

## CHEMISTRY STUDENTS' UNION

<b>6</b>	12.011 ±4,2	<b>16</b>	32.06 ±2,4,6
4470 <sup>+</sup> 4100 <sup>+</sup>	<b>C</b>	717.75 388.36	<b>S</b>
2.62		2.07	
1s <sup>2</sup> 2s <sup>2</sup> 2p <sup>2</sup> Carbon		[Ne]3s <sup>2</sup> 3p <sup>4</sup> Sulfur	

<b>92</b>	238.029 6,5,4,3
4407 1405	<b>U</b>
18.90	
[Rn]5f <sup>6</sup> 6d <sup>1</sup> 7s <sup>2</sup> Uranium	

## Introduction

The Chemistry Students' Union (CSU) is a student run organization acting as the representative voice for all undergraduate students enrolled in a chemistry course. We hold social and academic events which strive to bring together students who share an interest in the discipline. If you want to get involved, please contact us at [csu@chem.utoronto.ca](mailto:csu@chem.utoronto.ca) or check out our website [www.chem.utoronto.ca/students/csua](http://www.chem.utoronto.ca/students/csua).

CSU Executive

## CHM 138H1F Introductory Organic Chemistry I

Instructor(s): A. Yudin; K. Quinlan

Enr: 328 Resp: 193 Retake: 62%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Yudin:</u>								
Presents	7	6	9	25	26	17	6	4.3
Explains	7	6	13	20	27	18	5	4.3
Communicates	7	3	7	14	22	27	17	5.0
Teaching	6	4	12	24	24	18	8	4.4
<u>Quinlan:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	8	9	42	38	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	7	17	38	35	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	8	16	37	36	6.0
Teaching	0	0	1	5	14	44	33	6.0
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	0	22	26	32	17	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	1	20	28	35	13	5.4
Learn Exp	3	0	5	21	29	30	9	5.0

Most students found the tests too difficult with not enough time to finish. The material was not well-distributed and too much emphasis was placed on only a few topics. Some students found lectures confusing, but when examples and models were presented, the learning experience greatly increased. There were mixed feelings as to whether the tutorials were helpful or just confusing.

Yudin was very knowledgeable but was difficult to understand at times. He was very enthusiastic and made the information interesting. His test was challenging.

Quinlan was very enthusiastic and thorough in her approach to teaching. Many students found her very fair and friendly. She was approachable and extremely generous in offering her time for extra help sessions and tutorials.

Instructor(s): M. Winnik

Enr: 328 Resp: 182 Retake: 61%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	1	6	16	29	24	21	5.3
Explains	0	0	2	9	26	34	26	5.7
Communicates	0	0	1	3	16	27	51	6.2
Teaching	0	0	2	6	23	33	32	5.8
Workload	0	0	0	24	26	31	17	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	1	20	29	33	15	5.4
Learn Exp	2	0	5	24	27	31	8	5.0

A lot of students found the lecturer very enthusiastic. Some students thought that the extra examples the lecturer gave in class were very helpful. Also, students really appreciated the great sense of humour the lecturer had. However, sometimes the students found the lecturer went through the course notes too fast for everyone to write them down. Students would have liked to have seen more practice questions given in class and tutorials to better prepare for the tests.

Instructor(s): K. Quinlan; A. Yudin

Enr: 459 Resp: 295 Retake: 64%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Quinlan:</u>								
Presents	1	0	0	5	25	39	27	5.8
Explains	1	0	1	7	23	37	28	5.8
Communicates	1	1	1	8	23	36	28	5.7
Teaching	1	0	0	9	19	43	25	5.8
<u>Yudin:</u>								
Presents	2	3	11	20	35	17	9	4.7
Explains	3	3	16	20	25	19	11	4.6
Communicates	3	2	6	17	22	27	18	5.1
Teaching	3	2	9	23	24	26	10	4.9
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	1	0	2	26	31	26	12	5.1
Difficulty	1	0	1	23	35	25	12	5.2
Learn Exp	0	2	4	30	28	24	9	4.9

Many students felt that Quinlan was very effective in her teaching style. Students felt that the instructor explained concepts clearly and conveyed enthusiasm for the material. Students appreciated the instructor's use of examples and the time taken to attend to questions.

