Cell & Systems Biology Students' Union

Introduction

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): D. Dansereau

Enr: 161		Resp: 105				Retake: 55%		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	3	6	20	44	24	5.8
Explains	0	0	4	6	25	43	20	5.7
Communicates	1	0	0	9	17	36	34	5.9
Teaching	0	0	1	5	24	40	25	5.7
Workload	0	0	1	30	34	24	7	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	1	37	32	24	3	4.9
Learn Exp	1	2	3	42	22	19	8	4.7

Students thought Dansereau was a good lecturer who explained concepts clearly, but at times spoke too slowly. In general, students thought there was too much material and thought 2 term tests as opposed to a midterm and final exam would have been a better means of evaluation. Overall, students thought the readings were excessive but helpful in clarifying lecture material. Labs were thought to complement the lectures well.

Instructor(s): D. Dansereau; B. Chang

Enr: 955		Resp: 802				Retake: 51%		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Dansereau:								
Presents	1	1	5	16	30	30	14	5.2
Explains	0	0	2	14	33	32	15	5.4
Communicates	0	0	2	11	25	37	22	5.6
Teaching	1	1	1	14	35	32	13	5.3
Chang:								
Presents	2	2	9	19	33	24	8	4.9
Explains	2	3	9	24	30	23	6	4.8
Communicates	1	1	3	21	30	27	13	5.2
Teaching	2	1	7	20	35	23	8	4.9
Course:								
Workload	0	0	0	37	35	17	8	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	2	36	36	16	6	4.9
Learn Exp	1	2	7	43	25	14	6	4.6

Overall, students found that the course load, in particular the readings, was too much work.   Tests did not reflect what was taught in class and many students commented that they disliked having a cumulative exam. Conversely, students found the labs to be extremely helpful and they supplemented the lectures well.

Dansereau had slides which were disorganized, but was able to present the material clearly. Students commented that they enjoyed the experiments he presented to clarify the concepts. Some commented that he spoke too fast.

Students thought that Chang was a fair lecturer, however, her slides were too basic and often she went off track and did not focus on the core concepts.

BIO 241H1S Cell and Developmental Biology

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

Enr: 890		Resp: 724				Retake: 55%		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Desveaux:								
Presents	0	0	0	6	21	38	32	5.9
Explains	0	0	1	7	22	39	29	5.9
Communicates	0	0	1	8	25	36	27	5.8
Teaching	0	0	1	7	25	37	28	5.9
Harris:								
Presents	0	0	0	9	31	38	20	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	8	30	38	21	5.7
Communicates	0	0	1	10	32	36	18	5.6
Teaching	0	0	1	7	34	37	19	5.7
Course:								
Workload	0	0	3	46	34	10	3	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	3	40	36	15	3	4.7
Learn Exp	0	1	4	44	29	13	6	4.6

Students found Desveaux open, friendly and approachable. He was well-organized and students felt he put a lot of effort into his lectures. Students appreciated his detailed slides and found him engaging as well.

Harris was also well-liked by students. He gave good examples during lectures, and was articulate and knowledgeable. Some students said they would have appreciated some more details on his slides.

Students did not feel the evaluation methods accurately reflected what they learnt. Students also asked for more wet labs and seemed to think the tutorials were unhelpful.

BIO 255Y1Y Cell and Molecular Biology with Advanced Laboratory

Instructor(s): D. Dansereau

Enr: 11		Resp: 8				Retake: 87%		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	37	50	12	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	0	37	50	12	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	12	50	37	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	0	25	62	12	5.7
Workload	0	0	0	75	12	12	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	12	50	25	12	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	14	28	57	0	5.4

Students thought Dansereau was a good lecturer who was very laid back. Sometimes they wished he would have better specified which points were important.

Students commented that the lab portion was excellent and complemented the lecture material well.

