11	23	35	29	5.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	29	41	17	11	5.1
Learn Exp	14	0	0	14	28	42	0	4.7

Stephan was described as a very enthusiastic approachable instructor who made the lecture component of the course very enjoyable. His lecture notes were clear and easy to follow.

Most students found the lectures to be enjoyable. However the labs were generally viewed as difficult and many students wished the lab reports were less time-consuming.

CHM 342H1F Modern Organic Synthesis

Instructor(s): M. Taylor

	Resp: 39							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	5	23	33	38	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	5	20	38	35	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	7	15	25	51	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	5	17	33	43	6.2
Workload	2	0	5	31	34	15	10	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	23	42	28	5	5.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	21	32	25	21	5.5

Taylor was an enthusiastic instructor who shared his knowledge of organic chemistry with his students. He was passionate and his methods of evaluation were fair however some students found the tests to be too long.

CHM 343H1S Organic Synthesis Techniques

Instructor(s): A. Dicks; R. Batey

	Resp: 23							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<u>Dicks:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	4	13	56	26	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	4	30	39	26	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	4	17	60	17	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	4	17	47	30	6.0
<u>Batey:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	4	21	52	21	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	13	21	47	17	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	0	26	56	17	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	0	21	43	34	6.1
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	0	39	39	8	13	5.0

Difficulty	0	0	0	43	30	13	13	5.0
Learn Exp	0	0	5	35	5	41	11	5.2

Most students found the course to be a valuable learning experience. The lab component of the course was enjoyed by the students much. However, students would appreciate more time permitted for the tests. The course workload was high.

Dicks was appreciated by the students for his knowledge and guidance in the labs.

Batey was well-liked by the students.

CHM 347H1F Organic Chemistry of Biological Compounds

Instructor(s): M. Nitz

Enr: 61	Resp: 48							Retake: 57%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	6	26	33	33	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	6	15	50	28	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	4	25	34	36	6.0
Teaching	0	0	2	2	12	46	36	6.1
Workload	0	0	11	52	15	13	6	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	4	35	33	13	13	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	9	24	36	21	9	5.0

Most students found the instructor very enthusiastic and always prepared and organized for lectures. He was always available to answer questions from students after class and easily approachable for individual appointments.

Although many students found the course material interesting, they would have appreciated more time for tests and the exam. More examples could have been helpful to assist students in studying for tests.

CHM 348H1F Organic Reaction Mechanisms

Instructor(s): R. Kluger

Enr: 43	Resp: 27							Retake: 36%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	11	7	18	25	29	7	0	3.8
Explains	7	11	7	29	22	14	7	4.2
Communicates	3	0	7	18	22	29	18	5.2
Teaching	7	7	7	14	22	40	0	4.6
Workload	0	0	3	37	29	18	11	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	3	18	33	29	14	5.3
Learn Exp	4	8	8	34	26	17	0	4.2

Students generally found the course interesting but felt that the workload was heavier than average. Kluger was found to be unclear, and at times could not explain concepts or answer questions clearly. Several students commented that the computational labs required more organization and would have preferred that a different textbooks be assigned for the course.

CHM 379H1S Biomolecular Chemistry

Instructor(s): A. Woolley

Enr: 19	Resp: 10							Retake: 100%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	10	10	70	10	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	0	20	50	30	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	20	20	40	20	5.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	10	60	30	6.2
Workload	0	0	11	44	33	11	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	40	40	20	0	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	10	20	30	40	6.0

Students enjoyed the course very much and found the material very interesting and valuable. The labs provided the students with a good opportunity to understand biochemistry better. A few students found the workload high.

The lecturer was described as patient and approachable and students said that he taught with enthusiasm.

CHM 410H1F Analytical Environmental Chemistry

Instructor(s): J. D'eon

Enr: 24	Resp: 20							Retake: 94%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	40	30	30	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	0	30	40	30	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	0	10	40	50	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	0	25	45	30	6.1
Workload	0	0	0	20	35	35	10	5.3
Difficulty	5	0	15	45	25	10	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	11	38	33	16	5.6

Many students felt that D'eon was a very good teacher and hoped that she would stay on to teach the course in the future. She was described as an approachable, organized lecturer, who was very friendly.

