

122 MANAGEMENT

Introduction

ASSU would like to thank the Faculty and Staff of the Commerce Program for their assistance with the following evaluations. We would also like to acknowledge the Commerce Students' Association (CSA) for their work summarizing these evaluations. If you would like to reach the CSA, visit them in Rm 118E at the Rotman Centre.

Editor

MGT 120H1S Financial Accounting I

Instructor(s): E. Zuliani

	Resp: 224							Retake: 60%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	1	8	23	27	30	8	5.0
Explains	0	3	10	23	31	22	7	4.8
Communicates	1	0	6	16	26	32	15	5.2
Teaching	1	0	4	23	30	27	11	5.1
Workload	0	0	3	42	27	17	6	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	4	43	24	18	9	4.8
Learn Exp	0	3	6	40	30	13	4	4.6

Most appreciated her enthusiasm and enjoyed the lectures. Lecture time was not sufficient to go through all the material in detail. The Powerpoint slides were very useful. Examples given in tutorials were helpful. The tests were very difficult because they covered material not explained in class; and were too long and the wording of questions was not clear. The distribution of tests was very inefficient and needs to be improved. A question period at the end of class would have been helpful. Having an OAC accounting background would be an advantage.

Instructor(s): E. Zuliani

	Resp: 123							Retake: 69%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	3	16	38	30	10	5.2
Explains	0	0	5	19	33	30	10	5.2
Communicates	0	0	4	11	33	35	14	5.4
Teaching	0	0	5	17	29	36	11	5.3
Workload	0	3	5	50	22	13	3	4.4
Difficulty	0	2	7	53	18	15	3	4.5
Learn Exp	1	2	5	39	32	12	4	4.5

Overall, students really enjoyed the course and learned a lot. Zuliani was enthusiastic and her lecture notes were very organized. Students said she tried really hard to make accounting fun, which was hard to do. Many students felt that handing out tests in the class was a big waste of lecture time. Multiple choice on the test was difficult. Students who didn't take accounting in high school found this course extremely hard. Overall, a very good course to take.

Instructor(s): E. Zuliani

	Resp: 56							Retake: 63%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	7	17	33	28	12	5.2
Explains	1	3	5	16	35	29	7	5.0
Communicates	3	1	1	9	25	45	12	5.4
Teaching	1	1	5	12	30	37	10	5.2
Workload	3	0	3	46	25	16	5	4.6
Difficulty	1	1	3	46	21	16	8	4.7
Learn Exp	2	2	11	40	23	14	4	4.4

Students enjoyed Zuliani's enthusiasm. Many felt that lectures were very rushed and students had trouble understanding the material. More detailed explanations would have been appreciated. Students would have liked more advice to prepare for tests. Tutorials were useful.

Instructor(s): E. Zuliani

	Resp: 168							Retake: 63%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	4	6	16	33	29	10	5.1
Explains	1	0	7	22	36	21	10	5.0
Communicates	2	0	2	18	31	34	10	5.2
Teaching	2	4	5	14	30	35	8	5.1
Workload	1	1	5	39	32	16	4	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	5	38	34	14	6	4.7
Learn Exp	3	3	3	33	29	24	2	4.7

Many students felt that OAC accounting should have been a mandatory prerequisite in order to take MGT 120, because it was hard for students who had no accounting background. Tutorials were not set up at a convenient time. Students wished that they could have a smaller class.

MGT 224H1F Financial Accounting Theory and Policy I

Instructor(s): I. Wiecek

	Resp: 45							Retake: 69%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	2	2	8	28	35	22	5.6
Explains	0	0	2	9	20	40	27	5.8
Communicates	0	0	2	0	31	37	28	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	2	26	42	28	6.0
Workload	0	0	0	36	40	20	2	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	34	41	20	2	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	0	30	33	20	16	5.2

Students felt that Wiecek was a very good instructor who was clear, efficient, and organized. She was very approachable and students appreciated her real world applications in class. However, some students felt that a TA and extra office hours would have been helpful.

MGT 224H1S Financial Accounting Theory and Policy I

Instructor(s): D. Segal

	Resp: 36							Retake: 63%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	5	30	36	27	5.9
Explains	0	0	2	16	22	33	25	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	19	25	30	25	5.6
Teaching	0	0	0	16	25	25	33	5.8
Workload	0	0	0	8	50	22	19	5.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	16	30	44	8	5.4
Learn Exp	0	3	0	25	35	32	3	5.0

Students found the assignments to be difficult and the material to be tedious. Many also felt the assignments were worth too much of their final marks. Some felt that a 10% participation mark was unfair, one student remarked that only accounting intellectuals were able to participate. Segal performed well overall and was quick responding to emails and calls.

Instructor(s): D. Segal

	Resp: 30							Retake: 55%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	10	20	36	33	5.9
Explains	0	0	3	20	20	33	23	5.5
Communicates	0	0	6	20	10	40	23	5.5
Teaching	0	0	3	16	20	40	20	5.6
Workload	0	0	0	6	30	36	26	5.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	0	33	40	26	5.9
Learn Exp	0	4	8	16	40	28	4	4.9

Segal was knowledgeable and a good instructor. The workload was very high and the material difficult. The participation mark was ambiguous and some thought it was unfair and resulted in poor quality class discussions. The IAPS were difficult and time consuming even though they were worth relatively little.