Instructor(s): B. Chang; D. Dansereau

Enr: 18		Resp: 16				Retake: 81%		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Chang:								
Presents	0	0	12	12	18	31	25	5.4
Explains	0	0	12	6	31	31	18	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	6	18	56	18	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	6	37	31	25	5.8
Dansereau:								
Presents	0	0	0	0	18	37	43	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	0	18	37	43	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	0	12	25	62	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	0	25	18	56	6.3
Course:								
Workload	0	0	0	43	25	25	6	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	43	43	6	6	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	7	14	42	35	6.1

Students enjoyed the lecture material although some thought the fill-in-the-blanks lecture slides made it difficult for those who had to miss a lecture. The labs were described as excellent, however, some commented that the lab time was very inconvenient.

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

Enr: 18		Resp: 6					Retake: 83%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Desveaux:								
Presents	0	0	0	16	0	16	66	6.3
Explains	0	0	0	0	16	16	66	6.5
Communicates	0	0	16	0	33	50	0	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	0	16	33	50	6.3
Harris:								
Presents	0	0	16	0	16	33	33	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	0	16	33	50	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	33	50	16	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	0	16	66	16	6.0
Course:								
Workload	0	0	0	50	33	16	0	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	0	16	66	16	0	5.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	40	40	20	5.8

BIO 260H1S Concepts in Genetics

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

Enr: 86		Resp: 50					Retake: 44%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Guttman:								
Presents	2	2	4	18	22	32	18	5.3
Explains	2	0	6	14	29	35	12	5.2
Communicates	0	0	0	6	20	43	26	5.9
Teaching	0	2	2	14	25	43	12	5.4
McCourt:								
Presents	6	4	10	20	76	20	14	4.7
Explains	2	0	2	12	30	30	22	5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	6	22	40	32	6.0
Teaching	0	2	4	24	20	32	18	5.3
Course:								
Workload	0	0	4	36	31	21	6	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	2	12	35	29	20	5.5
Learn Exp	2	0	4	38	26	21	7	4.8

Students thought that Guttman was very professional and lectured well. Students found his lecture slides informative.

Students thought the course was interesting but difficult and a lot of work. The tutorials were helpful, however, the assignments were often vague and difficult.

BIO 270H1F Animal Physiology

Instructor(s): D. Lovejoy

Enr: 501		Resp: 65					Retake: 55%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	3	0	7	9	38	26	14	5.2
Explains	6	0	4	17	31	23	17	5.1
Communicates	1	1	9	6	25	32	23	5.4
Teaching	6	1	4	6	30	33	16	5.2
Workload	0	1	9	66	19	3	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	3	11	61	14	7	1	4.2
Learn Exp	2	4	10	44	21	12	4	4.3

Lovejoy was described as enthusiastic and students appreciated the examples he used to clarify the material. The labs complemented the material well and were fun to perform. The only critique was that the first lab seemed out of place and really had nothing to do with the course material.

BIO 271H1S Animal Physiology II

Instructor(s): M. Woodin

Enr: 479		Resp: 56					Retake: 59%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	12	17	50	19	5.8
Explains	0	1	0	12	16	53	16	5.7
Communicates	0	0	3	8	19	44	23	5.8
Teaching	0	0	3	10	21	44	19	5.7
Workload	0	0	12	69	16	1	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	8	80	7	3	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	4	10	66	10	6	2	4.1

Students, overall, felt that Woodin was an excellent lecturer who explained the concepts clearly and precisely. Many people also thought he used his class time well, and that his tests were evaluated in a fair manner.

Overall, the course was interesting, yet too broad. Students thought that the vidoes helped clear up the details of concepts presented in class. However, lab reports were marked too strictly.

CSB 200Y1Y Current Topics in Molecular Biology

Instructor(s): A. Bruce

Enr: 51		Resp: 23					Retake: 90%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	17	8	47	36	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	17	17	43	21	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	4	8	26	60	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	8	13	26	52	6.2
Workload	4	0	28	66	0	0	0	3.6
Difficulty	0	4	18	68	9	0	0	3.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	31	25	21	12	5.2

Bruce was described as a very enthusiastic and understanding instructor. She was always eager to help and explained things well. Her enthusiasm for the course material made learning very enjoyable.

Overall, students with no background in science found this course to be interesting and applicable.