Yudin used many real life examples in his lectures, which some students appreciated and felt conveyed his enthusiasm for the course. A few students felt that this caused him to stray too far from lecture material and did not enhance their understanding of the concepts covered.

Instructor(s): M. Winnik

Enr: 459 Resp: 290 Retake: 63%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	1	1	4	15	26	26	23	5.4
Explains	0	1	3	7	23	36	27	5.7
Communicates	0	1	1	2	10	26	57	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	6	18	38	35	6.0
Workload	0	0	1	26	30	27	13	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	1	22	34	25	15	5.3
Learn Exp	0	3	2	29	28	26	9	5.0

Winnik was considered a good instructor and very enthusiastic. He made lectures interesting using good examples.

In general, students felt that there was a lot of material to cover in this course. Many felt the second term test was too long and contained material not adequately covered in class. Some students felt that more practice questions would have been helpful preparation and felt course expectations were not clear. Some students felt there was not enough connection between labs and the lectures.

### 34 CHEMISTRY

Instructor(s): K. Quinlan; S. Browning

	Enr: 249							Mean
	Resp: 131							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<b>Quinlan:</b>								
Presents	2	0	5	14	20	37	19	5.4
Explains	2	1	3	16	22	31	22	5.4
Communicates	2	3	4	9	24	35	20	5.4
Teaching	3	3	2	12	24	34	19	5.4
<b>Browning:</b>								
Presents	1	1	1	8	24	38	23	5.6
Explains	2	1	3	11	20	40	20	5.5
Communicates	1	1	0	8	12	31	44	6.0
Teaching	1	0	2	8	17	35	33	5.8
<b>Course:</b>								
Workload	0	3	1	26	28	24	14	5.1
Difficulty	0	2	3	25	23	31	13	5.2
Learn Exp	3	6	7	28	26	15	13	4.7

The course notes were well-organized but perhaps a bit lengthy. Some students would have appreciated better evaluation in tutorials and more help with labs. Although the material was sometimes uninteresting, the instructors managed to keep the course engaging and entertaining. Students generally believed there should have been a more even coverage of material on the tests in relation to what was covered in class.

Most students liked Quinlan's teaching style and found the in-class problem solving to help with the tests, which Quinlan gave helpful feedback on.

Students felt that Browning was enthusiastic, engaging, well-organized and very helpful. Some students felt that more examples would have been helpful.

#### CHM 138H1S Introductory Organic Chemistry I

Instructor(s): S. Browning

	Enr: 209							Mean
	Resp: 60							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	1	0	0	11	10	43	33	5.9
Explains	1	0	3	8	15	38	33	5.8
Communicates	1	0	0	1	11	35	50	6.3
Teaching	1	0	3	5	13	35	41	6.0
Workload	1	0	0	27	35	30	5	5.1
Difficulty	1	1	0	16	35	28	15	5.3
Learn Exp	4	10	8	21	27	19	8	4.5

Many students thought that Browning was very enthusiastic and approachable. He explained the concepts thoroughly and always helped students with their questions. However, students wished the instructor would have provided more relevant practice questions to better prepare them for the tests.

The course material was challenging for a first year course, but students enjoyed the instructor's teaching.

Instructor(s): S. Browning

	Enr: 473							Mean
	Resp: 261							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	5	28	30	33	5.9
Explains	0	0	1	8	28	38	43	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	5	10	38	43	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	10	18	34	35	5.9
Workload	0	0	0	35	30	24	7	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	1	34	33	20	9	5.0
Learn Exp	1	1	2	42	26	18	6	4.7

Most students thoroughly enjoyed Browning. He was a good, approachable and enthusiastic lecturer. He explained concepts with good clarification.

The tests were challenging and more time should have been allotted. The labs were challenging but a good learning experience.

