



Introduction

Geography is not maps, geographers study everything from economics to poverty to climate change to social stratification, transportation, housing and planning. Urban planners are ranked as among the professionals with the highest job satisfaction. Get started in geography with TUGS, the Toronto Undergraduate Geography Society (TUGS) - an academic course union for any student taking a geography course at the University of Toronto - St. George. TUGS also sits on a number of committees in the University of Toronto Geography and Planning Department.

As a member of ASSU, TUGS gets some of all those student fees you pay, so get involved, come out to events, meet students, faculty and professionals, learn new skills, provide feedback etc. and get some of your money back. TUGS also sells old midterms as study aids for \$1.00. Contact us at: tugs@geog.utoronto.ca or Sid Smith - Room 613 or visit our website at: <http://www.geog.utoronto.ca/associations/tugs>

TUGS Executive

GGR 100H1F Introduction to Physical Geography

Instructor(s): S. Finkelstein

Enr: 182	Resp: 97							Retake: 69%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	1	1	2	13	25	34	22	5.6
Explains	1	0	3	15	20	46	13	5.5
Communicates	1	2	2	13	20	35	25	5.6
Teaching	0	3	1	6	19	46	22	5.8
Workload	0	3	3	43	39	6	4	4.6
Difficulty	0	1	11	43	30	11	2	4.5
Learn Exp	5	2	6	32	34	13	5	4.5

Finkelstein was praised for her teaching style and friendly manner. Students also appreciated that she was available for individual consultation. However, this course received generally negative comments regarding the design and grading scheme.

Students felt it was too rushed as a half year course, material could not be well-conducted in the 1-hour lecture, and lab material was difficult. The writing assignments were criticized by many as unnecessary for 1st years. Due to the rushed nature of the course, and the large class size, students were grouped into 2 lab sessions that were one week apart. The later session apparently had their assignments due at the same time as the midterms and exam. Many suggested that it should have been a full year course. The field trip and overall course components were interesting.

GGR 101H1S Ancient Civilizations and their Environment

Instructor(s): S. Cowling

Enr: 247	Resp: 94							Retake: 60%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	3	7	19	19	25	17	7	4.4
Explains	3	2	14	17	33	19	9	4.7
Communicates	0	2	3	17	25	28	23	5.5
Teaching	5	8	5	18	35	19	6	4.6

Workload	2	3	19	66	6	2	0	3.8
Difficulty	0	3	14	51	19	9	2	4.2
Learn Exp	12	2	10	45	18	2	7	3.9

Students generally found this course unorganized and lacking structure. Many students felt that the tutorials were unrelated to the course material and only beneficial for students in the sciences. However, since this was the first time the course was taught, many students agreed that the course had much potential with a textbook and GGR 100 as a prerequisite.

GGR 107H1F Environment, Food and People

Instructor(s): S. Wakefield

Enr: 344	Resp: 103							Retake: 61%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	1	9	20	43	23	5.8
Explains	0	0	2	10	16	40	28	5.8
Communicates	0	0	1	2	11	31	50	6.2
Teaching	0	0	3	5	20	44	28	5.9
Workload	0	0	2	54	27	13	4	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	6	60	23	9	2	4.4
Learn Exp	0	7	2	39	28	12	9	4.7

Wakefield was an enthusiastic instructor and sparked the interest of students. She responded to emails promptly. The readings did not reflect what was learned in lecture. The requirements of the assignments were unclear and had little to do with the lectures. Tutorials seemed rushed, and TAs did not seem approachable.

There were a total of 3 assignments, and many felt that it was a little excessive for a half course. Because the assignments were cumulatively based one after the other, students wished they could have been returned with more feedback and in a more timely fashion.

GGR 124H1S Urbanization, Contemporary Cities and Urban Life

Instructor(s): D. Dupuy

Enr: 221	Resp: 80							Retake: 83%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	1	5	13	51	27	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	2	17	53	26	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	3	24	37	34	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	2	16	56	24	6.0
Workload	0	0	10	62	20	6	1	4.3
Difficulty	0	1	17	55	16	7	1	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	1	37	32	20	8	5.0

Dupuy was a very good instructor who was enthusiastic and very knowledgeable. Students thought tutorials were useless, and that TAs were unhelpful. They would have liked more constructive feedback on the assignments.