Overall students were very positive about the course. The labs, while challenging were tied in nicely to the lecture material.

CHM 414H1F Biosensors and Chemical Sensors

Instructor(s): M. Thompson

Enr: 31	Resp: 20							Retake: 84%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	15	25	20	40	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	15	15	15	55	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	5	15	20	60	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	5	10	25	60	6.4
Workload	0	0	10	65	10	10	5	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	60	30	5	5	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	18	18	37	25	5.7

Most students found the instructor outstanding, and motivating. He was really enthusiastic about the course material and presented it very well.

Overall, students appreciated the interesting course material and found it to be a great course to take.

CHM 415H1S Atmospheric Chemistry

Instructor(s): J. Murphy

Enr: 51	Resp: 26							Retake: 71%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	12	20	40	28	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	20	32	32	16	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	12	8	36	44	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	0	20	56	24	6.0
Workload	0	0	0	40	40	16	4	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	45	29	16	8	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	0	26	46	26	6	5.2

Overall, students found the course to be interesting. Most students commended the instructor's teaching skills and fairness when evaluating his students. One major concern was the lack of problems solved in class, with many students requesting that the instructor should have done more calculations in class to help improve their understanding.

CHM 417H1S Instrumentation for Chemists

Instructor(s): A. Wheeler

Enr: 10	Resp: 6							Retake: 83%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	16	50	33	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	0	16	66	16	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	0	20	20	60	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	0	16	66	16	6.0
Workload	0	0	0	50	33	16	0	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	0	16	50	33	0	5.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	20	0	80	0	5.6

The instructor was described as very enthusiastic and organized. His teaching style highly motivated students to do well and made this course enjoyable.

36 CHEMISTRY

The course material was well presented and lots of examples were provided to help students understand it.

CHM 426H1S Polymer Chemistry

Instructor(s): M. Winnik

	Resp: 10							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	11	66	22	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	0	0	88	11	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	66	33	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	0	22	55	22	6.0
Workload	0	0	12	75	12	0	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	11	0	88	0	0	0	3.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	66	0	33	0	4.7

CHM 427H1F Statistical Mechanics

Instructor(s): R. Kapral

	Resp: 5							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	0	8	20	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	20	0	40	40	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	60	40	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	60	40	6.4
Workload	0	25	25	25	0	0	25	4.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	25	25	25	25	5.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	33	0	66	0	5.3

Kapral was very good at explaining difficult concepts. However, students felt that they were not well prepared coming into the course. A Summary given at the end of the course regarding important concepts would have been useful.

CHM 432H1F Organometallic Chemistry and Catalysis

Instructor(s): J. Powell

	Resp: 15							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	6	0	13	40	20	20	5.3
Explains	0	0	0	0	40	40	20	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	20	60	20	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	6	20	46	26	5.9
Workload	0	0	0	60	13	6	20	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	20	40	20	20	5.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	16	41	8	33	5.6

Overall students liked this course and the instructor. However, some students found the tests difficult.

CHM 434H1F Advanced Materials Chemistry

Instructor(s): G. Ozin

	Resp: 16							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	6	26	0	26	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	0	13	46	40	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	26	73	6.7
Teaching	0	0	0	0	18	37	43	6.2
Workload	0	0	0	14	50	28	7	5.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	21	42	28	7	5.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	30	50	20	5.9

Many students felt that Ozin was a wonderful instructor. He was enthusiastic and explained concepts thoroughly. Some students found that a solid background in material chemistry was not necessary as Ozin explained all concepts required in a clear manner and backed them up with many interesting examples.

