

CELL & SYSTEMS BIOLOGY STUDENTS' UNION

Introduction

The Cell Systems Biology Students' Union (CSBSU) aims to better student life for all undergraduates enrolled in biology related courses. The tours to socials and movie nights, which are open to all students, staff and faculty. Please visit the CSBSU office in RW 123 or check out their [website: http://www.csbsu.csb.utoronto.ca](http://www.csbsu.csb.utoronto.ca)

CSBSU Executive

BIO 130H1S Molecular and Cell Biology

Instructor(s): K. Yip

	Enr: 441							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	3	12	34	48	6.3
Explains	0	0	0	3	11	34	49	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	5	15	34	42	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	4	10	34	50	6.3
Workload	0	0	3	39	29	17	8	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	2	36	35	17	7	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	1	25	28	31	11	5.2

Yip was very enthusiastic and explained concepts clearly. He moved at a quick pace but gave students enough time to copy their notes. The majority of the students enjoyed having him as an instructor.

Some students found the readings a bit excessive and sometimes not completely helpful. Most students enjoyed the labs and found that it complemented the course work very well.

Instructor(s): J. Coleman; J. Mitchell

	Enr: 1266							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<u>Coleman:</u>								
Presents	1	0	1	13	27	35	19	5.5
Explains	0	1	3	13	29	33	18	5.4
Communicates	1	0	3	12	27	33	20	5.4
Teaching	1	0	1	11	28	35	19	5.5
<u>Mitchell:</u>								
Presents	2	2	8	22	29	25	10	4.9
Explains	2	3	10	24	29	21	7	4.7
Communicates	4	5	13	25	26	16	7	4.4
Teaching	3	3	11	26	26	19	8	4.6
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	1	4	46	28	12	6	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	3	46	29	14	4	4.7
Learn Exp	1	1	3	35	31	19	7	4.8

Coleman was described as an organized instructor. His slow-paced lecture style allowed students to understand the material and take proper notes. He kept the class engaged with the use of examples. Some students complained about his lack of enthusiasm. Students felt he also went off-topic at times.

Mitchell was described as a knowledgeable instructor. Students complained about her fast-paced lectures and her tendency to read off the slides throughout lecture. Students also complained about her lack of enthusiasm and monotonous lecture style. Students felt that they did not have enough time to fill in the blanks in the lecture slides due to the lack

of time in the lectures.

The course load was found to be overwhelming with material from both the lectures and the textbook combined adding a lot of pressure on students for the cumulative exam. Students found the tests too tricky. The labs were found to be longer than needed, since students felt they spent a lot of time waiting. The textbook was found to be crucial to do well in the course, but overwhelming. Students valued the textbook and clicker questions.

BIO 240H1F Molecular Biology

Instructor(s): D. Dansereau

	Enr: 1251							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	1	8	20	37	31	5.9
Explains	0	0	1	7	20	39	30	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	4	14	32	46	6.2
Teaching	0	0	1	4	17	37	38	6.1
Workload	0	1	3	47	28	14	5	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	3	42	32	16	4	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	1	31	31	24	11	5.1

Students thought the instructor was very enthusiastic and well-organized. They found him to be very knowledgeable and passionate about the subject. Some complained that he talked too fast and covered too much material.

Students found topics on modern technology useful, but thought the assigned papers were too difficult. Even though the required fill in the blanks on the lecture notes encouraged class attendance, some students found it distracting. Most found the lab component helpful and useful to their learning experience.

BIO 241H1S Cell and Developmental Biology

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

	Enr: 1030							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<u>Desveaux:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	8	27	41	21	5.7
Explains	0	0	1	8	30	39	20	5.7
Communicates	0	0	1	12	28	35	20	5.6
Teaching	0	0	0	8	30	39	19	5.7
<u>Harris:</u>								
Presents	0	0	1	9	30	40	18	5.6
Explains	0	0	1	7	28	42	19	5.7
Communicates	0	0	2	12	28	37	18	5.6
Teaching	0	0	0	10	30	41	17	5.6
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	2	53	28	11	3	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	3	47	30	13	3	4.6
Learn Exp	1	0	4	47	25	17	4	4.6

Desveaux expressed great enthusiasm in the course material and provided good examples and real-life parallels. However students found he spoke too fast and could go slower. Overall, Desveaux was a good instructor.