Two assignments and a midterm would have been preferred over having just three assignments. Readings could also have been assigned, as the lecture slides were seemingly over-simplistic.

Instructor(s): D. Cowen

Enr: 232	Resp: 93							Retake: 93%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	2	5	23	32	36	6.0
Explains	0	0	1	5	26	28	38	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	1	10	23	64	6.5
Teaching	0	0	1	4	6	44	43	6.2
Workload	0	1	2	58	28	8	1	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	4	80	10	3	1	4.2
Learn Exp	0	1	2	22	34	22	15	5.2

Cowen was described as very enthusiastic and knowledgeable. She sometimes spoke too quickly and went through the material too fast.

Students felt that the readings were too intensive and that economic concepts were not explained well enough considering it was a first year class. Students also felt that the course would be more appropriate as a full year class.

94 GEOGRAPHY

GGR 201H1S Geomorphology

Instructor(s): A. Brunton

Enr: 54	Resp: 26							Retake: 76%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	3	0	15	42	30	7	5.2
Explains	0	3	0	19	26	38	11	5.3
Communicates	0	0	0	11	23	42	23	5.8
Teaching	0	0	3	7	34	46	7	5.5
Workload	0	3	3	80	7	3	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	0	11	57	23	7	0	4.3
Learn Exp	0	4	0	66	19	4	4	4.3

Brunton was described as very passionate about the course material. Students enjoyed his lectures and felt he was knowledgeable, displaying a high level of experience in the field. However, some students would have preferred more specific requirements for the assignments.

Students enjoyed the field trip. Many students commented on the difficulty of the midterm. Also, the textbook was not required, but was a great reference for some of the theories.

GGR 203H1S Introduction to Climatology

Instructor(s): H. Harvey

Enr: 27	Resp: 15							Retake: 71%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	6	13	0	20	20	40	5.5
Explains	0	13	0	6	20	13	46	5.6
Communicates	0	6	0	0	13	13	66	6.3
Teaching	0	6	6	6	6	20	53	5.9
Workload	0	0	0	73	13	13	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	6	33	40	6	13	4.9
Learn Exp	0	9	0	18	9	27	36	5.5

Students thought that Harvey was a good instructor. They thought that the material was very challenging, albeit interesting. However, a significant amount of math was required. A course textbook might also have been helpful.

GGR 206H1F Introduction to Hydrology

Instructor(s): J. Chen

Enr: 64	Resp: 33							Retake: 65%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	3	3	6	15	36	27	9	5.0
Explains	6	6	9	6	31	25	15	4.9
Communicates	3	0	6	12	27	33	18	5.3
Teaching	6	3	3	12	36	30	9	5.0
Workload	0	3	9	68	18	0	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	6	6	53	28	0	6	4.3
Learn Exp	13	0	0	59	18	4	4	4.0

The level of math and physics should have been better explained for assignments and exams. Many students felt it was a positive learning experience nevertheless.

GGR 240H1F Historical Geography of North America

Instructor(s): M. Farish

Enr: 86	Resp: 64							Retake: 88%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	4	25	42	26	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	8	22	36	32	5.9
Communicates	0	0	1	3	11	39	44	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	1	12	48	37	6.2
Workload	0	0	3	82	11	3	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	4	77	15	1	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	2	28	24	24	20	5.3

Farish was described as enthusiastic, innovative and knowledgeable. Students appreciated his approachability and attentiveness to their questions.

Generally, students found the course material to be interesting. However, some students wished for more direction in the assignments. Overall, students found it to be a good course experience.

GGR 241H1F Historical Geographies of Urban Exclusion and Segregation

Instructor(s): R. Lewis

Enr: 127	Resp: 75							Retake: 88%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	2	6	33	31	25	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	4	26	44	25	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	2	12	36	48	6.3
Teaching	0	1	0	1	18	50	29	6.0
Workload	1	0	4	82	8	2	0	4.1
Difficulty	1	0	8	73	14	2	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	26	35	20	16	5.3

Students touted Lewis for his wealth of knowledge and humour. He was very thorough and communicated concepts well. However, some felt that he spoke too quickly.