#### CHM 139H1F Chemistry: Physical Principles

Instructor(s): S. Browning; R. Jockusch

	Enr: 395							Mean
	Resp: 221							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<b>Browning:</b>								
Presents	0	0	1	14	28	30	23	5.5
Explains	0	0	3	15	24	35	19	5.5
Communicates	0	0	2	6	15	33	42	6.1
Teaching	0	1	2	11	28	31	24	5.6
<b>Jockusch:</b>								
Presents	1	1	3	18	33	26	15	5.2
Explains	1	1	5	17	30	27	14	5.2
Communicates	1	2	6	14	28	31	14	5.2
Teaching	3	2	6	17	34	25	10	4.9
<b>Course:</b>								
Workload	0	0	0	20	33	24	20	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	4	23	30	26	14	5.2
Learn Exp	5	2	9	41	26	8	5	4.3

Most students enjoyed both instructors. More examples would have been appreciated by many students. Many agreed that the homework questions were not challenging enough and did not reflect class material.

Browning was entertaining and made the course material interesting. His enthusiasm for the material made it easier for students to understand. His teaching methods were innovative and provided a good experience for students.

Students generally felt that, although Jockusch showed enthusiasm for the material, she was unclear when explaining some concepts. Her examples were appreciated by the students but sometimes she went too quickly for students to copy everything down. A few students complained about the difficulty of the test compared to assigned questions.

Instructor(s): S. Whittington

	Enr: 395							Mean
	Resp: 205							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	2	3	13	25	26	16	12	4.7
Explains	1	5	14	24	20	19	13	4.7
Communicates	2	5	9	20	27	17	16	4.8
Teaching	1	1	6	23	26	26	14	5.1
Workload	0	0	2	28	27	22	17	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	4	30	28	22	12	5.0
Learn Exp	3	3	9	45	25	7	5	4.3

Many students thought that Whittington was a good instructor who explained concepts clearly. He was also enthusiastic and approachable.

Students felt there was a lot of material to cover in a short time. The labs were very demanding and more feedback on lab reports would have been appreciated.

Instructor(s): S. Browning; R. Jockusch

	Enr: 292							Mean
	Resp: 39							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<b>Browning:</b>								
Presents	0	0	2	12	30	23	30	5.7
Explains	2	0	7	12	25	25	25	5.4
Communicates	0	0	5	0	12	38	43	6.2
Teaching	0	0	2	15	17	35	28	5.7
<b>Jockusch:</b>								
Presents	0	0	5	18	27	27	21	5.4
Explains	0	0	2	24	24	40	8	5.3
Communicates	0	0	0	8	27	37	27	5.8
Teaching	0	5	0	13	29	37	13	5.4
<b>Course:</b>								
Workload	2	0	7	18	15	34	21	5.3
Difficulty	2	0	5	20	20	41	10	5.2
Learn Exp	0	2	8	37	40	8	2	4.5

The tests did not reflect the course material. The homework questions were not challenging enough compared to the test questions. It would have been helpful if tutorials covered more lab and class material.

Instructor(s): S. Whittington

	Enr: 292							Mean
	Resp: 38							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	2	13	28	31	23	5.6
Explains	0	5	7	2	36	23	23	5.4
Communicates	0	2	2	18	29	21	24	5.4
Teaching	0	0	2	18	26	36	15	5.4
Workload	0	0	18	15	27	27	12	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	9	21	39	21	9	5.0
Learn Exp	0	0	3	44	41	10	0	4.6

**CHM 139H1S Chemistry, Physical Principles**

Instructor(s): J. Murphy; F. Talbot

	Enr: 386							Mean
	Resp: 227							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	9	6	12	29	28	10	2	4.0
Explains	10	9	18	30	18	10	1	3.8
Communicates	12	7	21	28	17	10	1	3.7
Teaching	14	7	23	26	16	10	0	3.6

Murphy:

Presents	9	6	12	29	28	10	2	4.0
Explains	10	9	18	30	18	10	1	3.8
Communicates	12	7	21	28	17	10	1	3.7
Teaching	14	7	23	26	16	10	0	3.6

Talbot:

Presents	2	4	10	26	33	16	6	4.6
Explains	2	3	7	26	31	22	7	4.8
Communicates	1	2	4	12	29	30	19	5.4
Teaching	1	4	9	23	29	24	6	4.7

Course:

Workload	0	0	1	31	37	16	12	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	2	27	31	21	15	5.2
Learn Exp	4	5	11	48	21	8	0	4.0

Murphy was generally a nice teacher but most students felt she should be more enthusiastic. Murphy's presentation was clear but students wanted more time to be spent on key concepts.