CSB 327H1F Extracellular Matrix Biology and Associated Pathologies

Instructor(s): M. Ringuette

Enr: 228		Resp: 76					Retake: 67%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	4	1	5	18	22	26	2	5.2
Explains	3	0	10	10	28	27	18	5.2
Communicates	0	1	0	5	25	34	33	5.9
Teaching	0	1	4	14	24	33	22	5.5
Workload	0	0	1	50	25	19	4	4.8
Difficulty	1	0	5	36	35	13	6	4.7
Learn Exp	3	3	3	31	29	15	11	4.7

Ringuette was described as fair, enthusiastic, approachable and helpful. Some commented he sometimes was difficult to hear, and sometimes was a bit disorganized.

The course content was described as interesting and covered a wide array of topics at an advanced level. The tests were generally thought to be fair.

CSB 328H1F Developmental Biology

Instructor(s): D. Dansereau; D. Godt

Enr: 40		Resp: 32					Retake: 81%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Dansereau:								
Presents	0	0	0	9	43	25	21	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	6	28	34	31	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	9	21	34	34	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	6	31	34	28	5.8
Godt:								
Presents	0	0	3	6	43	28	18	5.5

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Explains	0	0	0	6	37	34	21	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	9	25	37	28	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	9	35	35	19	5.6
Course:								
Workload	0	0	3	68	18	3	6	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	9	53	28	6	3	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	8	44	24	12	12	4.8

Overall, students really enjoyed this course. Students liked the use of the chalkboard alongside the powerpoint slides. Both instructors took their time to explain concepts thoroughly. Students thought that the test was fair, however, many thought the tutorials could have been more engaging.

CSB 330H1S Techniques in Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology

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

Enr: 16   Resp: 14   Retake: 83%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Bruce:								
Presents	0	0	7	14	21	28	28	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	21	21	14	42	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	14	28	28	28	5.7
Teaching	0	0	0	7	35	21	35	5.9
Harris:								
Presents	0	0	0	7	14	50	28	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	7	28	28	35	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	0	28	28	42	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	0	28	28	42	6.1
Course:								
Workload	0	0	0	46	38	15	0	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	0	61	38	0	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	16	25	41	16	5.6

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

Instructor(s): M. Ringuette

Enr: 199   Resp: 96   Retake: 71%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	1	1	4	6	31	30	26	5.6
Explains	1	0	5	8	20	40	25	5.7
Communicates	0	0	1	4	17	27	50	6.2
Teaching	0	1	1	5	20	38	33	5.9
Workload	0	1	4	63	23	7	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	1	4	45	31	15	3	4.6
Learn Exp	0	1	4	32	32	16	12	5.0

Students thought that Ringuette was a good lecturer who was very approachable, although some felt that he could be hard to follow at times.

Students thought the exams were very reflective of the course material and very fair. Students enjoyed the 2% bonus for the clicker questions, as it was incentive to attend classes and focus on the lectures.

CSB 332H1S Neurobiology of the Synapse

Instructor(s): M. Woodin

Enr: 387   Resp: 75   Retake: 78%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	8	26	41	24	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	5	27	39	28	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	1	22	37	38	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	9	22	44	24	5.8
Workload	0	2	15	67	15	0	0	3.9
Difficulty	0	2	8	67	18	2	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	4	42	34	14	3	4.7

The students found Woodin to be a good and enthusiastic instructor. Some students said it was hard to get a hold of the instructor after lectures.

Overall, people enjoyed the course but complained about the method of evaluation. Students felt that they were tested on very small details instead of the concepts. Students did not find the Nervework software to be useful.