Overall, students found the course material fascinating and enjoyable. Although, several students wished that Lewis had made his powerpoint slides available online. Nonetheless, most had a positive learning experience.

GGR 246H1S Geography of Canada

Instructor(s): K. Geddie

Enr: 168	Resp: 80							Retake: 60%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	1	3	21	43	23	6	5.0
Explains	0	0	8	25	22	35	7	5.1
Communicates	0	0	3	17	41	30	6	5.2
Teaching	0	1	3	20	41	26	6	5.1
Workload	0	1	7	82	7	1	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	1	8	80	7	2	0	4.0
Learn Exp	0	6	6	50	24	10	3	4.4

The instructor was knowledgeable but many students felt the lectures could have been better organized.

GGR 252H1S Marketing Geography

Instructor(s): J. Leydon

Enr: 472	Resp: 167							Retake: 75%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	1	5	15	23	33	21	5.5
Explains	0	0	1	11	21	39	25	5.7
Communicates	0	0	1	6	23	33	33	5.9
Teaching	0	0	2	9	22	40	24	5.7
Workload	1	1	14	64	12	3	3	4.1
Difficulty	1	6	14	64	7	6	0	3.9
Learn Exp	1	2	4	32	22	23	11	4.9

Leydon was an enthusiastic instructor with a great sense of humour. Many thought that the tutorials were useless. The TAs simply repeated what was on the assignment outlines, without stating what their expectations were.

GGR 254H1S Geography USA

Instructor(s): R. Lewis

Enr: 141	Resp: 67							Retake: 76%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	1	3	3	3	16	33	38	5.9
Explains	1	0	3	4	15	33	42	6.0
Communicates	0	1	0	7	5	22	62	6.4
Teaching	0	3	3	4	23	32	33	5.8
Workload	1	1	3	54	33	4	1	4.4
Difficulty	1	1	7	68	9	7	4	4.2
Learn Exp	3	3	5	27	25	18	14	4.8

Lewis was an enthusiastic lecturer. Students felt that he was very warm and welcoming especially with his sense of humour. Also, he was very attentive to their questions. Students felt that he was organized and put a lot of thought into preparing lecture material. However, Lewis had a tendency to rush through the material.

Some students felt that the assignments were too challenging and/or marked too harshly for a 2nd year level course. Some students suggested reducing the number of assignments and implementing a midterm. Also, students requested that the lecture slides be made accessible to all.

GGR 270H1F Introducing Analytical Methods

Instructor(s): D. Dupuy

Enr: 227	Resp: 154							Retake: 42%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	10	28	37	24	5.7
Explains	0	0	2	13	26	41	15	5.5
Communicates	0	0	2	11	36	32	17	5.5
Teaching	0	0	1	11	18	51	17	5.7
Workload	0	0	3	65	20	5	4	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	6	46	29	8	7	4.6
Learn Exp	1	1	5	46	25	16	2	4.5

Dupuy did a very good job communicating difficult and challenging concepts. Many found him to be well-organized and informative. However, some students wished that he had more time for personal consultation.

Many felt that the tutorials did not adequately prepare them for tests and assignments. Moreover, students requested that slides should have been available online and for a course website to have been set up. Furthermore, some felt that the textbook was not particularly useful. Also, some students felt that their assignments were not marked consistently and that marks were allotted arbitrarily at times. Overall, the course contained challenging material.

GGR 272H1F Geographic Information and Mapping I

Instructor(s): D. Boyes

Enr: 117	Resp: 72							Retake: 79%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	1	5	22	52	18	5.8
Explains	0	0	1	5	19	44	29	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	1	12	40	45	6.3
Teaching	0	0	1	2	19	50	26	6.0
Workload	0	0	2	53	26	15	1	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	4	47	37	9	1	4.6
Learn Exp	0	3	0	27	35	25	7	5.0

Students found Boyes to be informative and engaging. Overall, students were pleased with how he communicated course concepts to them. However, many felt the midterm did not accurately reflect what was taught in class. Also, there were mixed reviews regarding the textbook. Some students found the textbook useful, while several others found it difficult to absorb.