Talbot answered questions effectively and cared about the students' understanding. Some students thought that time was wasted at the beginning of classes. Overall, students liked Talbot and thought that he will improve with more experience.

Instructor(s): A. Wheeler

	Enr: 386							Mean
	Resp: 219							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	9	28	38	23	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	9	20	41	27	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	10	19	33	34	5.8
Teaching	0	0	1	7	23	40	26	5.8
Workload	0	0	1	33	34	19	10	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	1	27	35	20	14	5.1
Learn Exp	3	5	10	45	22	10	1	4.2

Wheeler was an effective instructor. Most students found him very enthusiastic and knowledgeable. He explained concepts in a "thorough and meticulous" way and provided plenty of significant examples that helped students understand the material.

Instructor(s): J. Murphy; F. Talbot

	Enr: 336							Mean
	Resp: 157							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	12	7	12	25	25	14	3	4.0
Explains	14	9	10	31	21	9	3	3.8
Communicates	14	9	16	24	18	12	3	3.8
Teaching	15	11	15	27	19	9	1	3.6

Talbot:

Presents	12	4	14	25	25	12	5	4.0
Explains	7	5	12	29	31	9	5	4.2
Communicates	7	1	7	26	28	17	9	4.6
Teaching	8	5	13	27	28	11	4	4.2

Course:

Workload	0	2	0	27	31	23	14	5.1
Difficulty	1	1	3	26	30	26	9	5.0
Learn Exp	7	7	10	42	21	8	3	4.0

Some students felt that Murphy was monotonous and thought her examples were not relevant to the course material. The students also felt that the test did not reflect what was taught in class.

Some felt that Talbot was not enthusiastic and complained that lecture slides were not posted on time and that his test was quite difficult.

Instructor(s): A. Wheeler

	Enr: 336							Mean
	Resp: 154							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	1	3	16	36	40	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	4	16	34	43	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	3	15	37	42	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	4	17	39	37	6.0
Workload	0	0	1	27	36	18	15	5.1
Difficulty	0	0	2	30	31	21	12	5.1
Learn Exp	7	2	3	52	17	12	6	4.2

Students described Wheeler as an enthusiastic and engaging lecturer. Most found his material quite interesting. Overall, Wheeler was an effective lecturer.

Instructor(s): K. Quinlan; D. Segal

	Enr: 118							Mean
	Resp: 32							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	3	0	10	39	25	21	5.5
Explains	0	0	7	14	29	22	25	5.4
Communicates	3	0	0	3	42	25	25	5.6
Teaching	3	0	3	17	25	28	21	5.3

Some students found Quinlan to be too quick-paced. There was too much theory rather than practice problems.

Segal was generally helpful. She presented the material at a slow pace and attended to questions. Students would have appreciated it if she spoke more loudly and clearer.

Most students felt the test was too difficult and did not reflect the lecture material taught.

**CHM 151Y1Y Chemistry: The Molecular Science**

Instructor(s): V. Dong; R. Miller

	Enr: 92							Mean
	Resp: 55							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	5	10	41	41	6.2
Explains	0	0	1	3	9	45	40	6.2
Communicates	0	0	3	1	14	40	40	6.1
Teaching	0	0	1	3	10	38	45	6.2

Dong:

Presents	0	0	0	3	7	49	39	6.2
Explains	0	0	1	1	5	41	49	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	1	5	28	64	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	1	7	39	50	6.4

Miller:

Presents	0	0	0	3	43	33	18	0	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	0	39	35	22	1	4.9	

Course:

## 36 CHEMISTRY

Learn Exp 0 3 0 19 17 35 23 5.5

Students found Dong to be very effective and many praised her way of presenting lectures through tablet PC notes.