Harris was described as a good instructor who gave a clear explanation of concepts. He used effective analogies. He was very enthusiastic, approachable and conducted engaging tutorials. Some students felt he gave out too much information in a short time, and thought it would be useful if he spent more time on his explanations.

Lecture material was interesting. Students felt that there could have been more wet labs and more hands-on experiments related to cell and developmental biology.

BIO 260H1S Concepts in Genetics

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

	Enr: 103							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<u>McCourt:</u>								
Presents	6	4	14	16	16	16	28	4.9

Explains	4	2	8	26	6	22	32	5.2
Communicates	0	0	0	22	14	30	34	5.8
Teaching	6	4	2	26	12	20	30	5.1
Moeder:								
Presents	2	2	12	24	34	14	12	4.8
Explains	2	6	10	34	22	14	12	4.6
Communicates	6	8	12	30	20	14	10	4.3
Teaching	2	6	12	28	30	12	10	4.5
Course:								
Workload	0	0	4	48	20	18	10	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	2	44	22	18	14	5.0
Learn Exp	4	2	7	50	16	11	7	4.4

Students found McCourt to be engaging but that he spent too much time answering students' questions. Students found that assignments were not very related to course materials. Some students believed McCourt's teaching style a bit unstructured, loose, vague and the midterm didn't reflect course material well.

Students thought that Moeder could be more enthusiastic, engaged and interested in the material. Lecture material was drawn from textbooks that were hard to find/buy and he tended to read off the slides.

BIO 270H1F Animal Physiology I

Instructor(s): D. Lovejoy

Enr: 536	Resp: 99							Retake: 67%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	1	2	6	21	27	28	13	5.1
Explains	1	3	5	16	16	35	22	5.4
Communicates	2	3	3	11	19	25	35	5.6
Teaching	1	4	5	11	26	31	20	5.3
Workload	1	3	16	67	7	3	2	3.9
Difficulty	1	4	15	65	9	2	2	3.9
Learn Exp	4	5	4	51	15	11	7	4.3

The students found Lovejoy to be an extremely nice person who was always available for help. Students praised his use of examples with lecture slides. However many students complained about his lecture style, which was regarded as somewhat distracting, slow and off-topic.

The students found the course material to be interesting. Many students thought the tests were fair. However, students complained about the inconsistency between the lecture material and labs. The assignments were regarded as tricky and difficult. Some students suggested the textbook should only be recommended, rather than mandatory. Overall, the students liked the course material.

BIO 271H1S Animal Physiology II

Instructor(s): L. Ohana

Enr: 502	Resp: 98							Retake: 64%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	6	3	20	25	32	10	2	4.1
Explains	7	8	17	36	17	10	2	3.9
Communicates	7	7	16	31	25	10	1	4.0
Teaching	8	5	14	31	31	6	3	4.0
Workload	1	4	14	68	7	1	3	3.9
Difficulty	1	2	11	69	12	1	2	4.0
Learn Exp	1	5	10	57	16	6	1	4.1

The students found Ohana approachable and nice. However, many students complained about the lack of organization and clarity in her lectures. Students felt the lab component of the course was poorly organized and felt that the lab reports were graded unfairly. Students recommended making the labs more engaging and interactive.

The textbook was not seen as valuable with regards to the tests.

CSB 200Y1Y Current Topics in Molecular Biology

Instructor(s): K. Yip

Enr: 26	Resp: 18							Retake: 92%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	0	25	75	6.8

Explains	0	0	0	0	0	38	61	6.6
Communicates	0	0	0	5	16	22	55	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	0	11	16	72	6.6
Workload	0	5	17	58	5	5	5	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	17	47	17	11	5	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	18	38	30	15	5.5

The students praised Yip for being well-organized, caring, enthusiastic and an overall amazing instructor. Some students even said that the university was lucky to have him. Most students loved the course and regarded it as a great experience.

CSB 325H1F Endocrine Physiology

Instructor(s): D. Lovejoy

Enr: 164	Resp: 54							Retake: 81%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	3	20	20	22	33	5.6
Explains	0	0	3	9	16	35	35	5.9
Communicates	1	1	1	3	12	14	62	6.2
Teaching	0	0	1	7	13	35	41	6.1
Workload	1	0	17	54	17	1	5	4.2
Difficulty	1	0	5	62	23	1	3	4.3
Learn Exp	2	0	5	35	16	21	18	5.0

Lovejoy was described as an excellent instructor who was really enthusiastic about the material. However students felt that he went off topic at times which made it hard to follow him.

