



### 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. Visit our website at: <http://www.geog.utoronto.ca/associations/tugs>

TUGS Executive

### GGR 100H1S Introduction to Physical Geography

Instructor(s): S. Finkelstein

Enr: 206	Resp: 103							Retake: 56%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	1	15	28	33	21	5.6
Explains	0	0	4	10	30	37	15	5.5
Communicates	0	2	2	14	27	33	18	5.4
Teaching	0	0	3	12	30	32	20	5.5
Workload	0	0	1	46	34	8	5	4.6
Difficulty	0	1	3	49	30	9	4	4.6
Learn Exp	1	3	3	46	18	23	2	4.7

Finkelstein was seen as a very enthusiastic and knowledgeable instructor. Presentations were helpful in aiding the understanding of material taught in class; however, greater support for tutorials was an area that students found needed improvement in. Overall the course was a very positive learning experience.

### GGR 101H1F Ancient Civilizations and their Environments

Instructor(s): A. Davis

Enr: 227	Resp: 108							Retake: 63%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	1	4	14	26	33	18	5.4
Explains	0	0	1	14	18	43	21	5.7
Communicates	0	0	1	14	17	24	42	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	10	20	42	25	5.0
Workload	0	4	6	73	11	2	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	1	8	58	25	3	1	4.3
Learn Exp	2	2	2	35	17	25	13	5.0

Overall Davis was an engaging and enthusiastic instructor. His lectures were good but some students found that he moved too quickly through the material. Also some students felt that Davis was disorganized at times and could have provided a more accurate course description.

### GGR 107H1F Environment, Food and People

Instructor(s): S. Wakefield

Enr: 333	Resp: 137							Retake: 70%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	3	6	28	29	31	5.7
Explains	0	0	1	11	24	27	36	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	2	18	29	48	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	9	21	32	34	5.9
Workload	0	3	11	60	18	4	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	4	16	60	12	4	0	4.0
Learn Exp	3	2	6	26	27	22	10	4.8

Wakefield was very organized and enthusiastic. Students appreciated the use of contemporary examples and documentaries. They also liked how she posted the slides, gave good feedback and was helpful.

Students enjoyed the assignments for this course. There were mixed feelings about the usefulness of the tutorials. Some thought the textbook was confusing but overall students enjoyed the course.

### GGR 124H1F Urbanization, Contemporary Cities and Urban Life

Instructor(s): D. Cowen

Enr: 341	Resp: 152							Retake: 81%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	4	16	43	36	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	2	15	36	44	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	3	10	27	58	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	1	17	30	50	6.3
Workload	1	1	7	56	18	10	4	4.4
Difficulty	0	2	10	61	16	6	3	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	31	24	27	15	5.2

The instructor was great, provided excellent examples and spoke clearly. She was very approachable and helpful.

Most students loved the lecture material. However, some found the workload to be too much for a first year course. The readings were difficult to comprehend at times and the tutorials could have been more structured. Overall it was a great learning experience.

### GGR 124H1S Urbanization, Contemporary Cities and Urban Life

Instructor(s): D. Dupuy

Enr: 334	Resp: 134							Retake: 68%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	1	9	30	40	18	5.6
Explains	0	0	3	8	27	41	18	5.6
Communicates	0	0	1	8	21	43	24	5.8
Teaching	0	0	1	12	35	35	13	5.4
Workload	3	6	24	44	17	3	1	3.8
Difficulty	2	3	18	55	13	4	1	3.9
Learn Exp	0	1	5	46	28	12	5	4.6

Dupuy presented the course material with enthusiasm and in an organized manner. However, many students felt the assignments could have been better explained. Overall, the course was interesting but contacting the instructor was often difficult outside the classroom.

### GGR 201H1S Geomorphology

Instructor(s): R. Philips

Enr: 74	Resp: 44							Retake: 47%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	4	4	6	25	25	27	4	4.7
Explains	4	2	16	16	30	25	4	4.6
Communicates	9	4	2	18	18	37	9	4.8
Teaching	9	4	4	23	23	30	2	4.5
Workload	2	0	2	23	23	33	15	5.3
Difficulty	5	0	0	28	23	30	12	5.1
Learn Exp	9	4	4	59	18	4	0	3.9

Students found the instructor could have been better connected the

material in class with the midterm and lab tutorials. This disconnection made it difficult for students to achieve good marks. The class field trip was enjoyed but greater feedback, more time and possibly a greater grade emphasis on labs would have been more constructive.