CSB 340H1F Plant Development

Instructor(s): T. Berleth

Enr: 31   Resp: 8   Retake: 50%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	12	12	37	25	12	5.1
Explains	0	0	0	37	12	25	25	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	12	25	25	37	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	25	12	37	25	5.6
Workload	0	0	0	50	25	25	0	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	50	37	0	12	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	16	33	16	33	0	4.7

CSB 343H1F Animal Energetics

Instructor(s): R. Stephenson

Enr: 152   Resp: 37   Retake: 67%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	8	13	30	36	11	5.3
Explains	0	0	5	5	27	36	25	5.7
Communicates	0	0	8	16	16	44	13	5.4
Teaching	0	2	0	11	27	38	19	5.6
Workload	0	5	8	61	13	11	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	19	55	11	13	0	4.2
Learn Exp	6	0	3	40	33	13	3	4.5

Stephenson was described as a good lecturer who used excellent examples to describe concepts. He also explained things well and talked clearly and slowly. He was very approachable and was available to answer students' questions. However, some complained that he went over general concepts too quickly.

Many students agreed that the multiple choice questions asked on the tests were very tricky. However, students liked the idea of having the tests be best 2/3 for their final mark. Overall, the course was deemed fair for a 300-level series course.

CSB 346H1S Neurobiology of Respiration

Instructor(s): J. Peever

Enr: 238   Resp: 83   Retake: 82%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	7	12	31	32	15	5.4
Explains	0	0	3	13	30	37	14	5.5
Communicates	0	0	1	8	30	34	25	5.7
Teaching	0	0	2	7	31	43	14	5.6
Workload	0	0	7	65	19	3	3	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	1	52	34	9	2	4.6
Learn Exp	0	1	0	50	27	12	7	4.7

Students found Peever to be a good lecturer who had a good sense of humour. Students thought he did an excellent job explaining things.

There was concern with lecture slides being too wordy, and frequently slides were skipped but still testable. Students thought the test was fair, but assignments did not test understanding but how well students could find obscure facts in a lengthy scientific paper.

CSB 347H1S Comparative Cellular Physiology

Instructor(s): L. Buck

Enr: 196   Resp: 71   Retake: 63%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	4	28	35	20	11	5.1
Explains	0	0	5	27	30	24	12	5.1
Communicates	0	0	1	12	27	37	21	5.6
Teaching	0	0	2	12	32	37	14	5.5
Workload	0	0	10	68	18	2	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	2	65	23	7	1	3.4
Learn Exp	1	1	3	53	25	7	5	4.4

Students thought Buck was a very good instructor who presented his material in a well-organized and well thought-out manner. He was also very approachable and friendly if students wanted to seek help.

In general, the course was well structured and tests were fair. Many students recommended this course because the material presented was useful.

CSB 349H1F Eukaryotic Gene Expression

Instructor(s): V. Tropepe; A. Moses

Enr: 193 | | | Resp: 148 | | | | Retake: 41%
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean
Tropepe: | | | | | | | |
Presents | 0 | 0 | 2 | 20 | 19 | 39 | 16 | 5.5
Explains | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 31 | 31 | 16 | 5.4
Communicates | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 20 | 37 | 23 | 5.6
Teaching | 0 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 22 | 40 | 20 | 5.6
Moses: | | | | | | | |
Presents | 0 | 3 | 5 | 22 | 28 | 32 | 6 | 5.0
Explains | 1 | 3 | 5 | 25 | 30 | 25 | 8 | 4.9
Communicates | 0 | 3 | 2 | 18 | 24 | 31 | 18 | 5.3
Teaching | 0 | 2 | 7 | 18 | 28 | 31 | 10 | 5.1
Course: | | | | | | | |
Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 27 | 28 | 28 | 5.7
Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 32 | 31 | 19 | 5.5
Learn Exp | 2 | 4 | 8 | 29 | 30 | 14 | 10 | 4.6

Students thought that both instructors did a good job at conveying the material, and most described topics covered as interesting and relevant. However, the majority of students warned that the workload or difficulty of this course was extremely high in comparison to other third year courses. The term test was incredibly difficult and required a great deal of critical thinking. Many stated that the test did not reflect the material presented in lectures and suggested that a greater emphasis be placed on molecular techniques during lectures.

Generally students did not enjoy tutorials and described them as intense and quite stressful. Often there was not enough time to complete assignments, and some complained disparity between TA marking. Many students thought that the final PBL (problem based learning) project required a lot of work and did not reflect its weight in the final grade.