Students found the course material really interesting. They felt that there should have been less emphasis on evolution and wished that the instructor did not rush through the last few topics. Students found the tutorials really useful. However they felt that 3 hours were unnecessary and that time could have been better spent for TAs to review the lecture material. Overall, students really enjoyed the learning experience.

CSB 327H1F Extracellular Matrix Biology and Associated Pathologies

Instructor(s): M. Ringuette

Enr: 203	Resp: 100							Retake: 64%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	3	1	10	17	27	29	13	5.0
Explains	1	1	10	18	32	30	8	5.0
Communicates	0	0	2	13	24	37	24	5.7
Teaching	0	0	8	12	25	39	15	5.4
Workload	0	1	7	47	34	7	3	4.5
Difficulty	0	2	3	39	34	16	6	4.8
Learn Exp	1	2	8	36	22	20	8	4.7

Students liked that Ringuette sincerely cared about how students performed in class, and they also thought that the Students Management Team (SMT) was a good addition. However they had some issues with the clarity of his voice and he would often jump from one idea to another which made the lectures difficult to follow. Some students also thought that the notes were a bit disorganized.

Students found the course material very interesting. They appreciated having an SMT to take some of their concerns to the instructor. They felt that the tests were fair and appreciated that the instructor gave bonus marks when it was appropriate. They would however have liked consistent office hours rather than the office hours offered before the test.

CSB 328H1F Developmental Biology

Instructor(s): D. Dansereau; A. Bruce

Enr: 78	Resp: 36							Retake: 90%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Dansereau:								
Presents	0	0	0	0	11	27	61	6.5
Explains	0	0	0	0	11	22	66	6.6
Communicates	0	0	0	2	2	22	72	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	2	30	66	6.6

26 CELL & SYSTEMS BIOLOGY

Bruce:

Presents	0	0	2	13	36	25	22	5.5
Explains	0	0	0	11	27	33	27	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	5	5	36	52	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	11	13	44	30	5.9

Course:

Workload	0	2	0	65	20	11	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	2	62	25	8	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	21	46	28	3	5.1

Dansereau was described as a captivating, humorous, and enthusiastic instructor. His Lecture material was well organized and concise. A lot of people agreed that he was an excellent lecturer.

Bruce was described as an enthusiastic lecturer, but many thought that she covered the material in a quick manner and needed to talk slower. However many people thought she did a good job.

Some people thought that the course material had a lot of material to cover while others felt that not enough time was given to cover all the "cool" material. Overall, students thought both instructors did an excellent job.

CSB 330H1S Techniques in Molecular, Cellular, and Developmental Biology

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

Enr: 21 Resp: 19 Retake: 87%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Bruce:								
Presents	0	0	0	10	36	31	21	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	0	52	31	15	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	26	42	31	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	10	5	57	29	6.0
Harris:								
Presents	0	0	0	5	21	47	26	5.9
Explains	0	0	5	0	26	42	26	5.8
Communicates	0	0	5	0	10	42	2	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	5	10	63	21	6.0
Course:								
Workload	0	0	0	57	42	0	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	5	68	26	0	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	45	45	0	9	4.7

Students felt that Bruce was organized and found his material interesting.

The directions for the labs were ambiguous and students would have preferred more guidance. Students also said that the course was challenging, but rewarding.

CSB 331H1S Advanced Cell Biology I: Cellular Dynamics During Development

Instructor(s): M. Ringuette

Enr: 147 Resp: 64 Retake: 69%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	1	14	31	31	21	5.6
Explains	0	0	1	11	30	28	28	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	3	29	31	36	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	8	25	30	36	5.9
Workload	0	0	1	57	22	14	3	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	3	49	22	19	4	4.7
Learn Exp	2	2	4	26	23	28	11	5.0

Ringuette was described as a good instructor who cared about his students. Some students found it hard to follow his lectures, Students found the supplementary notes to be really helpful.

Students believed that there should have been less references to CSB 327 material as that was not a pre-requisite for this course. The SMT team was described as helpful. Overall, students liked the course and found the tests fair.