### GGR 203H1S Introduction to Climatology

Instructor(s): D. Harvey

	Resp: 27							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	7	11	11	22	14	22	11	4.4
Explains	7	0	11	33	25	14	7	4.4
Communicates	7	0	0	14	18	33	25	5.4
Teaching	7	3	11	14	18	33	11	4.8
Workload	0	0	3	37	29	22	7	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	29	11	22	37	5.7
Learn Exp	8	8	8	29	29	12	4	4.2

The instructor was viewed as knowledgeable but many felt his expectations were too high. The students felt that the use of a textbook would have benefitted their learning experience. Overall, the course material could have been taught in a slower pace and the lectures could have been better organized.

### GGR 206H1F Introduction to Hydrology

Instructor(s): R. Verma

	Resp: 35							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	2	0	17	20	34	14	11	4.7
Explains	0	2	5	28	37	14	11	4.9
Communicates	0	0	0	5	25	40	28	5.9
Teaching	0	0	2	25	31	28	11	5.2
Workload	2	5	11	71	2	5	0	3.8
Difficulty	2	5	11	68	5	5	0	3.9
Learn Exp	3	0	7	46	10	17	14	4.7

Verma was an approachable and helpful instructor. Some students thought that the lectures were disorganized. There were mixed feelings about the textbook that was used where some students wanted the course to have more math.

### GGR 222H1S Interdisciplinary Perspectives on the Environment

Instructor(s): J. Nugent

	Resp: 73							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	2	10	27	27	18	7	4	3.8
Explains	1	2	13	25	34	15	6	4.6
Communicates	1	0	1	18	26	29	23	5.5
Teaching	1	4	8	35	26	14	9	4.6
Workload	1	1	11	67	17	1	0	4.0
Difficulty	1	2	8	71	14	1	0	4.0
Learn Exp	1	0	11	52	19	9	3	4.3

The instructor was seen as highly enthusiastic and knowledgeable about the course material. The lecture slides were disorganized and the lectures often deviated from the syllabus. Overall, students felt too much material was compacted into a half-course.

### GGR 240H1F Historical Geography of North America

Instructor(s): M. Farish

	Resp: 53							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	3	11	16	41	26	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	7	18	41	32	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	3	13	41	41	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	5	16	54	22	5.9
Workload	0	0	7	71	13	7	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	7	73	9	7	1	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	5	44	26	13	10	4.8

Farish was described as knowledgeable, enthusiastic, and interested in the class' engagement with the course. A minority of students felt that his lectures were too broad and fast-paced.

The course had great feedback, with many students enjoying the material and multitude of examples used to illustrate the lectures. However, some felt that it was difficult to contextualize the overall course themes and expectations. Many students felt their assignments were unfairly graded, reflecting a disconnection between the TAs and the instructor.

### GGR 246H1S Geography of Canada

Instructor(s): J. Leydon

	Resp: 81							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	1	7	27	42	21	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	1	15	55	28	6.1
Communicates	0	0	1	1	16	36	45	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	3	18	55	22	6.0
Workload	0	1	6	67	21	3	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	1	12	75	7	2	0	4.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	33	33	20	12	5.1

Students found the instructor to be an outstanding lecturer who was able to keep students' interest levels high and foster a greater appreciation for the discipline. Overall Leydon was a knowledgeable instructor who was attentive to his students and provided great feedback for all assignments and tests.

### GGR 270H1F Introductory Analytical Methods

Instructor(s): D. Dupuy

	Resp: 116							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	4	10	25	38	20	5.6
Explains	0	0	4	11	24	41	17	5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	6	28	39	24	5.8
Teaching	0	0	3	11	22	37	23	5.6
Workload	0	1	6	68	15	5	1	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	7	41	25	14	8	4.7
Learn Exp	4	2	10	40	21	13	6	4.4

Dupuy was described as approachable, enthusiastic and thorough. A minority of students felt they would have benefitted from an instructor with a stronger background in stats, but most felt his conceptual approach was favourable.