GGR 273H1S Geographic Information and Mapping II

Instructor(s): D. Boyes

Enr: 69	Resp: 44							Retake: 78%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	6	9	59	25	6.0
Explains	0	0	4	4	9	40	40	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	4	6	31	56	6.4
Teaching	0	0	2	4	9	43	40	6.2
Workload	0	0	0	41	34	18	4	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	29	51	14	4	5.0
Learn Exp	2	0	8	5	35	29	17	5.3

Boyes was extremely enthusiastic and knowledgeable about the course material. Students appreciated his ability to explain and demonstrate advanced GIS topics well. Students also noted that Boyes was very helpful outside of class hours.

However, students found some aspects of the course to be needing

improvement. Students found the midterm to be very narrow and overly specific. Also, students requested that the lecture slides be made available prior to class. Furthermore, many students felt that information key to the completion of course assignments was presented too close to the actual due date. Lastly, students felt that the textbook did not always reflect the lecture/test material.

GGR 301H1S Fluvial Geomorphology

Instructor(s): J. Desloges

Enr: 18	Resp: 16							Retake: 71%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	6	0	0	6	18	43	25	5.6
Explains	6	0	0	6	6	46	33	5.8
Communicates	6	0	0	6	0	53	33	5.9
Teaching	6	0	0	0	13	46	33	5.9
Workload	0	0	6	26	33	26	6	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	13	33	33	20	5.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	27	18	45	9	5.4

Desloges was a very knowledgeable instructor, making complex concepts easy to understand, interesting and accessible. However, many students felt the lectures were too fast, hard to follow at times and thus it didn't create the appropriate class room atmosphere for discussion and questions.

GGR 303H1F Climate-Biosphere Interactions

Instructor(s): S. Cowling

Enr: 57	Resp: 39							Retake: 85%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	2	2	7	13	39	21	13	5.0
Explains	0	2	5	18	23	34	15	5.3
Communicates	0	0	0	5	23	39	31	6.0
Teaching	0	5	2	13	28	31	18	5.3
Workload	0	0	28	63	7	0	0	3.8
Difficulty	0	2	10	65	15	5	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	6	3	44	24	10	10	4.6

As an instructor, Cowling was very informative and knowledgeable. Although some found it difficult to follow her at times, students appreciated her approachability and eagerness to help. Overall, students seemed to enjoy the course content, although some found the tests to be very challenging. Still, students reported it to be a good and interesting learning experience.

GGR 305H1S Biogeography

Instructor(s): S. Finkelstein

Enr: 82	Resp: 41							Retake: 81%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	4	21	46	26	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	5	20	55	20	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	5	20	45	30	6.0
Teaching	0	0	2	2	14	51	29	6.0
Workload	0	0	7	75	12	0	5	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	7	65	21	0	4	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	48	32	12	8	4.8

Students really enjoyed Finkelstein's enthusiasm, they felt overall she was clear, organized and approachable to questions. She was very knowledgeable on the topic, however, many felt the textbook was difficult, too detailed and didn't match well with the material taught in lectures - which focussed only on a few concepts.

Few also would have appreciated a lab or a small field trip.

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

GGR 314H1S Global Warming

Instructor(s): D. Harvey

	Resp: 54							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	3	1	5	20	37	18	12	4.9
Explains	3	0	3	20	38	18	14	5.1
Communicates	3	1	0	7	16	31	38	5.8
Teaching	5	3	5	13	37	16	16	4.9
Workload	0	0	1	16	33	24	24	5.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	22	27	24	25	5.5
Learn Exp	4	2	2	25	27	20	18	5.0

Harvey was described as a good lecturer having enthusiasm for the course material. Although students appreciated Harvey having high expectations for his students, many interpreted him to be demanding and strict.