Instructor(s): D. Segal

	Enr: 31							Resp: 26							Retake: 72%							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	7	11	46	34	0	0	0	7	11	46	34	0	0	0	7	11	46	34	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	3	23	34	38	0	0	0	3	23	34	38	0	0	0	3	23	34	38	6.1
Communicates	0	0	3	7	11	42	34	0	0	3	7	11	42	34	0	0	3	7	11	42	34	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	3	26	38	30	0	0	0	3	26	38	30	0	0	0	3	26	38	30	6.0
Workload	0	0	0	15	42	23	19	0	0	0	15	42	23	19	0	0	0	15	42	23	19	5.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	15	38	30	15	0	0	0	15	38	30	15	0	0	0	15	38	30	15	5.5
Learn Exp	0	6	6	25	12	12	37	0	6	6	25	12	12	37	0	6	6	25	12	12	37	5.3

Students liked Segal's style of teaching because he explained concepts clearly. He taught his classes in an energetic manner.

MGT 252H1F Principles of Marketing

Instructor(s): D. Greeno

	Enr: 19							Resp: 18							Retake: 73%							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	11	64	17	5	0	0	0	11	64	17	5	0	0	0	11	64	17	5	5.2
Explains	0	5	0	5	38	22	27	0	5	0	5	38	22	27	0	5	0	5	38	22	27	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	5	33	61	0	0	0	0	5	33	61	0	0	0	0	5	33	61	6.6
Teaching	0	0	5	0	16	50	27	0	0	5	0	16	50	27	0	0	5	0	16	50	27	5.9
Workload	0	0	12	56	18	6	6	0	0	12	56	18	6	6	0	0	12	56	18	6	6	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	12	62	12	12	0	0	0	12	62	12	12	0	0	0	12	62	12	12	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	7	30	23	23	15	0	0	7	30	23	23	15	0	0	7	30	23	23	15	5.1

Greeno was a friendly and helpful instructor. His lectures were entertaining and informative with lots of examples.

Instructor(s): D. Greeno

	Enr: 49							Resp: 33							Retake: 64%							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	9	15	25	21	21	6	0	9	15	25	21	21	6	0	9	15	25	21	21	6	4.5
Explains	0	0	9	18	37	25	9	0	0	9	18	37	25	9	0	0	9	18	37	25	9	5.1
Communicates	0	3	0	9	21	31	34	0	3	0	9	21	31	34	0	3	0	9	21	31	34	5.8
Teaching	0	0	6	16	38	35	3	0	0	6	16	38	35	3	0	0	6	16	38	35	3	5.1
Workload	0	3	9	37	34	15	0	0	3	9	37	34	15	0	0	3	9	37	34	15	0	4.5
Difficulty	0	3	12	0	31	3	0	0	3	12	0	31	3	0	0	3	12	0	31	3	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	3	3	51	29	11	0	0	3	3	51	29	11	0	0	3	3	51	29	11	0	4.4

Students occasionally found the instructor confusing but helpful. There was too much required reading but handouts were useful.

Instructor(s): D. Greeno

	Enr: 43							Resp: 38							Retake: 72%							Mean		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
Presents	2	0	8	18	35	16	18	0	4	2	2	9	31	50	6.1	0	2	2	2	11	46	38	6.0	
Explains	2	0	10	13	18	28	26	0	2	0	0	2	28	26	42	6.1	2	0	0	0	11	46	39	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	2	28	26	42	0	0	2	16	27	21	32	6.0	4	2	0	0	13	32	46	6.0	
Teaching	0	0	2	16	27	21	32	0	2	15	59	15	6	0	4.1	0	2	15	59	15	6	0	4.1	
Workload	0	0	0	37	35	21	5	0	9	11	63	15	0	0	3.9	0	9	11	63	15	0	0	3.9	
Difficulty	0	0	8	67	13	10	0	2	5	0	16	32	32	10	5.1	0	8	67	13	10	0	4.3		
Learn Exp	0	6	3	22	41	22	3	2	5	0	16	32	32	10	5.1	0	6	3	22	41	22	3	4.8	

Most students felt Greeno was a good instructor who cared about how his students did in the class. Lectures were enthusiastic with numerous examples presented. However, students felt that the text readings were too long for a half-credit course.

Instructor(s): D. Greeno

	Enr: 41							Resp: 28							Retake: 48%							Mean	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	11	11	18	40	14	3	0	11	11	18	40	14	3	4.5	0	11	11	18	40	14	3	4.5
Explains	0	3	7	37	22	24	0	0	3	7	37	22	24	0	4.7	0	3	7	37	22	24	0	4.7
Communicates	0	0	11	15	19	34	19	0	0	11	15	19	34	19	5.3	0	0	11	15	19	34	19	5.3
Teaching	0	3	7	29	33	18	7	0	3	7	29	33	18	7	4.8	0	3	7	29	33	18	7	4.8
Workload	0	0	7	32	35	21	3	0	0	7	32	35	21	3	4.8	0	0	7	32	35	21	3	4.8

Difficulty	0	0	10	46	28	10	3	4.5
Learn Exp	0	8	13	17	39	21	0	4.5

Greeno cared a lot about the students. Students appreciated his Powerpoint presentations. However, some felt that the midterm test was difficult and said that there was too much required reading in the course.