Students also wished for slides to be posted, but many felt the lack of posted slides helped their attendance and concentration. Many also felt the course felt too rushed after the midterm.

### GGR 273H1S Geographic Information and Mapping II

Instructor(s): D. Boyes

	Resp: 51							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	12	34	54	6.4
Explains	0	0	0	0	14	32	54	6.4
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	16	84	6.8
Teaching	0	0	0	2	10	48	40	6.3
Workload	0	0	4	60	30	4	2	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	56	35	7	0	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	2	18	25	43	11	5.4

Students found the instructor to be an engaging lecturer equipped with helpful presentations of information. Labs were seen as lacking in help and support but students appreciated the practical experience even though lab assignments were difficult.

Overall outstanding instructor teaching an interesting and applicable course.

**GGR 301H1S Fluvial Geomorphology**

Instructor(s): J. Desloges

Enr: 25	Resp: 18							Retake: 81%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	17	29	29	23	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	0	27	38	33	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	27	27	44	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	0	16	50	33	6.2
Workload	0	0	0	44	38	11	5	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	38	44	16	0	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	42	14	35	7	5.1

Students found that the instructor successfully bridged classroom lectures with a field trip allowing a cross connection of class context with real world examples.

**GGR 303H1F Climate-Biosphere Interactions**

Instructor(s): S. Cowling

Enr: 32	Resp: 24							Retake: 73%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	4	4	8	25	33	25	5.5
Explains	4	0	0	8	37	37	12	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	4	8	29	58	6.4
Teaching	4	0	0	4	25	50	16	5.6
Workload	0	12	16	58	12	0	0	3.7
Difficulty	0	4	16	54	20	4	0	4.0
Learn Exp	0	5	0	44	38	5	5	4.6

Cowling was described as an enthusiastic instructor who was very approachable and helpful. Some students would have preferred the course to be a seminar so that answers to application questions could be provided. Overall the course was an enjoyable experience.

**GGR 305H1F Biogeography**

Instructor(s): S. Finkelstein

Enr: 73	Resp: 45							Retake: 88%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	2	6	15	34	40	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	6	22	34	36	6.0
Communicates	0	0	2	4	11	35	46	6.2
Teaching	0	0	2	4	13	34	45	6.2
Workload	0	0	0	81	13	2	2	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	6	62	20	8	2	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	30	36	21	12	5.2

Finkelstein was described as knowledgeable, helpful and a fantastic lecturer. She was very approachable to answer question.

**GGR 308H1S Physical Aspects of the Canadian Arctic and Subarctic**

Instructor(s): M. Diamond

Enr: 46	Resp: 25							Retake: 61%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	4	4	16	24	36	8	8	4.4
Explains	4	0	20	20	24	20	12	4.7
Communicates	0	0	0	20	24	28	28	5.6
Teaching	0	0	16	16	36	12	20	5.0
Workload	4	0	4	78	8	4	0	4.0
Difficulty	4	0	4	70	16	0	4	4.1
Learn Exp	5	0	10	52	15	5	10	4.3

Many students commended Diamond on her strong enthusiasm, but criticized her for not really knowing the subject at hand.

**GGR 314H1S Global Warming**

Instructor(s): D. Harvey

Enr: 133	Resp: 44							Retake: 64%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	4	2	13	41	18	18	5.2
Explains	0	2	2	16	20	30	27	5.6
Communicates	0	2	0	2	18	25	51	6.2
Teaching	0	2	2	9	35	30	19	5.5
Workload	0	0	0	29	22	22	25	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	18	34	27	20	5.5
Learn Exp	0	3	6	12	25	25	28	5.5

Although students found the course to be heavier in content than many other courses, students believed that the course was extremely beneficial and very high in quality. The difficulty of the course may be high but students found the instructor to be very knowledgeable and an expert in this field.