Many students found the material to be extremely difficult. In fact, students were unhappy with the degree of difficulty on course tests. Some felt that there should have been recommended preparation courses as several students felt that they were lacking necessary background in physical/environmental sciences. Students felt that the course required significantly more effort and work in order to succeed compared to other courses at the 300-level.

GGR 323H1F Issues in Population Geography

Instructor(s): J. Leydon

	Resp: 88							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	2	9	20	39	28	5.8
Explains	0	0	1	2	13	39	44	6.2
Communicates	0	0	1	1	5	30	61	6.5
Teaching	0	0	1	1	14	41	41	6.2
Workload	0	0	5	80	9	2	1	4.1
Difficulty	0	1	9	74	8	4	2	4.1
Learn Exp	1	0	0	21	29	26	21	5.4

Students were greatly pleased with Leydon. Many found him to be enthusiastic and humorous. Also, students appreciated his approachability and willingness to help with assignments. However, he spoke too fast at times.

GGR 331H1F Resource and Environmental Theory

Instructor(s): C Hostovsky

	Resp: 36							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	2	2	5	27	27	27	5	4.8
Explains	2	0	0	20	34	25	17	5.3
Communicates	0	0	0	5	14	25	54	6.3
Teaching	0	0	5	16	30	27	19	5.4
Workload	0	0	5	82	8	2	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	16	72	11	0	0	3.9
Learn Exp	0	0	16	28	32	16	8	4.7

Hostovsky was described as an enthusiastic instructor. However, he went off topic at times, and because of this, some students felt that the course was somewhat disorganized. Overall, it was an interesting course.

GGR 332H1S Urban Waste Management

Instructor(s): C. Hostovsky

	Resp: 52							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	3	17	13	29	17	17	4.9
Explains	0	0	2	12	28	32	24	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	4	18	28	50	6.2
Teaching	0	4	4	16	18	30	26	5.5
Workload	0	4	2	76	10	8	0	4.2
Difficulty	2	2	10	74	10	2	0	3.9

Learn Exp	0	0	6	11	39	27	13	5.3
-----------	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	-----

Students described Hostovsky as interesting and engaging. They appreciated that the assignments were relevant and true to the spirit of the course material. Moreover, students were extremely appreciative of the course's field trip experience.

On the other hand, some students felt that some lectures were somewhat disorganized and lacking structure. Students also wish that there had been a Portal site set up for the course. Overall, it was a great learning experience.

GGR 334H1S Water Resource Management

Instructor(s): R. Verma

	Resp: 49							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	2	8	48	32	8	5.4
Explains	0	0	0	8	46	32	12	5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	10	18	28	42	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	6	34	46	12	5.7
Workload	0	2	10	75	10	0	2	4.0
Difficulty	0	4	12	75	6	0	2	3.9
Learn Exp	0	0	2	40	22	30	5	4.9

Verma was clearly enthusiastic about the material. She was a dedicated and committed instructor. Many liked how she brought in some personal experiences, highlighting the practicality of the course. However, many commented that it was difficult to attend class, since she read off the slides directly. A very enjoyable course, nonetheless.

GGR 335H1F Business and Environmental Change

Instructor(s): R. White

	Resp: 46							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	4	26	46	22	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	8	28	42	20	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	15	26	37	20	5.6
Teaching	0	0	0	8	28	42	20	5.7
Workload	0	0	2	86	6	4	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	6	56	8	8	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	2	18	42	28	7	5.2

Many students thought White was a knowledgeable and interesting instructor. Some described the course as career-inspiring and informative. However, many students would have appreciated earlier posting of notes, set office hours and more detailed instruction on assignments/final papers. Some students also suggested that the course could have covered more theoretical foundations and recent events. Despite these issues, students found the course valuable because it brought to them many new ideas and concepts.

GGR 336H1S Urban Historical Geography of North America

Instructor(s): R. Lewis

	Resp: 63							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	3	1	17	46	30	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	8	14	48	29	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	3	15	36	44	6.2
Teaching	0	0	1	6	14	52	25	5.9
Workload	0	0	6	66	23	3	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	1	1	74	17	4	0	4.2
Learn Exp	2	0	4	22	33	29	8	5.1

Most students cited Lewis as a good instructor. His dedication and passion for the course material was reflected in the presentation slides. He used several useful and vivid examples to explain course concepts. Overall, a job well done!