Miller was described as a passionate, enthusiastic and effective lecturer. Many students found his in-class demonstrations to be very engaging and some described them as an effective way of capturing the interest of students.

Instructor(s): R. Morris

	Enr: 92							Mean
	Resp: 46							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	21	21	10	30	15	5.0
Explains	0	0	21	26	19	15	17	4.8
Communicates	2	0	17	36	2	21	19	4.8
Teaching	0	0	13	30	23	13	19	5.0
Workload	0	0	2	57	31	8	0	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	42	28	25	2	4.9
Learn Exp	0	2	0	26	17	32	20	5.4

A few students felt that Morris did not show a lot of enthusiasm, but many found him to be quite approachable and helpful. Some found the "course community" useful though not very necessary to do well in the course.

### CHM 217H1F Introduction to Analytical Chemistry

Instructor(s): D. Stone

	Enr: 113							Mean
	Resp: 73							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	2	0	2	13	26	35	19	5.4
Explains	2	0	1	12	32	32	17	5.4
Communicates	0	0	2	4	24	24	43	6.0
Teaching	1	1	2	10	21	36	24	5.6
Workload	0	0	0	28	31	24	15	5.3
Difficulty	0	0	7	33	39	11	8	4.8
Learn Exp	1	3	1	34	27	26	4	4.8

Students enjoyed Stone's enthusiasm and his humour. He was approachable, and answered questions well. However, students remarked that his notes were sometimes disorganized and had little room to add annotations. A common complaint was that assignments were not graded in an appropriate amount of time, and the lack of comments on reports hindered students' ability to improve during the course. Some students did not find the textbook to be useful and thought the workload was too heavy. Generally, however, students felt Stone was good.

### CHM 220H1F Physical Chemistry for Life Sciences

Instructor(s): A. Dhirani

	Enr: 471							Mean
	Resp: 203							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	6	7	22	28	23	10	3	4.0
Explains	4	11	20	29	18	10	6	4.0
Communicates	2	0	12	26	26	22	10	4.8
Teaching	4	8	14	23	29	14	5	4.3
Workload	0	1	10	56	19	8	3	4.3
Difficulty	0	1	4	25	30	30	7	5.1
Learn Exp	6	12	21	43	9	3	2	3.6

Students generally felt that the tests were not comprised of enough questions, did not reflect the material presented in lectures and the textbook, and did not reflect the level of difficulty of the suggested problems. Students were not given enough time to complete the tests, and were asked to state memorized formulas, rather than using them.

Dhirani was patient and tried to answer questions to the best of his ability, but students sometimes had a difficult time understanding him. His notes were somewhat unclear and disorganized at times. Many students enjoyed the demos presented in class.

### CHM 221H1S Physical Chemistry: The Molecular Viewpoint

Instructor(s): J. Schofield

	Enr: 37							Mean
	Resp: 23							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	4	8	8	26	34	8	8	4.4
Explains	8	4	0	26	43	13	4	4.5
Communicates	4	0	8	21	21	30	13	5.0
Teaching	0	4	13	13	26	30	13	5.0
Workload	0	0	4	30	17	30	17	5.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	21	8	26	43	5.9
Learn Exp	12	6	6	31	18	18	6	4.2

Students felt Schofield was approachable but his notes were somewhat disorganized. He assumed students knew the math however, review would have been helpful.

Students found that second year math should have been required or the course should have contained less math. Also, the tests were challenging.

### CHM 225Y1Y Introduction to Physical Chemistry

Instructor(s): R. Kapral

	Enr: 55							Mean
	Resp: 45							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	2	0	4	4	22	35	31	5.8
Explains	2	0	2	18	20	25	31	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	13	26	33	26	5.7
Teaching	2	0	0	2	22	42	31	5.9
Workload	0	2	11	43	26	8	4	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	2	20	26	33	17	5.4
Learn Exp	2	5	2	25	27	16	19	5.0

Many students would have appreciated a more qualitative approach to the course material before learning the mathematics relevant to the concepts. Some would have liked more examples. The tests were considered fair to slightly difficult.