CSB 332H1S Neurobiology of the Synapse

Instructor(s): L. Ohana

Enr: 385 Resp: 82 Retake: 50%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	1	7	21	25	23	12	8	4.3
Explains	3	13	18	32	14	12	4	4.0
Communicates	0	4	7	35	31	10	9	4.7
Teaching	0	7	22	27	28	8	5	4.2
Workload	0	3	13	75	5	1	0	3.9
Difficulty	0	1	11	67	16	2	0	4.1
Learn Exp	1	3	19	53	115	3	3	4.0

Although Ohana was respected for her efforts to teach, she was regarded as an ambiguous instructor. Students complained about her teaching style, highlighting her tendency to present more difficult than they actually were. Students recommended that she prepare for lectures ahead of time to avoid confusion and allow time for completion of lectures.

The course material was regarded as interesting. Students found the clicker questions to be helpful. Most students felt the tests were not graded fairly and suggested a feedback on mark breakdowns. Students also recommended including small assignments or quizzes to have a fair mark distribution.

CSB 340H1F Plant Development

Instructor(s): T. Berleth

Enr: 30 Resp: 14 Retake: 53%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	21	42	21	14	0	4.3
Explains	0	0	7	21	42	28	0	4.9
Communicates	0	7	0	28	42	14	7	4.8
Teaching	0	0	0	21	42	35	0	5.1
Workload	0	0	21	21	35	21	0	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	7	35	42	14	0	4.6
Learn Exp	0	7	7	42	28	14	0	4.4

Berleth was very knowledgeable and enthusiastic but perhaps the course and his slides could have been more organized. Some students felt that the course, improved their ability to read and comprehend scientific literature, however they did not recommend the course to students who do not enjoy scientific articles. Students felt that Berleth's slides were disorganized and would have appreciated if the slides were always posted before the lecture. Students felt that tests were a fair evaluation of the course material. Some felt that the course structure was challenging.

CSB 343H1F Animal Energetics

Instructor(s): R. Stephenson

Enr: 153 Resp: 63 Retake: 76%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	1	19	29	26	22	5.5
Explains	0	1	1	16	27	27	24	5.5
Communicates	1	0	3	18	34	14	27	5.4
Teaching	0	0	1	21	29	29	18	5.4
Workload	0	3	8	69	16	5	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	1	10	67	13	5	1	4.2
Learn Exp	0	4	6	44	21	17	6	4.6

Students described Stephenson as a very knowledgeable about the topics in the course. He was clear, organized and had an effective method of conveying information by making good use of examples to explain his topics.

Students liked the idea of having best two three tests being counted in the final mark. Some students felt that lectures should have been related to the textbook readings. Many students felt that sample tests or past tests should have been made available to them. The tests were too long, the short answer questions required broad answers, and students were not sure of the specific answers that were looked for. Few students felt that preparing for four essays for the finals was time consuming and would have preferred the test format on the exam. Also it would have been good to have lecture recordings posted online.

CSB 345H1F Introductory Biology of Sleep

Instructor(s): R. Stephenson

	Enr: 155							Mean
	Resp: 95							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	2	2	5	24	29	25	10	5.0
Explains	2	1	5	21	27	27	14	5.1
Communicates	2	2	3	10	28	36	17	5.4
Teaching	2	3	5	18	27	34	9	5.1
Workload	0	2	6	67	21	2	1	4.2
Difficulty	0	1	3	52	33	7	2	4.5
Learn Exp	3	0	10	43	22	13	6	4.5

Overall, students felt that the instructor was very knowledgeable and demonstrated a high level of critical thinking. However most found the multiple choice questions to be tricky and said they would have benefitted from more time to write the tests.

CSB 347H1S Comparative Cellular Physiology

Instructor(s): L. Buck

	Enr: 290							Mean
	Resp: 99							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	1	9	19	30	32	7	5.1
Explains	0	2	3	16	39	25	13	5.2
Communicates	0	0	1	13	29	31	24	5.7
Teaching	0	0	2	16	36	27	17	5.4
Workload	0	0	10	37	17	2	2	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	8	62	21	4	2	4.3
Learn Exp	0	1	6	62	15	9	4	4.4

Buck was described as an experience instructor who knew the material very well. Some students complained about his lecture style emphasizing his lack of clarity and tendency to go off topic at times.