CSB 350H1S Laboratory in Molecular Plant Biology

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

Enr: 42 | | | Resp: 25 | | | | Retake: 95%
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean
Christendat: | | | | | | | |
Presents | 0 | 0 | 4 | 20 | 29 | 37 | 8 | 5.2
Explains | 0 | 0 | 4 | 20 | 20 | 41 | 12 | 5.4
Communicates | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 16 | 52 | 28 | 6.0
Teaching | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 36 | 44 | 12 | 5.5
Neumann: | | | | | | | |
Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 25 | 50 | 16 | 5.8
Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 29 | 45 | 16 | 5.7
Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 20 | 52 | 20 | 5.8
Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 28 | 56 | 12 | 5.8
Course: | | | | | | | |
Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 28 | 24 | 12 | 5.1
Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 12 | 52 | 16 | 16 | 4 | 4.5
Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 40 | 20 | 5.6

CSB 352H1S Bioinformatic Methods

Instructor(s): N. Provart

Enr: 80 | | | Resp: 52 | | | | Retake: 78%
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean
Presents | 0 | 0 | 3 | 25 | 21 | 33 | 17 | 5.3
Explains | 1 | 0 | 9 | 23 | 28 | 26 | 9 | 5.6
Communicates | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 28 | 34 | 19 | 5.5
Teaching | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 39 | 37 | 13 | 5.5
Workload | 0 | 13 | 55 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 4.3
Difficulty | 0 | 3 | 5 | 50 | 30 | 9 | 0 | 4.4

Learn Exp | | 2 | 2 | 8 | 33 | 20 | 22 | 11 | 4.8

Students, in general, enjoyed this course and found the instructor knowledgeable, friendly and very approachable. The main concern was the large degree of autonomy in the labs. Many found the labs too long to complete in the set time. Students also thought that there was disparity in the marking between TAs and wished that lab expectations were more clearly defined.

CSB 353H1S Introduction to Plant-Microbe Interactions

Instructor(s): K. Yoshioka

Enr: 97 | | | Resp: 39 | | | | Retake: 87%
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean
Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 23 | 38 | 35 | 6.1
Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 34 | 44 | 6.2
Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 13 | 67 | 6.5
Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 46 | 38 | 6.2
Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 18 | 8 | 0 | 4.4
Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 21 | 8 | 2 | 4.5
Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 24 | 34 | 10 | 5.2

The students thought the course in general was very well taught. Most students thought Yoshioka was very interesting, friendly and approachable.

Overall, the course material was very interesting and many thought it made the course more enjoyable to study.

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

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

Enr: 16 | | | Resp: 14 | | | | Retake: 53%
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean
Harris: | | | | | | | |
Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 35 | 35 | 21 | 5.7
Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 35 | 42 | 14 | 5.6
Communicates | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 21 | 35 | 28 | 5.7
Teaching | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 14 | 35 | 35 | 5.8
Tepass: | | | | | | | |
Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 35 | 14 | 5.6
Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 50 | 14 | 5.8
Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 35 | 35 | 21 | 5.7
Teaching | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 28 | 28 | 28 | 5.6
Course: | | | | | | | |
Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 28 | 28 | 7 | 5.1
Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 7 | 21 | 35 | 28 | 7 | 5.1
Learn Exp | 0 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 50 | 16 | 8 | 4.8

Students found the material interesting and described the class as enjoyable. Some believed that there should have been more focus on the lectures.

Some students complained that the instructors were unclear about their expectations.

CSB 429H1S Germ Cell Biology

Instructor(s): D. Godt

Enr: 22 | | | Resp: 17 | | | | Retake: 93%
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean
Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 52 | 29 | 6.1
Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 41 | 41 | 6.2
Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 43 | 37 | 6.1
Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 35 | 52 | 6.4
Workload | 0 | 0 | 5 | 52 | 35 | 5 | 0 | 4.4
Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 5 | 41 | 47 | 5 | 0 | 4.5
Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 30 | 38 | 15 | 5.5

Godt was described as a very friendly instructor who was very approachable and open to questions.