Kapral was well-liked by all students for his good sense of humour, friendly personality and approachable demeanor. He was always available for questions.

Instructor(s): J. Schofield

	Enr: 48							Mean
	Resp: 30							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	6	6	34	31	6	13	4.7
Explains	3	10	6	31	31	13	3	4.3
Communicates	0	0	13	20	33	20	13	5.0
Teaching	0	3	16	20	30	16	13	4.8
Workload	0	0	13	50	26	3	6	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	13	30	36	20	5.6
Learn Exp	0	9	0	33	28	23	4	4.7

Schofield was enthusiastic and approachable but spoke too quickly. Students would have appreciated clearer notes and lectures. Also, students wanted a balance between mathematical formulas and conceptual explanations.

The course textbook was inadequate and too elementary for the lecture material. Students felt that more mathematical knowledge should have been a prerequisite, not a recommendation. More practice problems and examples were needed prior to the test.

### CHM 238Y1Y Introduction to Inorganic Chemistry

Instructor(s): G. Ozin

	Enr: 69							Mean
	Resp: 45							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	2	0	9	22	36	18	11	4.9
Explains	2	2	6	22	26	28	11	5.0
Communicates	0	0	0	11	22	34	31	5.9
Teaching	0	0	4	26	24	35	8	5.2
Workload	0	0	2	20	28	26	22	5.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	18	34	29	18	5.5

Learn Exp 12 19 6 32 12 3 12 3.7

Ozin was liked by many students. Most found him very enthusiastic and knowledgeable. A lot of students found him approachable and eager to answer any questions that they had. His slides were clear and easy to understand.

### CHM 247H1F Introductory Organic Chemistry II

Instructor(s): C. Kutas

Enr: 196	Resp: 97							Retake: 51%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	1	7	32	28	18	11	4.9
Explains	0	0	5	26	33	25	10	5.1
Communicates	0	0	7	25	36	21	9	5.0
Teaching	0	0	5	23	35	25	10	5.1
Workload	0	1	1	27	30	21	17	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	1	29	28	26	13	5.2
Learn Exp	0	3	7	33	31	16	6	4.7

Generally, students found Kutas very well-organized and knowledgeable. Most students felt that the course material was too intensive and required a lot of memorization.

### CHM 247H1S Introductory Organic Chemistry II

Instructor(s): A. Dicks; V. Dong

Enr: 179	Resp: 85							Retake: 53%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Dicks:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	2	9	32	55	6.4
Explains	0	0	0	3	12	43	40	6.2
Communicates	0	0	1	3	9	36	48	6.3
Teaching	0	1	0	4	9	42	41	6.2
<u>Dong:</u>								
Presents	0	0	4	14	29	32	18	5.5
Explains	0	0	3	5	30	40	19	5.7
Communicates	0	0	2	7	29	41	19	5.7
Teaching	0	0	0	12	34	33	19	5.6
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	0	0	25	39	25	10	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	1	27	29	27	14	5.3
Learn Exp	0	1	8	47	19	16	6	4.6

Students overwhelmingly praised Dicks for being very enthusiastic, well-organized and humorous. Students liked his overhead notes, as it kept him at an appropriate pace, and allowed the students to actively learn rather than just passively absorb information. Dicks was clear, simplified concepts, and answered questions well. Students especially appreciated his singing!

Students thought Dong was clear, organized and friendly. Students mostly enjoyed the way she made the lectures interactive and how she used a Tablet PC to "write" on her powerpoint slides. Some students felt her notes could have been better organized.

Students were divided on the issue of having three instructors in a half course. Some appreciated the change, others thought the transition was not smooth. The term tests were seen as fair, albeit slightly too long.