**GGR 320H1F Geographics of Transnationalism, Migration and Gender**

Instructor(s): R. Silvey

Enr: 58	Resp: 40							Retake: 96%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	5	12	32	35	15	5.4
Explains	0	0	5	7	20	40	27	5.0
Communicates	0	0	2	2	17	25	51	6.2
Teaching	0	0	2	2	17	45	32	6.0
Workload	0	0	5	85	7	2	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	5	5	70	17	2	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	30	26	19	23	5.3

Most students commented that they learned a lot in the course. Overall, the course could have been arranged in a more balanced manner. Students appreciated Silvey's enthusiasm and found her easy to approach.

**GGR 323H1F Issues in Population Geography**

Instructor(s): J. Leydon

Enr: 65	Resp: 42							Retake: 91%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	2	0	2	12	17	36	29	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	4	21	29	43	6.1
Communicates	2	0	0	7	14	17	58	6.2
Teaching	0	2	0	2	19	31	43	6.1
Workload	2	0	0	67	17	5	7	4.4
Difficulty	2	0	0	72	20	2	2	4.2
Learn Exp	3	0	0	29	44	3	18	5.0

Leydon was an informative and engaging instructor. Students appreciated the use of excellent examples to describe the material. He was very approachable.

The course had a good layout with organized lecture slides and helpful merits.

**GGR 328H1F Labour Geographies**

Instructor(s): L. Stephens

Enr: 77	Resp: 43							Retake: 67%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	2	14	28	45	9	5.5
Explains	2	0	0	21	30	35	9	5.2
Communicates	0	0	4	7	35	30	21	5.6
Teaching	2	0	2	11	28	40	14	5.4
Workload	0	0	11	76	9	2	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	2	7	69	14	7	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	2	0	52	26	15	2	4.6

Stephens was viewed by the students highly enthusiastic and well-organized. However, some students felt the pace of the lecture could

have been slower. Overall, the course material was interesting and the instructor was very engaging.

### GGR 333H1F Energy Supply and Use

Instructor(s): D. Harvey

Enr: 28 Resp: 12 Retake: 33%								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	8	0	33	33	0	25	4.9
Explains	0	0	16	33	16	25	8	4.8
Communicates	0	0	8	0	41	33	16	5.5
Teaching	0	8	33	33	8	0	16	4.1
Workload	0	0	0	41	8	0	50	5.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	16	8	25	50	6.1
Learn Exp	0	22	22	22	22	0	11	3.9

The small number of students that commented said that this was a very hard course.

### GGR 334H1F Water Resource Management

Instructor(s): R. Verma

Enr: 93 Resp: 45 Retake: 80%								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	4	28	42	24	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	15	13	45	25	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	2	8	31	57	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	0	28	31	40	6.1
Workload	0	0	4	79	13	2	0	4.1
Difficulty	2	0	13	72	11	0	0	3.9
Learn Exp	0	2	2	32	23	20	17	5.1

The instructor received positive comments on her teaching style and enthusiasm. Despite the midway instructor change in the course, Verma was able to provide a valuable learning experience. The lectures were often very dense due to the fact that Verma had to cover a lot of material in the short one month that she taught. Overall, Verma's enthusiastic and passion in water resource management made the course worthwhile to take.

### GGR 336H1S Urban Historical Geography of North America

Instructor(s): P. Vitale

Enr: 169 Resp: 85 Retake: 77%								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	7	7	30	42	19	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	4	23	40	30	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	1	11	40	46	6.3
Teaching	0	1	0	7	20	48	23	5.8
Workload	0	0	7	72	13	6	1	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	4	77	13	3	1	4.2
Learn Exp	0	1	2	30	30	21	13	5.1

Lectures were fast paced and content could have been better distributed but students found slides to be very helpful. They also thought that the instructor was extremely enthusiastic, knowledgeable and approachable. Assignments were also interesting to students.

### GGR 337H1S Environmental Remote Sensing

Instructor(s): J. Liu

Enr: 32 Resp: 19 Retake: 93%								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	25	15	36	26	15	5.3
Explains	0	0	11	16	33	16	22	5.2
Communicates	0	0	0	0	26	57	15	5.9
Teaching	0	0	5	10	26	42	15	5.5
Workload	5	0	10	52	10	5	15	4.4
Difficulty	5	0	10	36	31	10	5	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	21	14	57	7	5.5

Liu was enthusiastic and very good at answering students' questions.