Students found the course material to be extremely interesting and relevant. However, some students felt the course assignments were difficult and at times unclear. Also, students would have liked for the presentation

slides to be made available. Overall, students appreciated the depth and coverage of the course.

GGR 337H1F Environmental Remote Sensing

Instructor(s): J. Chen

Enr: 21		Resp: 18						Retake: 55%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	17	17	17	35	11	5.1	
Explains	0	11	11	11	27	27	11	4.8	
Communicates	0	0	0	5	22	44	27	5.9	
Teaching	0	0	11	16	11	44	16	5.4	
Workload	0	0	11	27	38	16	5	4.8	
Difficulty	0	0	0	27	38	27	5	5.1	
Learn Exp	6	6	6	20	26	20	13	4.7	

The course was found to be challenging. The instructor's lecture slides did not explain the concepts clearly, as mathematical formulas were not given and explained to back up the numbers.

The course also appeared to assume basic knowledge of physics and advanced mathematics, which were not prerequisites listed in the calendar. Labs could have been better put to use by teaching students how to use the program for remote sensing. Students would have liked more tutorials to discuss assignments.

GGR 339H1S Urban Geography, Planning and Political Processes

Instructor(s): D. Cowen

Enr: 88		Resp: 52						Retake: 77%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	3	5	25	38	26	5.8	
Explains	0	0	0	9	13	41	35	6.0	
Communicates	0	0	0	1	13	25	59	6.4	
Teaching	0	0	0	5	23	31	39	6.0	
Workload	0	0	0	81	14	2	2	4.2	
Difficulty	0	2	2	65	24	4	2	4.3	
Learn Exp	0	0	0	22	19	25	32	5.7	

Students commended Cowen on her lecturing style and ability. Most found her to be very enthusiastic and insightful. However, a few felt that she spoke too fast at times and was difficult to follow.

Some students felt that the lectures were overloaded with information and concepts. Some requested that there be extended class hours or tutorials. Also, many had mixed reviews on the course's use of group projects. While many enjoyed the experience, some felt it was no cohesive to such a large class.

GGR 360H1S Culture, History and Landscape

Instructor(s): M. Farish

Enr: 60		Resp: 43						Retake: 89%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	0	2	21	42	33	6.1	
Explains	0	0	0	4	11	45	38	6.2	
Communicates	0	0	0	0	14	39	46	6.3	
Teaching	0	0	0	2	7	64	26	6.1	
Workload	0	0	2	85	9	2	0	4.1	
Difficulty	0	0	2	83	11	2	0	4.1	
Learn Exp	0	0	0	31	34	25	9	5.1	

Many students found the course to be extremely enjoyable, citing the instructor's enthusiasm for the material and his sense of humour. He communicated effectively with ample examples, some of them drawing from his personal experience. Some students felt that the assignments were vague and needed more guidelines. Overall, the course was a positive experience and highly recommended.

GGR 361H1S Understanding the Urban Landscape

Instructor(s): S. Mukherjee

Enr: 80		Resp: 46						Retake: 64%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	2	0	15	20	28	26	6	4.8	
Explains	2	2	8	26	26	15	17	4.9	
Communicates	0	4	0	15	33	33	13	5.3	
Teaching	2	2	4	26	35	20	8	4.9	
Workload	0	4	0	48	18	18	9	4.7	
Difficulty	0	2	0	68	24	4	0	4.3	
Learn Exp	6	3	6	45	22	9	6	4.3	

Students felt despite the genuineness of Mukherjee, her lecture and teaching style did not effectively engage students. Also, the readings were too long. Class discussions took up too much time and was more conducive to arguments and conflicting ideas from students.