MGT 252H1S Principles of Marketing

Instructor(s): D. Greeno

	Enr: 48							Resp: 18							Retake: 76%							Mean	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	0	11	5	41	29	11	0	0	11	5	41	29	11	5.2	0	0	11	5	41	29	11	5.2
Explains	0	0	0	5	41	17	35	0	0	0	5	41	17	35	5.8	0	0	0	5	41	17	35	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	5	11	35	47	0	0	0	5	11	35	47	6.2	0	0	0	5	11	35	47	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	5	35	41	17	0	0	0	5	35	41	17	5.7	0	0	0	5	35	41	17	5.7
Workload	0	0	17	47	29	0	5	0	0	17	47	29	0	5	4.3	0	0	17	47	29	0	5	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	11	82	0	5	0	0	0	11	82	0	5	0	4.0	0	0	11	82	0	5	0	4.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	46	38	15	0	0	0	0	46	38	15	0	4.7	0	0	0	46	38	15	0	4.7

Students enjoyed the course and the instructor. The group project was time consuming. The readings were interesting.

Instructor(s): D. Greeno

	Enr: 42							Resp: 40							Retake: 64%							Mean	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	2	5	5	23	18	26	18	2	5	5	23	18	26	18	5.0	0	0	2	12	38	23	23	5.5
Explains	0	0	2	12	38	23	23	0	0	2	12	38	23	23	5.5	0	0	2	12	38	23	23	5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	5	27	22	45	0	0	0	5	27	22	45	6.1	0	0	0	5	27	22	45	6.1
Teaching	0	0	2	18	23	31	23	0	0	2	18	23	31	23	5.6	0	0	2	18	23	31	23	5.6
Workload	0	0	2	52	32	7	5	0	0	2	52	32	7	5	4.6	0	0	2	52	32	7	5	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	7	65	25	2	0	0	0	7	65	25	2	0	4.2	0	0	7	65	25	2	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	4	48	24	20	4	0	0	4	48	24	20	4	4.7	0	0	4	48	24	20	4	4.7

Greeno received overwhelming praise from his students. He made learning fun and captivated the interests of his students. The tests were deemed as being too long and were difficult to complete with the allocated time. The course was well-organized and many students enjoyed watching the videos in class.

MGT 262H1S Individual and Group Behaviour in Organizations

Instructor(s): S. Cote

	Enr: 48							Resp: 44							Retake: 90%							Mean	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	4	2	2	9	31	50	0	4	2	2	9	31	50	6.1	0	4	2	2	9	31	50	6.1
Explains	0	2	2	2	11	46	38	0	2	2	2	11	46	38	6.0	0	2	2	2	11	46	38	6.0
Communicates	2	0	0	0	11	46	39	2	0	0	0	11	46	39	6.2	2	0	0	0	11	46	39	6.2
Teaching	4	2	0	0	13	32	46	4	2	0	0	13	32	46	6.0	4	2	0	0	13	32	46	6.0
Workload	0	2	15	59	15	6	0	0	2	15	59	15	6	0	4.1	0	2	15	59	15	6	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	9	11	63	15	0	0	0	9	11	63	15	0	0	3.9	0	9	11	63	15	0	0	3.9
Learn Exp	2	5	0	16	32	32	10	2	5	0	16	32	32	10	5.1	2	5	0	16	32	32	10	5.1

Students enjoyed the course and really liked the instructor. Lectures were interesting and well-supplemented with videos. He was attentive to students' needs and was caring. Some students found there wasn't enough time for the group assignment, especially the survey part. Students also would have liked more feedback on graded work.

Instructor(s): H. Schepmyer

	Enr: 50							Resp: 26							Retake: 76%							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5																	

124 MANAGEMENT

Most students found the instructor very enthusiastic and approachable. The course material was interesting. Some students were concerned with untimely changes to the course requirements. Also, the group project was a little disorganized and some felt that they did not have enough time. It was suggested that course material related to the project should have been taught earlier.

MGT 310Y1Y Managerial Economics

Instructor(s): F. Mathewson

	Enr: 38							Resp: 31		Retake: 34%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean			
Presents	3	0	0	35	32	16	12	4.9			
Explains	6	3	13	20	30	20	6	4.5			
Communicates	0	0	6	16	30	40	6	5.2			
Teaching	0	3	0	29	29	25	12	5.1			
Workload	0	0	0	61	35	3	0	4.4			
Difficulty	0	0	0	19	19	38	22	5.6			
Learn Exp	0	8	24	32	20	12	4	4.2			

Some students found the instructor very nice and enthusiastic about the course. However, tests were hard and students felt that solutions to problems would have been helpful.

Instructor(s): A. Hosios

	Enr: 34							Resp: 25		Retake: 82%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean			
Presents	0	0	0	12	20	48	20	5.8			
Explains	0	0	4	8	16	32	40	6.0			
Communicates	0	0	0	8	12	32	48	6.2			
Teaching	0	0	0	8	8	56	28	6.0			
Workload	0	0	0	66	20	8	4	4.5			
Difficulty	0	0	0	40	28	20	12	5.0			
Learn Exp	5	0	0	35	25	25	10	4.9			

Hosios taught with enthusiasm and brought the material alive.

MGT 322H1F Financial Accounting Theory and Policy II

Instructor(s): J. Amernic

	Enr: 42							Resp: 35		Retake: 75%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean			
Presents	0	0	0	11	20	32	35	5.9			
Explains	0	0	2	2	26	26	41	6.0			
Communicates	0	0	0	0	8	26	64	6.6			
Teaching	0	0	2	0	17	41	38	6.1			
Workload	0	0	3	27	45	15	9	5.0			
Difficulty	0	0	2	29	38	23	5	5.0			
Learn Exp	0	0	0	24	24	32	20	5.5			

Well liked by students, Amernic was considered very enthusiastic and was able to make a dull subject interesting. Many students considered Amernic to be a very good instructor.