Students found the course material very helpful. Most students emphasized the need for more time during tests, stating that tests were too long and not enough time was available for completion.

CSB 349H1F Eukaryotic Gene Expression

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

	Enr: 168							Mean
	Resp: 43							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<u>Tropepe:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	18	23	20	37	5.8
Explains	0	2	9	9	16	28	33	5.6
Communicates	0	0	2	19	19	29	29	5.6
Teaching	0	2	0	19	23	21	33	5.6
<u>Moses:</u>								
Presents	2	0	7	21	23	23	21	5.2
Explains	0	4	14	11	19	26	23	5.2
Communicates	2	2	7	19	19	26	23	5.2
Teaching	2	2	9	19	21	26	19	5.1
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	0	10	27	30	32	5.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	7	34	41	17	5.7
Learn Exp	0	0	8	38	20	26	5	4.8

Tropepe was described as a very engaging instructor who made difficult concepts clear. Students felt that he was approachable and attentive to students' questions. Students also appreciated Tropepe's preparation for exams.

Students enjoyed the lectures by Moses but felt that at time, the slides could be disorganized.

Students felt that the course workload was extremely high and that tutorials did not reflect the lecture material. They felt unfairly graded on assignments and tests were extremely challenging, requiring a good understanding of the material. A textbook was recommended for further understanding. Although challenging, the course provided a good outline of genetic technologies.

CSB 350H1S Laboratory in Molecular Plant Biology

Instructor(s): D. Christendat; E. Nambara

	Enr: 42							Mean
	Resp: 36							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<u>Christendat:</u>								
Presents	0	0	5	19	22	36	16	5.4
Explains	0	0	2	19	25	36	16	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	8	33	36	22	5.7
Teaching	0	0	2	13	33	33	16	5.5
<u>Nambara:</u>								
Presents	0	0	5	11	37	31	14	5.4
Explains	0	0	17	14	28	22	17	5.1
Communicates	0	0	8	14	31	22	22	5.4
Teaching	0	0	11	20	3	20	17	5.1
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	2	47	30	19	0	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	2	66	27	2	0	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	6	30	36	26	5.8

Christendat was described as a good instructor who was very passionate about molecular biology and eager to help students.

Nambara did a good job at explaining concepts and answered questions effectively.

Most people really enjoyed the lab component. Overall, people enjoyed the course but thought lectures could be more organized.

CSB 352H1S Bioinformatic Methods

Instructor(s): N. Provart

	Enr: 112							Mean
	Resp: 79							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	2	11	31	31	22	5.6
Explains	0	0	3	15	40	27	12	5.3
Communicates	0	0	5	12	30	35	16	5.5
Teaching	0	0	2	10	26	40	20	5.7
Workload	1	2	17	65	11	0	1	3.9
Difficulty	1	0	20	58	14	2	2	4.0
Learn Exp	1	3	3	38	23	20	9	4.8

Provart was very enthusiastic about the material and answered questions effectively.

The course was very informative, Students felt that the lecture material could have included more information related to lab material. Lab instructions could have been more practical and more detail oriented.

CSB 353H1S Introduction to Plant Microbe Interactions

Instructor(s): K. Yoshioka

	Enr: 147							Mean
	Resp: 36							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	8	22	28	40	6.0
Explains	0	0	2	5	25	42	22	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	2	8	37	51	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	2	8	44	44	6.3
Workload	0	3	6	59	21	9	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	3	9	46	28	12	0	4.4
Learn Exp	4	0	8	20	25	25	16	5.0

Some students thought the instructor could have spoken louder, but most of them found her to be very enthusiastic about the course material. She was very clear about communicating what she expects of the students.

The tests were found to be difficult yet fair, for the students. The concepts were more important than the specific details and the students liked this format better.

28 CELL & SYSTEMS BIOLOGY

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

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

Enr: 20	Resp: 14							Retake: 61%	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
<u>Harris:</u>									
Presents	0	0	0	7	7	35	50		6.3
Explains	0	0	0	7	21	21	50		6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	35	21	42		6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	7	7	35	50		6.3
<u>Tepass:</u>									
Presents	0	0	0	21	14	35	28		5.7
Explains	0	7	0	7	35	28	21		5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	14	35	35	14		5.5
Teaching	0	0	7	14	7	42	28		5.7
<u>Course:</u>									
Workload	0	0	0	46	23	30	0		4.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	41	25	33	0		4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	8	8	41	41	0		5.2

Students thought Harris was an approachable, friendly and helpful lecturer. They thought the discussions were helpful and that he spent his time to prepare every student for their presentation. However some believed the test did not fully reflect the material taught.