GGR 366H1S Historical Toronto

Instructor(s): G. Gad

Enr: 53		Resp: 33						Retake: 87%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	0	6	18	46	28	6.0	
Explains	0	0	0	3	21	51	24	6.3	
Communicates	0	0	0	3	9	30	57	5.5	
Teaching	0	0	0	3	15	48	33	6.1	
Workload	0	0	6	60	27	3	3	4.4	
Difficulty	0	0	12	71	12	3	0	4.1	
Learn Exp	0	0	3	19	30	30	15	5.3	

Gad was a fantastic instructor. He was enthusiastic and the learning experience was very good. Many thoroughly enjoyed the class.

Many students thought that the assignments were long and tedious, but valuable. However, they thought that using only the textbooks as sources was restrictive. Also, posting the lectures notes online would have been helpful.

GGR 373H1F Advanced Geographic Information Systems

Instructor(s): D. Boyes

Enr: 35		Resp: 29						Retake: 96%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	0	0	13	37	48	6.3	
Explains	0	0	0	0	20	41	37	6.2	
Communicates	0	0	0	0	6	37	55	6.5	
Teaching	0	0	0	0	3	44	51	6.5	
Workload	0	3	0	25	39	21	10	5.1	
Difficulty	0	0	3	35	32	21	7	4.9	
Learn Exp	0	0	0	4	27	45	22	5.9	

Boyes was very enthusiastic as an instructor and he communicated the course content extremely well. Students appreciated his ability to help students understand difficult concepts better. However, some students complained about the length and difficulty of the lab assignments. Overall, students highly recommended the course.

GGR 390H1F Field Methods

Instructor(s): J. Desloges; S. Finkelstein

Enr: 15		Resp: 15						Retake: 93%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
<u>Desloges:</u>									
Presents	0	0	0	6	6	26	60	6.4	
Explains	0	0	0	6	13	26	53	6.3	
Communicates	0	0	0	0	6	13	80	6.7	
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	33	66	6.7	
<u>Finkelstein:</u>									
Presents	0	0	0	6	6	26	60	6.4	
Explains	0	0	0	6	0	26	66	6.5	
Communicates	0	0	0	0	6	6	86	6.8	
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	20	80	6.8	

Course:

Workload	6	0	6	20	20	26	20	5.1
Difficulty	0	0	0	13	53	20	13	5.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	13	20	66	6.5

Students found the instructors to be very enthusiastic and knowledgeable. Students also appreciated their guidance and interaction with students throughout the course. With regards to the course, many found the workload overwhelming and more suited to a full year course. Nonetheless, students appreciated the intimate setting of the class and highly recommended it.

GGR 403H1S Global Ecology and Biogeochemical Cycles

Instructor(s): S. Cowling

	Resp: 11							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Enr: 22								Retake: 90%
Presents	0	9	0	0	9	54	27	5.8
Explains	0	9	0	0	9	45	36	5.9
Communicates	0	0	9	0	0	9	81	6.5
Teaching	0	9	0	0	9	18	63	6.2
Workload	0	0	27	45	27	0	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	0	36	45	18	0	0	3.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	28	14	28	28	5.6

The majority of students really enjoyed Cowling's course, her knowledge, enthusiasm and encouragement. They also enjoyed the flexibility of the class and its topics. However, some would have appreciated some formal lectures at the beginning.

GGR 413H1S Watershed Hydroecology

Instructor(s): J. Chen

	Resp: 7							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Enr: 9								Retake: 66%
Presents	0	0	0	0	14	57	28	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	0	28	57	14	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	0	14	42	42	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	85	14	6.1
Workload	0	0	0	14	28	57	0	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	14	28	42	14	5.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	25	0	50	25	5.8

GGR 415H1S Resource and Environmental Planning

Instructor(s): C. Hostovsky

	Resp: 26							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Enr: 31								Retake: 95%
Presents	0	0	7	11	42	26	11	5.2
Explains	0	0	0	0	42	26	30	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	0	19	30	50	6.3
Teaching	0	0	3	3	38	23	30	5.7
Workload	0	0	7	92	0	0	0	3.9
Difficulty	0	0	11	84	3	0	0	3.9
Learn Exp	0	0	0	45	18	22	13	5.0

Students enjoyed Hostovsky's class thoroughly. They especially liked the course assignment which were seen as innovative, informative and relevant. Many students were past students of Hostovsky and touted his engaging and informative teaching methods. Some students however, noted that he could be repetitive at times in both lecture material and lecture slides.