Instructor(s): S. Skonieczny

Enr: 179	Resp: 71							Retake: 38%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	4	1	22	18	25	21	6	4.5
Explains	4	1	7	23	35	20	7	4.8
Communicates	4	1	5	26	20	31	8	4.9
Teaching	2	0	7	23	32	26	7	4.9
Workload	0	0	2	25	32	23	16	5.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	23	33	26	16	5.4
Learn Exp	0	3	18	45	18	9	6	4.3

A few students thought that Skonieczny was a little disorganized and sometimes spoke too fast, however, some enjoyed his humour. Students

did not have sufficient time to copy down his notes and listen to him at the same time, and they wished he had posted his notes online.

Instructor(s): A. Dicks; S. Skonieczny

Enr: 226	Resp: 173							Retake: 46%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
<u>Dicks:</u>								
Presents	0	0	0	2	14	37	45	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	4	19	41	34	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	2	9	43	44	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	1	18	35	44	6.2
<u>Skonieczny:</u>								
Presents	1	1	10	25	30	25	5	4.8
Explains	0	2	10	19	28	28	10	5.0
Communicates	0	1	5	17	24	36	13	5.3
Teaching	1	0	7	23	28	29	9	5.0
<u>Course:</u>								
Workload	0	1	0	32	27	26	11	5.1
Difficulty	0	1	1	25	31	28	11	5.2
Learn Exp	0	2	4	42	34	13	2	4.6

Most students found Dicks amazing, highly organized and taught with enthusiasm. Students also appreciated his humour which made the class more enjoyable. Dicks was very approachable and was always there to answer questions.

Skonieczny was found to be nice and approachable. Some students found it helpful when the instructor explained the lab material sometimes in class. However, students would have appreciated lecture notes online as they were hard to follow at times.

A few students found the material and the test challenging. Some found the lab a little time consuming.

Instructor(s): V. Dong

Enr: 226	Resp: 150							Retake: 45%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	2	0	5	20	34	26	10	5.0
Explains	0	0	4	18	32	34	9	5.3
Communicates	0	0	0	10	32	42	13	5.6
Teaching	0	0	0	18	37	32	10	5.3
Workload	0	0	0	33	28	24	13	5.2
Difficulty	0	0	1	22	35	28	9	5.2
Learn Exp	3	0	6	40	32	13	2	4.5

Students found Dong very passionate about chemistry. Some students found her lectures easy to understand while others would have appreciated it more if she had provided more organized notes and spoke a bit slower.

### CHM 249H1S Organic Chemistry

Instructor(s): R. Batey

Enr: 44	Resp: 30							Retake: 82%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	6	6	26	60	6.4
Explains	0	0	0	6	3	26	63	6.5
Communicates	0	0	0	0	6	23	70	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	3	6	23	66	6.5
Workload	0	6	10	36	23	20	3	4.5
Difficulty	0	3	3	40	36	13	3	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	3	7	28	25	35	5.8

Most students thought that Batey was fantastic, "amazing" and excellent. He was well-organized and was very approachable in and out of class. He conveyed material in a very interesting manner that provoked enjoyment and enthusiasm.

The labs were excellent and was liked by the majority of students. The course was very organized and thoroughly enjoyable.

## 38 CHEMISTRY

### CHM 310H1S Environmental Chemistry

Instructor(s): S. Mabury

	Resp: 71							Retake: 79%	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	1	4	17	23	26	21	5	4.6	
Explains	1	2	7	23	26	30	8	5.0	
Communicates	0	0	1	0	4	30	63	6.6	
Teaching	0	0	1	7	27	36	27	5.8	
Workload	0	0	2	44	26	18	7	4.8	
Difficulty	0	0	1	33	31	24	8	5.1	
Learn Exp	0	0	1	23	27	30	16	5.4	

Students thought Mabury was very enthusiastic and knowledgeable. However, his notes were somewhat disorganized and he spoke too fast. Audio recordings of the lecture helped a lot.

Students found the course very interesting and valuable. Some felt it needed a textbook.