MGT 322H1S Financial Accounting Theory and Policy II

Instructor(s): J. Amernic

	Enr: 50							Resp: 37		Retake: 64%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean			
Presents	0	2	0	10	18	37	29	5.8			
Explains	0	0	5	0	27	27	38	5.9			
Communicates	0	0	0	2	8	21	67	6.5			
Teaching	0	0	2	2	17	48	28	6.0			
Workload	0	0	0	22	34	31	11	5.3			
Difficulty	0	0	0	20	31	28	20	5.5			
Learn Exp	0	3	0	25	22	44	3	5.1			

The instructor was very organized and prepared for his classes. Many students felt that he also made the lectures very interesting.

Instructor(s): J. Amernic

	Enr: 47							Resp: 38		Retake: 69%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean			
Presents	0	0	2	2	22	28	42	6.1			
Explains	0	0	0	5	14	42	37	6.1			
Communicates	0	0	0	2	2	11	82	6.7			
Teaching	0	0	0	0	17	28	54	6.4			
Workload	0	0	0	20	54	20	5	5.1			
Difficulty	0	0	0	14	57	14	14	5.3			
Learn Exp	0	0	0	20	33	33	13	5.4			

Amernic's lectures were enthusiastic and energetic, and he was always willing to spend time to help students with the challenging course material. Overall, the course was enjoyable and the instructor excellent.

MGT 330H1S Investments

Instructor(s): K. Wang

	Enr: 32							Resp: 14		Retake: 92%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean			
Presents	0	0	0	0	15	38	46	6.3			
Explains	0	0	0	0	30	61	7	5.8			
Communicates	0	0	0	15	0	69	15	5.8			
Teaching	0	0	0	0	7	53	38	6.3			
Workload	0	0	0	21	35	42	0	5.2			
Difficulty	0	0	0	14	35	42	7	5.4			
Learn Exp	0	0	0	12	50	37	0	5.2			

Students said Wang made the course interesting and was available to answer questions. His lecture notes were very organized. Overall, students really enjoyed the course.

Instructor(s): K. Wang

	Enr: 41							Resp: 38		Retake: 80%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean			
Presents	0	0	0	8	21	37	32	5.9			
Explains	0	0	0	18	26	42	13	5.5			
Communicates	0	0	2	13	28	26	28	5.7			
Teaching	0	0	0	5	21	42	31	6.0			
Workload	0	2	0	39	42	10	5	4.7			
Difficulty	0	2	0	36	36	15	7	4.9			
Learn Exp	0	0	0	26	26	23	23	5.4			

Wang was very knowledgeable and explained the course material in a clear manner. Students found his email updates and the notes on his website very useful. He was very friendly and approachable. However, students felt the workload was a bit heavy and complicated.

Instructor(s): K. Wang

	Enr: 40							Resp: 37		Retake: 87%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean			
Presents	0	0	0	2	22	40	34	6.1			
Explains	0	0	0	11	47	30	11	5.4			
Communicates	0	0	0	11	28	37	22	5.7			
Teaching	0	0	0	0	21	45	32	6.1			
Workload	0	0	2	50	36	8	2	4.6			
Difficulty	0	0	0	27	59	8	5	4.9			
Learn Exp	0	0	3	15	50	19	11	5.2			

The course was a valuable learning experience. Wang was passionate about the course material which students felt would be useful in the future. Some students complained that the exam was weighted too heavily and the textbook did not really correspond with the course material. However, Wang's lecture notes were very informative.

Instructor(s): A. Ahmed

	Enr: 10							Resp: 9	Retake: 57%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	11	11	11	44	11	11	4.7	
Explains	0	11	11	22	11	33	11	4.8	
Communicates	0	11	0	11	44	11	22	5.1	
Teaching	11	11	0	33	0	22	22	4.6	
Workload	0	0	0	44	11	44	0	5.0	
Difficulty	0	0	11	33	44	11	0	4.6	
Learn Exp	16	0	0	33	33	16	0	4.2	

A few students complained of poor teaching techniques and the instructor went through topics too fast in class.

MGT 331Y1Y Finance

Instructor(s): K. Benzacar

	Enr: 36							Resp: 28	Retake: 77%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	3	10	28	42	14	5.5	
Explains	0	0	7	17	28	35	10	5.2	
Communicates	0	0	3	14	32	50	0	5.3	
Teaching	0	0	3	14	29	40	11	5.4	
Workload	7	3	17	46	21	3	0	3.8	
Difficulty	7	0	17	32	32	10	0	4.1	
Learn Exp	4	0	4	45	27	13	4	4.5	

There was an overwhelming consensus that Benzacar was a good and caring instructor. The midterms were challenging in comparison to the examples and assigned problems. Many students mentioned that they would have preferred more regular tutorials.

MGT 337Y1Y Business Finance

Instructor(s): A. Ahmed

	Enr: 45							Resp: 13	Retake: 36%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	30	23	30	7	7	4.4	
Explains	0	30	15	15	30	0	7	3.8	
Communicates	0	8	8	8	33	33	8	5.0	
Teaching	0	16	16	33	25	8	0	3.9	
Workload	0	0	0	25	50	8	16	5.2	
Difficulty	0	0	0	16	33	8	41	5.8	
Learn Exp	11	11	11	55	11	0	0	3.4	

Many students were dissatisfied with the instructor's teaching style. They felt that he lacked preparation and that the lecture slides did not help increase understanding of the material. Students felt that the instructor did not explain concepts clearly and was not always able to answer their questions effectively.