### GGR 339H1S Urban Geography, Planning and Political Processes

Instructor(s): D. Cowen

Enr: 63 Resp: 48 Retake: 100%								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	8	45	45	6.4
Explains	0	0	0	0	8	39	52	6.4
Communicates	0	0	0	0	4	29	65	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	2	36	61	6.6
Workload	0	0	0	77	18	4	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	4	62	29	4	0	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	20	25	31	22	5.6

Students found the instructor to be extremely knowledgeable and enthusiastic and always enjoyed her lectures. The course content stimulated discussions that were very interesting to the entire class. Overall, an outstanding instructor.

### GGR 356H1F Recreation and Tourism

Instructor(s): J. Leydon

Enr: 74 Resp: 36 Retake: 88%								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	5	33	22	38	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	5	16	38	38	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	2	13	36	47	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	5	16	44	33	6.1
Workload	0	0	2	75	19	0	2	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	2	85	11	0	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	26	34	23	15	5.3

Students really enjoyed the lectures and found the instructor very engaging and knowledgeable. However, students expressed that group projects were useful but the heavy emphasis on them was not preferred.

### GGR 360H1S Culture, History and Landscape

Instructor(s): M. Farish

Enr: 63 Resp: 40 Retake: 97%								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	12	55	32	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	0	7	43	48	6.4
Communicates	0	0	0	0	2	50	47	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	0	5	51	43	6.4
Workload	0	0	0	80	17	2	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	80	17	2	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	28	31	21	18	5.3

The breadth of the material and effective use of examples and case studies were positively received by students. The instructor was also very engaging and passionate about this area of study and students appreciated the organization and useful feedback provided.

### GGR 381H1F Field Course in Environmental Geography

Instructor(s): S. Prudham

Enr: 11 Resp: 7 Retake: 100%								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	57	42	0	5.4
Explains	0	0	0	0	42	42	14	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	0	14	85	0	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	0	14	57	28	6.1
Workload	0	0	14	57	14	14	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	57	42	0	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	16	16	66	6.5

The students thought it was a great course, valuable learning experience, and enjoyed the field trips.



## 82 GEOGRAPHY

### GGR 390H1F Field Methods

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

Enr: 21	Resp: 21							Retake: 84%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Finkelstein:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	4	19	52	23	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	0	4	61	33	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	4	28	66	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	10	45	45	6.3
<u>Desloges:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	5	21	47	26	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	0	10	57	31	6.2
Communicates	0	0	5	0	5	36	52	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	0	11	55	33	6.2
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	0	19	61	14	4	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	60	25	10	5	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	5	0	35	41	17	5.6

Overall both Desloges and Finkelstein were highly praised by students for their good job organizing and teaching the course. The field aspect of the course was very much enjoyed by students and students found both instructors to be quite helpful. With this being said, many students had issues with the assignment formatting of the class. The first two assignments were unnecessary and a distraction from the overall research.

### GGR 403H1S Global Ecology and Biogeochemical Cycles

Instructor(s): S. Cowling

Enr: 27	Resp: 22							Retake: 80%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	18	18	50	13	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	9	27	40	22	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	4	22	72	6.7
Teaching	0	0	0	4	13	40	40	6.2
Workload	0	0	27	63	4	4	0	3.9
Difficulty	0	0	4	63	18	13	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	5	35	11	29	17	5.2

Students enjoyed the discussion and presentation structure of the class. Many enjoyed the class and appreciated the instructors' enthusiasm.

### GGR 409H1F Contaminants in the Environment

Instructor(s): M. Diamond

Enr: 13	Resp: 12							Retake: 72%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	9	9	9	36	18	18	0	4.0
Explains	0	0	8	41	33	16	0	4.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	33	33	33	6.0
Teaching	0	0	9	27	18	27	18	5.2
Workload	0	0	0	33	58	8	0	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	25	41	33	0	5.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	25	37	25	12	5.2

Students praised Diamond for her enthusiasm and interactive teaching style. Overall, the learning experience was valuable but some felt the lectures could have been better organized.