The course itself was described as being very interesting and students enjoyed the focus on critical thinking.

CSB 431H1S Evolution of Development

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

Enr: 12 Resp: 8 Retake: 66%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Winklbauer:								
Presents	0	0	28	0	57	0	14	4.7
Explains	0	0	14	0	42	14	28	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	14	0	42	42	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	28	42	0	28	5.3
Larsen:								
Presents	0	0	12	12	25	37	12	5.2
Explains	0	0	0	0	25	37	37	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	12	50	37	6.2
Teaching	0	0	12	0	25	37	25	5.6
Course:								
Workload	12	0	12	37	12	25	0	4.1
Difficulty	12	0	12	75	0	0	0	3.5
Learn Exp	20	0	0	0	40	40	0	4.6

A number of students indicated that they enjoyed the course and found the instructors knowledgeable. They were critical of how the course was administered, noting that no clear criteria for evaluation was communicated to the students.

Some students said they enjoyed the discussions that Larsen led. A few students found Winklbauer difficult to understand at times and suggested the use of lecture slides to improve clarity.

CSB 435H1F Regulatory Networks and Systems in Molecular Biology

Instructor(s): A. Moses

Enr: 23 Resp: 16 Retake: 73%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	6	6	18	18	37	12	5.1
Explains	0	6	0	18	18	37	18	5.4
Communicates	0	0	6	0	25	18	50	6.1
Teaching	0	6	0	25	0	50	18	5.4
Workload	0	6	12	75	6	0	0	3.8
Difficulty	6	0	6	31	37	12	6	4.6
Learn Exp	0	7	0	28	42	14	7	4.8

Students thought Moses was very enthusiastic in presenting his material. Some commented that though the material was presented well, some of it was quite difficult to understand. Students thought that the open-book midterm was too long to complete.

CSB 445H1F Biology of Sleep

Instructor(s): R. Stephenson

Enr: 15 Resp: 13 Retake: 76%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	7	0	15	46	15	15	5.1
Explains	0	0	0	7	53	23	15	5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	0	38	30	30	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	0	38	46	15	5.8
Workload	0	0	7	38	38	15	0	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	38	38	23	0	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	50	20	20	10	4.9

Stephenson was described as helpful and passionate about sleep research. His teaching style was described as outstanding.

Overall, students enjoyed the course but felt that it would have been better if there were more lectures instead of just student presentations. Students believed that the course should have been more structured. They suggested that it would be better to focus less on presentations and perhaps discuss the articles as a seminar group. Also, individual feedback would have been helpful.

CSB 450H1S Plant Proteomics in Systems Biology

Instructor(s): D. Christendat

Enr: 16 Resp: 12 Retake: 54%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	18	27	36	18	5.5
Explains	0	0	0	18	36	36	9	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	9	9	63	18	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	0	18	45	36	6.2
Workload	9	0	0	36	27	18	9	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	45	27	18	9	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	0	33	55	11	0	4.8

Students thought the instructor was excellent and explained things very well. Students enjoyed the different types of evaluations although some wished he was clearer on expectations for tests and assignments.

CSB 452H1F Molecular Plant-Microorganism Interactions

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

Enr: 31 Resp: 26 Retake: 96%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Desveaux:								
Presents	0	0	0	0	32	32	36	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	11	19	30	38	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	0	23	26	50	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	0	12	48	40	6.3
Yoshioka:								
Presents	0	0	0	3	11	50	34	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	11	7	42	38	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	15	26	57	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	0	11	46	42	6.3
Course:								
Workload	0	0	11	69	3	15	0	4.2
Difficulty	3	0	11	65	7	3	7	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	21	43	17	17	5.3

CSB 460H1F Plant Signal Transduction

Instructor(s): P. McCourt; T. Berleth

Enr: 14 Resp: 10 Retake: 80%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
McCourt:								
Presents	0	0	0	20	10	60	10	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	0	20	60	20	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	0	20	50	30	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	0	30	40	30	6.0
Berleth:								
Presents	11	0	11	0	22	33	22	5.1
Explains	0	0	10	10	30	40	10	5.3
Communicates	0	0	10	10	10	60	10	5.5
Teaching	0	0	10	10	10	50	20	5.6
Course:								
Workload	0	0	0	50	30	10	10	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	10	60	20	0	10	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	37	25	12	25	5.2