The assignments and tests did not reflect what was taught in class. Also, the assignments took many hours of hard work even though they were only worth 2% each. The textbook was at an introductory level which didn't help students prepare for lectures/assignments.

Instructor(s): D. Brean

	Enr: 45							Resp: 47	Retake: 68%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	0	12	40	25	21	5.6	
Explains	0	0	0	15	36	28	19	5.5	
Communicates	2	0	0	0	17	28	52	6.2	
Teaching	0	0	0	8	23	29	38	6.0	
Workload	0	0	0	17	34	38	10	5.4	
Difficulty	0	0	0	10	44	25	19	5.5	
Learn Exp	2	0	5	22	30	30	8	5.0	

Brean was interesting, helpful, and knowledgeable in his techniques to teaching. It would have made concepts easier to understand if more solutions were provided for practice examples. Students also found that the midterms were much tougher than class examples.

Instructor(s): A. Ahmed

	Enr: 44							Resp: 21	Retake: 68%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	4	14	33	33	14	0	4.4	
Explains	0	9	14	19	42	9	4	4.4	
Communicates	4	4	0	14	23	47	4	5.1	
Teaching	0	4	14	28	33	14	4	4.5	
Workload	4	0	0	19	38	28	9	5.1	
Difficulty	4	0	0	9	28	42	14	5.4	
Learn Exp	0	0	11	35	35	11	5	4.6	

Students liked his use of his work experience to explain the topics. However, they felt that he wasn't very encouraging. The course material was very new and challenging to students. A large number of topics were covered in the course. The assignments were difficult and took a lot of time to complete which was not reflected in the mark weighting. Some students were concerned about the common exam because each instructor taught different things.

MGT 353H1F Introduction to Marketing Management

Instructor(s): T. Dewan

	Enr: 46							Resp: 35	Retake: 75%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	5	2	11	34	22	17	5	4.4	
Explains	0	8	11	28	25	14	11	4.6	
Communicates	0	0	2	14	20	31	31	5.7	
Teaching	2	2	5	22	25	28	11	5.0	
Workload	0	2	5	60	22	8	0	4.3	
Difficulty	0	0	5	77	14	0	2	4.2	
Learn Exp	0	3	7	32	17	21	17	5.0	

Feelings towards Dewan were mixed. Most found Dewan to be an enthusiastic instructor while a few felt Dewan was disorganized. Some felt that expectations for the class and assignments unclear. Many students felt that the participation mark was worth too much.

MGT 363H1F Organization Design

Instructor(s): D. Ondrack

	Enr: 46							Resp: 38	Retake: 85%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	0	10	29	35	24	5.7	
Explains	0	0	0	2	8	54	35	6.2	
Communicates	0	0	2	2	19	41	33	6.0	
Teaching	0	0	0	2	24	40	32	6.0	
Workload	0	5	5	62	18	2	5	4.2	
Difficulty	0	2	8	70	16	2	0	4.1	
Learn Exp	0	0	0	42	25	21	10	5.0	

Many students found the instructor to be very friendly, knowledgeable and approachable. The examples used in class added tremendously to the learning experience.

MGT 363H1S Organization Design

Instructor(s): D. Ondrack

	Enr: 52							Resp: 30	Retake: 79%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	
Presents	0	0	0	6	13	50	30	6.0	
Explains	0	0	0	6	3	51	37	6.2	
Communicates	0	0	0	0	13	53	33	6.2	
Teaching	0	0	3	3	13	40	40	6.1	
Workload	3	3	10	50	23	10	0	4.2	
Difficulty	3	3	3	70	16	3	0	4.0	
Learn Exp	0	0	0	26	42	21	10	5.2	

Students thought Ondrack was great. Some complained that the class average in this class and the class average in another MGT 363 class was very different for the midterm, suggesting that the TA's should mark more consistently.

126 MANAGEMENT

MGT 374H1S Operations Management

Instructor(s): A. Chan

	Resp: 36							Retake: 59%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	2	0	19	36	27	13	5.3
Explains	0	2	8	25	36	25	2	4.8
Communicates	2	0	11	8	41	25	11	5.1
Teaching	0	5	2	16	19	47	8	5.2
Workload	0	2	14	42	31	5	2	4.3
Difficulty	2	5	8	37	31	5	8	4.4
Learn Exp	7	0	7	39	21	17	7	4.5

The course was very quantitative-based. Some students believed that it was difficult to understand Chan at times. However, the use of assignments helped to improve the students' course mark.

Instructor(s): A. Chan

	Resp: 30							Retake: 70%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	3	35	32	28	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	6	41	31	20	5.7
Communicates	0	0	3	3	34	34	24	5.7
Teaching	0	3	0	6	27	48	13	5.6
Workload	0	0	7	46	39	3	3	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	7	42	32	10	7	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	42	42	14	0	4.7

Some students felt that the midterm was difficult and marked strictly. Chan was a good lecturer. The course was also very mathematical based.