### GGR 413H1S Watershed Hydroecology

Instructor(s): J. Chen

Enr: 21	Resp: 12							Retake: 77%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	16	33	41	8	5.4
Explains	0	0	0	33	8	50	8	5.3
Communicates	0	0	0	8	33	33	25	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	8	16	41	33	6.0
Workload	0	0	0	0	66	16	16	5.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	18	36	36	9	5.4

Learn Exp	0	0	0	33	11	22	33	5.6
-----------	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	-----

Many students found the instructor to be extremely helpful and effective at explaining difficult concepts. However, students thought that time for the lab assignments would have been beneficial.

### GGR 416H1S Environmental Impact Assessment

Instructor(s): S. Wakefield

Enr: 27	Resp: 21							Retake: 84%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	5	12	50	20	10	5.2
Explains	0	0	5	15	35	30	15	5.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	30	45	25	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	4	47	28	19	5.6
Workload	0	0	0	40	45	10	5	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	10	35	30	20	5	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	40	33	20	6	4.9

Wakefield was described as helpful and great at giving detailed comments and feedback on assignments. She was very engaging and enthusiastic. She guided the class through the lecture material very well and it was very easy to meet with her.

Some of the lectures were described as dry. Some of the assignments were unclear.

### GGR 421H1F History & Philosophy of Geography

Instructor(s): M. Farish

Enr: 23	Resp: 15							Retake: 80%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	26	53	20	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	13	26	26	33	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	6	40	53	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	0	13	20	66	6.5
Workload	0	0	0	46	20	26	6	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	40	20	26	13	5.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	8	25	66	0	5.6

Students found readings to be a bit dry at times but they also thought that it was useful as the content provoked interesting and intriguing discussions. Farish was seen as a really helpful instructor who provided useful feedback and comments on all marked work.

Overall the content and way it was taught was enjoyed by students.

### GGR 424H1S Transportation Geography and Planning

Instructor(s): C. Hostovsky

Enr: 30	Resp: 16							Retake: 100%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	6	0	6	33	26	26	5.5
Explains	0	0	0	6	20	33	40	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	13	6	20	60	6.3
Teaching	6	0	0	6	20	20	46	5.8
Workload	0	6	20	53	6	13	0	4.0
Difficulty	6	0	26	53	13	0	0	3.7
Learn Exp	0	7	15	7	23	23	23	5.1

Students enjoyed his lectures very much but the content could have been more complex.

### GGR 457H1S Post-War Suburbs

Instructor(s): D. Cowen

Enr: 33	Resp: 18							Retake: 100%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	11	55	33	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	0	0	38	61	6.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	38	61	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	50	50	6.5
Workload	0	0	5	66	27	0	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	83	11	5	0	4.2

Learn Exp 0 0 0 0 37 18 43 6.1

The instructor was regarded as very enthusiastic and engaging. She provided weekly feedback which many students found helpful. However, some students felt the readings were heavy.

#### GGR 462H1S GIS Project

Instructor(s): D. Boyes

Enr: 24	Resp: 17							Retake: 100%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	0	29	70	6.7
Explains	0	0	0	0	0	41	58	6.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	23	76	6.8
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	37	62	6.6
Workload	0	0	0	12	37	18	31	5.7
Difficulty	0	0	0	37	43	6	12	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	21	21	57	6.4

Students enjoyed the independent structure of this course and found that they benefitted from the hands-on approach to research.

Boyes was seen as a very organized passionate, helpful and engaging instructor. The practicality of the knowledge and skills learnt in class was much appreciated and a great learning experience overall.

#### GGR 473H1F Cartographic Design

Instructor(s): B. Moldofsky

Enr: 24	Resp: 14							Retake: 83%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	7	14	42	14	21	5.3
Explains	0	0	0	7	21	42	28	5.9
Communicates	0	7	0	7	7	28	50	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	7	35	57	0	5.5
Workload	0	0	7	14	28	7	42	5.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	50	21	21	7	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	11	33	11	11	33	5.2



1969: THE PINNACLE OF AMERICAN SPACE EXPLORATION



2012: THE PINNACLE OF CANADIAN SPACE EXPLORATION