GGR 431H1S Regional Dynamics

Instructor(s): G. Spencer

	Resp: 11							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Enr: 24								Retake: 90%
Presents	0	0	0	0	18	54	27	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	0	27	54	18	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	27	18	45	9	5.4
Teaching	0	0	0	0	27	63	9	5.8

Workload	0	0	0	70	10	20	0	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	60	30	10	0	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	44	33	11	11	4.9

Students found Spencer to be very approachable to questions and discussions. He was able to make dry material interesting, making good use of examples and explaining concepts clearly.

Overall, a good course, but some students felt smaller assignments or a larger break up of marks would have been appreciated.

GGR 439H1F Global Political Geography

Instructor(s): J. Leydon

	Resp: 24							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Enr: 32								Retake: 78%
Presents	0	8	12	4	33	29	12	5.0
Explains	0	0	4	8	26	34	26	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	4	8	50	37	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	4	8	34	52	6.3
Workload	0	0	0	34	43	17	4	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	47	39	8	4	4.7
Learn Exp	0	5	0	21	31	31	10	5.2

The response for Leydon's teaching was generally very positive. Many praised him as being enthusiastic and recommended his course. Leydon was described as a very good, passionate and helpful in and out of lectures.

Students enjoyed the seminar format of this course. Although some suggested that lecture material could have been better organized.

GGR 451H1F Health and Place

Instructor(s): S. Wakefield

	Resp: 21							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Enr: 27								Retake: 85%
Presents	0	0	0	0	23	57	19	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	0	19	57	23	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	0	4	47	47	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	0	14	66	19	6.0
Workload	0	5	10	63	15	5	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	5	5	75	15	0	0	4.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	37	43	6	12	4.9

Wakefield was described as down to earth, helpful and good at answering students' questions. However, a few students suggested that there should have been more diversity in assignments (for examples, more health issues). As well, some thought the assignments could have been graded in a shorter period of time. Overall, most students found this course enjoyable, and the instructor easy to understand.

GGR 452H1F Space, Power, Geography: Understanding Spatiality

Instructor(s): S. Ruddick

	Resp: 11							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Enr: 19								Retake: 81%
Presents	0	0	9	36	27	27	0	4.7
Explains	0	0	0	18	45	9	27	5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	0	45	36	18	5.7
Teaching	0	0	0	0	45	54	0	5.5
Workload	0	0	0	36	9	54	0	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	18	36	36	9	5.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	12	25	37	25	5.8

The course was described as insightful and thought-provoking. The instructor really engaged students. It was suggested that the instructor could have prescribed questions to facilitate the assimilation of information from the readings, as they were quite long and dense. This could also have benefitted class participation.

GGR 462H1S GIS Research Project

Instructor(s): D. Boyes

Enr: 15	Resp: 15							Retake: 71%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	13	33	53	6.4
Explains	0	0	0	0	6	53	40	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	13	26	60	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	40	60	6.6
Workload	0	6	0	0	13	60	20	5.8
Difficulty	0	6	0	33	40	20	0	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	8	16	33	41	6.1

Students, overall, enjoyed the great deal of technical skills and practical experiences they gained out of the course. There were some concerns about the workload, however. Overall, the experience was good and the instructor was effective and knowledgeable.

GGR 473H1F Cartographic Design

Instructor(s): J. Pisek

Enr: 25	Resp: 13							Retake: 91%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	7	23	38	30	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	7	38	23	30	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	15	38	46	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	0	7	61	30	6.2
Workload	0	0	0	30	53	15	0	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	23	53	15	7	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	36	36	27	5.9

Pisek was described as enthusiastic, approachable and understanding by almost all students. The students thought that the assignments were valuable and practical. Some suggested that extra lab hours would have been appreciated. Students would also have liked more real-life data in their practice.

Overall, most commented that the course was a positive learning experience.