MGT 393H1F Legal Environment of Business I

Instructor(s): R. Sahni

	Resp: 36							Retake: 93%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	2	2	5	8	38	41	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	0	8	27	63	6.6
Communicates	0	0	0	5	13	33	47	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	2	19	47	0	6.1
Workload	0	0	8	54	34	2	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	2	54	34	5	2	4.5
Learn Exp	0	3	0	7	46	23	19	5.4

Many students found the instructor to be very enthusiastic and interesting. Some students wanted more feedback on assignments and tests. As well, some students thought lecture notes would have been helpful because a lot of material as covered.

Instructor(s): R. Powers

	Resp: 45							Retake: 87%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	2	12	23	33	23	5	4.8
Explains	0	0	0	7	23	33	35	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	0	12	25	62	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	7	30	30	32	5.9
Workload	0	0	0	60	23	7	7	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	39	44	5	10	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	0	23	16	30	26	5.6

Overall, students felt that the class was enjoyable and the instructor was enthusiastic.

Instructor(s): R. Powers

	Resp: 48							Retake: 97%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	15	41	19	23	5.5

Explains	0	0	0	4	10	19	65	6.5
Communicates	0	0	0	2	4	15	78	6.7
Teaching	0	0	0	4	8	40	46	6.3
Workload	0	0	13	56	26	2	2	4.2
Difficulty	0	2	2	67	21	4	2	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	9	9	37	43	6.2

Powers was a humorous and enthusiastic instructor who made class very enjoyable to attend. His use of real life examples to explain legal topics was greatly appreciated. Some felt that the marking was done poorly with very little feedback. Also, it would have been more helpful if the class notes were more organized and detailed.

Instructor(s): D. Shear

	Resp: 34							Retake: 96%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	3	33	63	6.6
Explains	0	0	0	0	3	27	69	6.7
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	37	62	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	3	9	27	60	6.5
Workload	0	0	0	41	41	11	5	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	35	41	11	11	5.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	4	31	13	50	6.1

Shear was an excellent instructor who was knowledgeable and showed enthusiasm in the course material. Handouts were greatly appreciated and proved to be useful. However, tests were too long.

MGT 393H1S Legal Environment of Business I

Instructor(s): D. Shear

	Resp: 29							Retake: 88%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	7	14	46	32	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	7	10	46	35	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	3	17	44	34	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	3	27	58	10	5.8
Workload	0	0	3	62	20	13	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	3	0	51	24	17	3	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	9	45	27	18	5.5

Shear was a good lecturer since he explained concepts very well, but he was often late for class! The course was enjoyable and the instructor's notes were quite helpful.

MGT 394H1S Legal Environment of Business II

Instructor(s): R. Powers

	Resp: 43							Retake: 95%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	2	21	30	30	14	5.3
Explains	0	0	0	4	2	47	45	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	2	6	20	69	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	4	4	46	44	6.3
Workload	0	4	11	69	11	2	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	4	6	65	18	4	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	8	11	44	36	6.1

Powers was a very enthusiastic lecturer and had a great sense of humour. His use of real life examples and his attitude contributed to the overall enjoyable course. He made the law material interesting.

MGT 411H1S Management Sciences

Instructor(s): O. Berman

	Resp: 18							Retake: 83%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	5	22	27	44	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	5	23	35	35	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	11	22	22	44	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	5	33	22	38	5.9

Workload	0	0	16	50	33	0	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	5	70	23	0	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	26	53	20	0	4.9

Berman was very enthusiastic in teaching the course. He attended to students' questions well and made himself available for extra help. He also answered emails very quickly.

MGT 412H1F Business Negotiations

Instructor(s): N. Fassina

Enr: 39	Resp: 35							Retake: 96%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	22	31	45	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	0	14	34	51	6.4
Communicates	0	0	0	0	2	11	85	6.8
Teaching	0	0	0	0	8	20	70	6.6
Workload	0	0	25	62	2	8	0	3.9
Difficulty	0	2	20	65	5	5	0	3.9
Learn Exp	0	0	3	6	25	18	46	6.0

Most students found the instructor very enthusiastic and effective. He was very approachable and encouraged a lot of class discussion. The course was very practical and students felt it should be made a regular course instead of a special topics one.

MGT 413H1S Technology Strategy

Instructor(s): K. Dahlin

Enr: 31	Resp: 22							Retake: 65%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	14	19	47	19	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	14	23	23	38	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	9	4	23	61	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	4	14	38	42	6.2
Workload	0	4	0	14	38	23	19	5.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	28	38	23	9	5.1
Learn Exp	5	5	0	11	27	27	22	5.2

Dahlin was very knowledgeable and lectured very well. The amount of reading for this course was a bit heavy at times. Students said the workload was challenging, but it was a rewarding course.

MGT 423H1F Canadian Income Taxation I

Instructor(s): J. Kitunen

Enr: 47	Resp: 44							Retake: 82%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	11	23	34	30	5.8
Explains	0	0	2	6	32	30	27	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	2	20	30	46	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	4	20	41	32	6.0
Workload	0	0	0	6	20	32	39	6.0
Difficulty	0	0	2	16	25	37	18	5.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	30	20	33	15	5.3

Students enjoyed the class and felt that the instructor was knowledgeable. A participation mark was mentioned as being unfair since class time was limited and class size was very large.

Instructor(s): J. Kitunen

Enr: 46	Resp: 42							Retake: 86%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	21	36	40	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	0	16	42	40	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	2	4	34	58	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	0	12	53	34	6.2
Workload	0	0	0	12	31	41	14	5.6
Difficulty	0	0	2	26	29	31	9	5.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	8	38	30	22	5.7

Students found this course to be challenging yet informative. Kitunen was enthusiastic and knowledgeable. Some students felt the latter half of the term was rushed. As well, some students found the participation marks to be a problem.