Instructor(s): E. Nambara

Enr: 14 Resp: 10 Retake: 75%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	10	0	10	70	10	5.7
Explains	0	0	10	10	20	50	10	5.4
Communicates	0	0	10	10	40	40	0	5.1
Teaching	0	0	10	10	0	60	20	5.7
Workload	0	0	0	44	33	11	11	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	11	44	33	0	11	4.6
Learn Exp	12	0	0	25	25	12	25	4.9

Students thought Nambara was a good instructor who explained material well and made sure to answer all students' questions. Some thought the test did not adequately reflect the material presented in lectures.

CSB 472H1S Computational Genomics and Bioinformatics

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

Enr: 34   Resp: 21   Retake: 75%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Guttman:								
Presents	0	0	0	4	33	23	38	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	4	23	52	19	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	9	33	47	9	5.6
Teaching	0	0	0	14	23	52	9	5.6
Provart:								
Presents	0	0	0	33	42	19	4	5.0
Explains	0	0	0	23	33	33	9	5.0
Communicates	0	0	4	14	42	28	9	5.2
Teaching	0	0	0	19	33	42	4	5.3
Course:								
Workload	0	4	0	38	42	14	0	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	47	38	14	0	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	5	21	36	36	0	5.1

Students found Guttman to be a very good instructor. His notes were well laid out and it was easy to take good lecture notes. Guttman did a great job preparing his slides.

Provart's lecture slides were packed with information. Students found that he went through the lecture material really fast not giving them enough time to copy down notes. He was enthusiastic about the material and tried to get students involved in the discussions.

Overall, the class was excellent on the whole. Students did not find the tutorials useful and thought that it had nothing to do with the lecture material.

CSB 473H1S Chemical Genomics

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

Enr: 31   Resp: 26   Retake: 86%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
McCourt:								
Presents	3	0	0	19	34	30	11	5.2
Explains	0	0	3	7	26	42	19	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	11	19	42	26	5.8
Teaching	0	3	0	3	23	57	11	5.7
Desveaux:								
Presents	0	0	0	23	11	34	30	5.7
Explains	0	0	3	7	19	38	30	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	15	19	38	26	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	3	19	50	26	6.0
Course:								
Workload	0	0	8	56	28	8	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	62	25	4	8	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	50	25	10	15	4.9

Students thought McCourt and Desveaux were experts in their field. Students wished that the assignments were better explained in terms of expectations, and some thought the amount of work required was high. Students also thought that the expectations for the tests were vague and thought the instructors should have better emphasized the readings.

DON'T ACQUIESCE!
get involved
with *your* education

assu

think pink.

CSB 475H1S Plant Metabolomics

Instructor(s): E. Nambara

Enr: 15   Resp: 10   Retake: 60%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	11	11	22	44	11	5.3
Explains	0	0	20	10	40	10	20	5.0
Communicates	0	0	0	20	40	20	20	5.4
Teaching	0	10	0	10	40	20	20	5.2
Workload	0	0	10	70	10	10	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	60	30	10	0	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	25	37	12	25	5.4

Students thought the lecturer was very knowledgeable, however, sometimes difficult to understand. Students cautioned that there was a lot of material covered in lectures.

CSB 483H1F Seminar in Development

Instructor(s): R. Winklbauer

Enr: 7   Resp: 6   Retake: 100%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	16	33	50	6.3
Explains	0	0	0	0	16	50	33	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	33	66	6.7
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	66	33	6.3
Workload	0	0	0	66	33	0	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	16	50	33	0	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	33	0	33	33	5.7

Overall, students found this course to be very interesting.

WHO KNEW THE MOST SUCCESSFUL CLASSMATE WOULD BE THE GUY WHO MAJORED IN BASKET WEAVING..?