Tepass was considered a good instructor overall, but few people believed he was not easy to approach to ask questions.

The course comments overall were generally positive. The discussions were very helpful and insightful.

CSB 429H1S Germ Cell Biology

Instructor(s): D. Godt

Enr: 22	Resp: 17							Retake: 93%	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	0	0	5	11	23	58		6.4
Explains	0	0	0	5	11	29	52		6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	5	11	17	64		6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	5	5	47	41		6.2
Workload	5	0	0	70	17	5	0		4.1
Difficulty	5	0	0	58	35	0	0		4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	20	10	40	30		5.8

Godt was very knowledgeable and enthusiastic. She explained material very well.

The course was very enjoyable and interesting.

CSB 430H1S Neurogenesis

Instructor(s): V. Tropepe

Enr: 20	Resp: 17							Retake: 82%	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	0	0	0	11	23	64		6.5
Explains	0	0	0	5	0	23	70		6.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	5	17	76		6.7
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	23	76		6.8
Workload	0	0	5	76	11	0	5		4.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	52	41	0	5		4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	41	41	17		5.8

Tropepe was lauded for his passion for the course material. Students praised his teaching method, finding him excellent, thoughtful and very approachable.

The course was described as extremely interesting. Many students believed the use of current research in lectures helped prepare them for graduate school. Some students regarded this as one of their favourite courses.

CSB 431H1S Evolution of Development

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

Enr: 21	Resp: 11							Retake: 80%	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
<u>Winklbauer:</u>									
Presents	0	0	9	9	27	36	18		5.5
Explains	0	0	0	9	18	36	36		6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	0	9	45	45		6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	0	27	36	36		6.1
<u>Larsen:</u>									
Presents	0	0	9	9	36	36	9		5.3
Explains	0	0	0	9	18	45	27		5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	9	0	45	45		6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	0	36	27	36		6.0
<u>Course:</u>									
Workload	0	0	20	70	0	10	0		4.0
Difficulty	0	10	20	50	10	10	0		3.9
Learn Exp	0	0	0	77	0	0	22		4.7

CSB 435H1F Regulatory Networks and Systems in Molecular Biology

Instructor(s): A. Moses

Enr: 35	Resp: 29							Retake: 54%	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	0	3	10	44	6	34		5.6
Explains	0	0	3	17	27	24	27		5.6
Communicates	0	0	3	6	17	27	44		6.0
Teaching	0	0	6	6	31	20	34		5.7
Workload	0	0	3	75	14	3	3		4.3
Difficulty	0	0	10	21	35	28	3		4.9
Learn Exp	4	0	12	36	12	24	12		4.7

Moses was enthusiastic, explained concepts clearly and thoroughly, was knowledgeable about the material and was quick in responding to queries. Some students felt that the quizzes and tests were too abstract and not specific to the course material. However some students liked that the material and evaluations were more critical thinking based rather than memorization based.

CSB 450H1S Plant Proteomics in Systems Biology

Instructor(s): D. Christendat

Enr: 25	Resp: 21							Retake: 77%	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	0	9	28	19	28	14		5.1
Explains	0	0	4	9	42	19	23		5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	14	19	33	33		5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	23	33	14	28		5.5
Workload	0	0	5	40	35	15	5		4.8
Difficulty	0	0	5	40	35	20	0		4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	6	12	31	25	25		5.5

CSB 452H1F Molecular Plant-Microorganism Interactions

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

Enr:31	Resp: 23							Retake: 65%	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
<u>Yoshioka:</u>									
Presents	0	0	0	19	33	28	19		5.5
Explains	0	0	0	13	40	22	22		5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	19	19	38	23		5.7
Teaching	0	0	0	14	28	28	28		5.7
<u>Desveaux:</u>									
Presents	0	0	4	4	33	28	28		5.7
Explains	0	0	4	4	18	40	31		5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	0	19	47	33		6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	4	19	47	28		6.0
<u>Course:</u>									
Workload	0	0	4	71	4	14	4		4.4
Difficulty	0	0	4	52	33	4	4		4.5

Learn Exp 0 0 6 33 26 20 13 5.0

Yoshioka was described as a "very nice lady". She was always available for one on one consultations and had fair test questions.