MGT 426H1F Advanced Accounting

Instructor(s): J. Myers

Enr: 37	Resp: 34							Retake: 72%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	2	14	32	14	23	11	4.8
Explains	2	0	11	23	32	20	8	4.8
Communicates	2	5	17	14	29	26	5	4.5
Teaching	2	0	11	26	29	23	5	4.7
Workload	0	0	2	14	29	44	8	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	8	23	50	17	5.8
Learn Exp	0	0	14	44	14	25	0	4.5

Students generally felt that the instructor was very knowledgeable and responsive to questions both in and out of class. However, the consensus was that he lacked enthusiasm while teaching and should have explained the reasoning behind the course concepts rather than just writing solutions on the board. Slides and handouts would have also assisted in teaching the material. Students also felt that a weight of 30% for a short assignment was too high.

MGT 426H1S Advanced Accounting

Instructor(s): G. Richardson

Enr: 49	Resp: 35							Retake: 30%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	2	17	20	14	14	2	4.6
Explains	2	0	17	26	17	17	2	4.5
Communicates	0	0	0	14	34	34	17	5.5
Teaching	0	2	5	34	31	20	5	4.8
Workload	0	0	2	47	23	17	8	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	32	32	26	8	5.1
Learn Exp	0	0	17	60	13	8	0	4.1

Many students felt that lectures were not helpful. The required readings were extremely valuable. The lectures were just a regurgitation of the textbook. Richardson was not very thorough in answering students' questions. Some felt that compulsory tutorials would have helped.

Instructor(s): G. Richardson

Enr: 28	Resp: 11							Retake: 60%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	20	40	30	10	5.3
Explains	0	0	9	18	36	27	9	5.1
Communicates	0	0	0	10	30	20	40	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	11	44	33	11	5.4
Workload	0	0	0	40	30	10	20	5.1
Difficulty	0	0	0	20	30	50	0	5.3
Learn Exp	0	0	12	25	25	37	0	4.9

Richardson had great enthusiasm. Students should expect to tie knowledge from other accounting and finance related courses.

MGT 428H1F Management Control

Instructor(s): B. Bertrand

Enr: 36	Resp: 30							Retake: 72%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	24	34	41	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	10	13	40	36	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	3	23	36	36	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	3	13	46	36	6.2
Workload	0	3	6	60	26	3	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	3	6	56	26	6	0	4.3
Learn Exp	0	5	0	25	35	15	20	5.2

128 MANAGEMENT

Students found Bertrand to be very organized, informative and approachable. Questions and concepts were discussed thoroughly.

MGT 428H1S Management Control

Instructor(s): E. Zuliani

	Resp: 32							Retake: 37%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	3	19	35	32	9	5.3
Explains	0	0	3	16	19	45	16	5.5
Communicates	0	0	3	22	19	29	25	5.5
Teaching	0	0	0	32	12	41	12	5.4
Workload	0	3	12	58	12	9	3	4.2
Difficulty	0	3	9	64	16	6	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	13	30	26	21	4	4	3.9

Some felt that the assignments were not a fair reflection of the course material and the expectations of the assignments were unclear. Old accounting material was rehashed, with very little new concepts covered. Zuliani was always friendly, approachable and in a "good mood".

MGT 429H1F Canadian Income Tax II

Instructor(s): R. Batch

	Resp: 13							Retake: 100%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	7	23	38	30	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	0	15	30	53	6.4
Communicates	0	0	0	0	15	53	30	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	0	7	53	38	6.3
Workload	0	0	0	53	0	38	7	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	30	23	38	7	5.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	33	55	11	5.8

Material covered in the course will help students who will be writing the UFE exam. Lectures had excellent examples.

MGT 429H1S Canadian Income Tax II

Instructor(s): J. Kitunen

	Resp: 42							Retake: 61%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	7	23	33	35	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	4	23	38	33	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	7	11	19	61	6.4
Teaching	0	0	2	2	16	33	45	6.2
Workload	0	0	0	11	16	40	30	5.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	7	23	33	35	6.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	27	27	24	21	5.4

Students enjoyed Kitunen's style of teaching: enthusiastic, helpful and organized. The instructor explained concepts quite clearly. The midterms and assignments were challenging, but the course was informative and the learning experience valuable.

Instructor(s): J. Kitunen

	Resp: 22							Retake: 65%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	13	31	36	18	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	7	13	36	40	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	4	13	27	54	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	4	22	36	36	6.0
Workload	0	0	0	9	36	45	9	5.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	18	36	36	9	5.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	11	52	29	5	5.3

Students felt the workload for this course was too high. It would've been better if the course material was taught at a slower pace because the instructor went through examples a little too quickly.

MGT 431H1F Advanced Topics in Corporate Finance

Instructor(s): O. Norli

	Resp: 10							Retake: 77%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	0	60	40	6.4
Explains	0	0	0	0	10	50	40	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	10	50	40	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	80	20	6.2
Workload	0	0	0	40	30	10	20	5.1
Difficulty	0	0	0	40	50	0	10	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	28	28	28	14	5.3

Students found Norli was a very good instructor who made the course interesting, and provided ample resources and feedback.