CHM 437H1S Bioinorganic Chemistry

Instructor(s): R. Morris

	Resp: 14							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	42	33	21	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	0	42	35	21	5.8
Communicates	0	0	7	7	30	38	15	5.5
Teaching	0	0	0	7	35	28	28	5.8
Workload	0	0	21	42	7	21	7	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	57	7	28	7	4.8
Learn Exp	0	8	8	41	25	16	0	4.3

Students enjoyed Morris, however a few students would have appreciated if Morris covered the material with a little more enthusiasm. He was approachable and answered questions very well.

CHM 440H1F The Synthesis of Modern Pharmaceutical Agents

Instructor(s): A. Yudin

	Resp: 12							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	8	0	33	25	25	8	0	3.8
Explains	0	8	16	41	8	25	0	4.2
Communicates	0	0	8	16	33	33	8	5.2
Teaching	0	8	16	33	33	0	8	4.2
Workload	0	0	25	33	33	0	8	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	16	58	8	16	5.2
Learn Exp	0	11	44	22	11	11	0	3.7

Some students found the course load a little heavy and most remarked that a lot of emphasis was put on memorization. Most students found the course disorganized and would have liked if Yudin provided more feedback on exams.

CHM 441H1F Spectroscopic Analysis in organic Chemistry

Instructor(s): S. Skonieczny

	Resp: 23							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	17	26	30	26	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	8	34	21	34	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	8	34	26	30	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	4	13	56	26	6.0
Workload	0	0	0	42	31	15	10	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	4	61	28	4	0	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	26	6	46	20	5.6

Most students found the instructor well organized and approachable.

Overall students found the course material extremely useful although it could be challenging at times.

CHM 443H1S Physical Organic Chemistry

Instructor(s): M. Taylor

	Resp: 7							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	0	14	85	6.9
Explains	0	0	0	0	0	28	71	6.7
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	28	71	6.7
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	28	71	6.7
Workload	0	0	0	57	14	14	14	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	42	28	14	14	5.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	0	66	33	6.3

Students enjoyed the course material and felt that the computation assignments were very effective towards understanding the lecture material. They felt that the instructor was very clear and enthusiastic and his tests were fair.

CHM 447H1F Bio-organic Chemistry

Instructor(s): R. Kluger

Enr: 23

Resp: 21

Retake: 37%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	10	10	30	20	25	5	0	3.5
Explains	0	15	20	35	20	5	5	4.0
Communicates	5	0	5	10	30	15	35	5.4
Teaching	0	5	5	45	10	25	10	4.8
Workload	0	0	35	45	5	10	5	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	0	65	10	20	5	4.7
Learn Exp	18	0	6	43	18	6	6	3.9

Most students found the course to be quite interesting and praised Kluger on his enthusiasm. Overall, Kluger was a good instructor but some students felt that he spoke too quickly at times. They would have appreciated if he had spent more time on explaining some of the more difficult concepts. Also it was said that Klugar's teaching style and slides were a bit disorganized and hard to follow.

Project: Universal Minds - a volunteer tutoring program that sends UofT students into local highschools to tutor Maths, Sciences and English. To find out more, drop by the ASSU office - SS 1068.

CHM 479H1S Biological Chemistry

Instructor(s): M. Nitz; A. Woolley

Enr: 25

Resp: 18

Retake: 62%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Nitz:</u>								
Presents	0	0	5	16	22	38	16	5.4
Explains	0	0	5	0	38	38	16	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	16	16	38	27	5.8
Teaching	0	5	5	5	27	33	22	5.4
<u>Woolley:</u>								
Presents	0	0	11	11	35	29	11	5.2
Explains	0	0	5	0	44	33	16	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	27	33	11	27	5.7
Teaching	0	5	0	5	33	33	22	5.6
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	5	5	55	11	11	11	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	22	38	22	16	5.3
Learn Exp	0	7	14	21	35	14	7	4.6

Many students felt the course was interesting and enjoyable. It was well organized and the information was very useful. However, the material was challenging.

Students found Woolley was well organized, however, he could have spoken faster and with more enthusiasm. His lecture slides were very useful.

Most students found Nitz was enthusiastic and well organized. However his material was challenging. He communicated expectations and material very well.