Desveaux was described as very approachable and also very helpful. Students enjoyed the course and found it very interesting. They liked the instructors, the material and the light workloads.

CSB 459H1F Plant Molecular Biology and Biotechnology

Instructor(s): D. Goring

	Resp: 12							Retake: 90%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	8	66	25	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	0	8	33	58	6.5
Communicates	0	0	0	0	16	33	50	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	58	41	6.4
Workload	0	0	8	75	16	0	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	16	58	16	8	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	10	40	30	20	5.6

Students found that Goring had the ability to teach difficult material in an interesting and organized manner. They also liked her interactive lecture style. Goring was approachable and caring.

CSB 460H1F Plant Signal Transduction

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

	Resp: 12							Retake: 90%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Berleth:</u>								
Presents	0	0	8	16	33	33	8	5.2
Explains	0	0	0	8	25	66	0	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	16	41	41	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	8	25	58	8	5.7
<u>McCourt:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	8	41	41	8	5.5
Explains	0	0	0	0	16	75	8	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	50	50	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	0	8	58	33	6.2
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	8	33	16	41	0	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	33	16	50	0	5.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	27	36	36	6.1

Berleth was very helpful during one-on-one sessions. However, Some felt his lectures were hard to follow at times.

McCourt was an outstanding instructor who challenged students to think.

CSB 472H1S Computational Genomics and Bioinformatics

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

	Resp: 25							Retake: 68%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Guttman:</u>								
Presents	4	0	4	4	20	40	28	5.7
Explains	4	0	4	0	32	32	28	5.6
Communicates	0	4	4	4	24	48	16	5.6
Teaching	4	0	0	12	16	48	20	5.6
<u>Provart:</u>								
Presents	0	0	8	8	44	28	12	5.3
Explains	0	0	8	4	28	48	12	5.5
Communicates	0	4	0	16	20	41	16	5.5
Teaching	0	0	0	12	40	36	12	5.5
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	0	50	29	16	4	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	36	32	28	4	5.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	50	20	15	15	4.9

Students felt that they could have used more help in the programming portion of the course - it was a lot of work.

CSB 473H1S Chemical Genomics

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

	Resp: 12							Retake: 90%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Desveaux:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	0	16	41	41	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	0	8	66	25	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	75	25	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	75	25	6.2
<u>McCourt:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	16	16	41	25	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	8	8	66	16	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	0	8	58	33	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	0	8	58	33	6.2
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	8	33	33	25	0	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	9	27	45	18	0	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	16	50	33	6.2

A very interesting course with two great instructors.

CSB 475H1S Plant Metabolomics

Instructor(s): E. Nambara

	Resp: 11							Retake: 90%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	45	18	27	9	5.0
Explains	0	0	0	18	27	54	0	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	0	36	36	27	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	0	27	63	9	5.8
Workload	0	0	27	54	0	18	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	9	45	27	18	0	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	18	36	45	0	5.3

CSB 483H1F Seminar In Development I

Instructor(s): R. Winklbauer

	Resp: 9							Retake: 100%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	0	60	40	6.4
Explains	0	0	0	0	14	57	28	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	44	55	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	44	55	6.6
Workload	0	0	25	75	0	0	0	3.8
Difficulty	0	0	12	62	25	0	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	14	42	42	6.3

Winklbauer was an excellent instructor. He made the class discussions extremely interesting.

This course was highly recommended for students interested in seminar style learning and advanced science.

CSB 484H1S Seminar in Development II

Instructor(s): E. Larsen

	Resp: 8							Retake: 100%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	0	50	50	6.5
Explains	0	0	0	0	0	37	62	6.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	37	62	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	25	75	6.8
Workload	0	0	50	37	0	0	12	3.9
Difficulty	0	0	12	87	0	0	0	3.9
Learn Exp	0	0	0	12	12	37	37	6.0

Students highly enjoyed the course and described Larsen as thoughtful and helpful. Students had a good learning experience. A highly recommended course.