Instructor(s): O. Norli

	Resp: 40							Retake: 75%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	2	0	7	22	32	35	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	15	32	35	17	5.6
Communicates	0	0	2	17	22	32	25	5.6
Teaching	0	0	0	15	22	37	25	5.7
Workload	0	0	0	27	42	20	10	5.1
Difficulty	0	0	2	37	37	12	10	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	3	27	27	27	13	5.2

Students enjoyed Norli's course because of his good organization skills and his approach to helping students.

Instructor(s): O. Norli

	Resp: 28							Retake: 65%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	3	14	17	28	35	5.8
Explains	3	0	3	21	21	28	21	5.3
Communicates	0	0	7	21	21	28	21	5.4
Teaching	0	0	3	10	25	39	21	5.6
Workload	0	0	17	17	25	21	17	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	7	28	42	7	14	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	0	52	14	23	9	4.9

Assignments were interesting but the text did not relate well with the course material. The lectures were presented in a well-planned manner.

MGT 439H1S International Finance

Instructor(s): C. Doidge

	Resp: 17							Retake: 76%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	5	47	47	6.4
Explains	0	0	0	11	17	35	35	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	5	0	35	58	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	5	0	47	47	6.4
Workload	0	0	0	35	47	5	11	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	52	29	5	11	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	0	18	37	18	25	5.5

Students really liked the instructor. The lecture notes were organized and useful. The instructor was enthusiastic about the material and was available for extra help. Students would have appreciated having solutions for the problem sets. Outstanding professor!

Instructor(s): C. Doidge

	Resp: 7							Retake: 83%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	16	83	0	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	0	33	50	16	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	16	66	16	6.0

Teaching	0	0	0	0	16	66	16	6.0
Workload	0	0	0	50	33	16	0	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	0	33	33	16	16	5.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	66	33	0	5.3

He was a very good instructor, but he talked too fast. The assignments were too long and time consuming. The assignments and case study should have been worth more marks.

MGT 452H1F Advanced Marketing Management

Instructor(s): J. Silver

Enr: 31	Resp: 31							Retake: 96%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	22	41	16	19	5.3
Explains	0	0	0	3	22	51	22	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	0	6	35	58	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	3	16	61	19	6.0
Workload	0	3	19	61	12	3	0	3.9
Difficulty	0	0	12	67	16	0	3	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	4	16	33	29	16	5.4

Students loved the instructor's funny and energetic attitude. His classes were always entertaining and interesting. Participation in class was weighted heavily in the marking scheme (30% of of the final grade).

MGT 452H1S Advanced Marketing Management

Instructor(s): J. Silver

Enr: 26	Resp: 23							Retake: 95%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	13	22	27	36	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	9	27	27	36	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	9	4	22	63	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	9	9	31	50	6.2
Workload	0	4	14	61	14	4	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	0	13	54	18	13	0	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	12	12	37	37	6.0

Silver's use of real life examples and scenarios helped students a great deal in understanding the course concepts. Students loved Silver's friendly and enthusiastic teaching style. The course was enjoyable and worthwhile.

MGT 454H1S Special Topics in Marketing

Instructor(s): T. Dewan

Enr: 25	Resp: 17							Retake: 57%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	12	37	25	18	6	4.7
Explains	6	6	0	25	25	37	0	4.7
Communicates	0	0	0	12	37	18	31	5.7
Teaching	6	6	0	18	37	18	12	4.8
Workload	0	0	0	11	35	23	29	5.7
Difficulty	0	0	0	5	41	35	17	5.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	44	33	11	11	4.9

Most students enjoyed the course material. However, there was not enough direction with respect to the assignments. Lectures were not clearly structured. Some students found it difficult to get in touch with the instructor for help on assignments and help with using the software program. It was suggested that the weight of marks did not match the amount of effort put into the presentation.

MGT 460H1S Human Resource Management

Instructor(s): D. Mackenzie

Enr: 50	Resp: 42							Retake: 72%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	2	14	9	14	45	14	5.3
Explains	0	2	14	9	14	45	14	5.3
Communicates	0	0	2	7	40	28	21	5.6
Teaching	0	0	4	17	21	43	12	5.4

Workload	0	0	4	66	23	4	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	4	80	14	0	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	6	42	30	21	0	4.7

She was very enthusiastic and caring about students. She liked practical real life examples however, some students felt that she didn't have enough teaching experience to teach 4th year students. Students suggested that slides should have been put together before class with all final changes. Some students were overwhelmed by the group project.

MGT 492H1S Introduction to Strategic Management

Instructor(s): K. Dahlin

Enr: 42	Resp: 29							Retake: 84%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	10	28	28	10	21	5.0
Explains	0	0	6	13	20	31	27	5.6
Communicates	0	0	3	7	7	40	40	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	20	17	27	34	5.8
Workload	3	7	0	3	40	29	14	5.2
Difficulty	3	3	3	28	46	10	3	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	11	11	38	16	22	5.3

Dahlin was an effective instructor who helped students understand the course material. She was enthusiastic and motivated students to do well. The use of cases was an effective method to broaden strategic thinking. Class participation was required, but the midterm was challenging.

Instructor(s): K. Dahlin

Enr: 20	Resp: 23							Retake: 73%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	18	36	27	18	5.5
Explains	0	0	0	4	38	42	14	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	4	31	27	36	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	0	40	40	18	5.8
Workload	0	0	0	43	21	21	13	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	52	26	17	4	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	9	18	27	27	18	5.3

Students enjoyed the classes and found her knowledgeable and energetic. Students found that the group work was very demanding and some students would have liked some individual work. Overall, very enjoyable.