### CHM 317H1S Introduction to Instrumental Methods of Analysis

Instructor(s): R. Jockusch; D. Stone

	Resp: 29							Retake: 62%	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
<u>Jockusch:</u>									
Presents	0	0	6	20	20	37	13	5.3	
Explains	0	0	6	31	24	34	3	5.0	
Communicates	0	0	0	20	27	41	10	5.4	
Teaching	0	0	3	35	17	32	10	5.1	
<u>Stone:</u>									
Presents	0	0	3	19	30	38	7	5.3	
Explains	0	0	3	21	28	35	10	5.3	
Communicates	0	0	0	14	17	60	7	5.6	
Teaching	0	3	3	14	22	40	14	5.4	
<u>Course:</u>									
Workload	0	0	0	27	37	10	24	5.3	
Difficulty	0	0	3	31	41	10	13	5.0	
Learn Exp	0	7	3	37	18	18	14	4.8	

Jockusch was very knowledgeable, enthusiastic, and approachable, however, students complained about the dry material. Some students complained about the length and difficulty of the midterm.

Stone was very friendly and effective, especially during the laboratory periods.

### CHM 325H1S Introduction to Inorganic and Polymer Materials Chemistry

Instructor(s): G. Ozin

	Resp: 24							Retake: 73%	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	4	0	13	40	36	4	5.2	
Explains	0	9	0	9	45	27	9	5.1	
Communicates	0	0	0	0	14	33	52	6.4	
Teaching	0	0	4	17	17	47	13	5.5	
Workload	9	9	9	54	13	4	0	3.7	
Difficulty	0	0	9	45	31	9	4	4.5	
Learn Exp	0	0	0	27	33	38	0	5.1	

### CHM 326H1F Introductory Quantum Mechanics and Spectroscopy

Instructor(s): S. Whittington

	Resp: 15							Retake: 86%	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	0	0	0	6	40	53	6.5	
Explains	0	0	0	0	13	60	26	6.1	
Communicates	0	0	0	6	6	46	40	6.2	
Teaching	0	0	0	0	13	46	40	6.3	
Workload	0	0	13	73	6	6	0	4.1	
Difficulty	0	0	0	53	33	13	0	4.6	
Learn Exp	0	0	8	33	25	25	8	4.9	

The course notes were well-organized and straightforward. Most found the exams to be fair although a lot of background in mathematics was required. Some wanted the problem set answers to be better explained.

Whittington was well liked by all students and was always available for consultation.

### CHM 328H1S Modern Physical Chemistry

Instructor(s): J. Schofield

	Resp: 9							Retake: 75%	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	0	1	33	44	11	0	4.6	
Explains	0	11	11	55	22	0	0	3.9	
Communicates	0	0	11	22	44	22	0	4.8	
Teaching	0	0	0	33	33	22	11	5.1	
Workload	0	0	0	77	22	0	0	4.2	
Difficulty	0	0	0	12	50	25	12	5.4	
Learn Exp	0	0	16	50	0	16	16	4.7	

Schofield used good forms of evaluations that enhanced understanding of the material and was very approachable. However, some students thought the course could have been better organized. The material was difficult and it would have been helpful if the lectures slowed down.

### CHM 338H1F Intermediate Inorganic Chemistry

Instructor(s): J. Powell

	Resp: 15							Retake: 71%	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	0	7	7	28	50	7	5.4	
Explains	0	0	0	6	0	46	46	6.3	
Communicates	0	0	6	0	6	20	66	6.4	
Teaching	0	0	6	0	6	60	26	6.0	
Workload	0	0	0	14	7	21	57	6.2	
Difficulty	0	0	0	7	53	30	7	5.4	
Learn Exp	0	0	0	7	38	38	15	5.6	

Students felt Powell was very well-organized and presented material in a clear manner. Generally, labs were found to be very time-consuming and challenging.

### CHM 342H1F Modern Organic Synthesis

Instructor(s): M. Lautens

	Resp: 59							Retake: 64%	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Presents	0	1	8	22	11	38	16	5.3	
Explains	0	0	3	16	15	45	18	5.6	
Communicates	0	0	1	8	28	44	16	5.7	
Teaching	0	0	1	10	18	51	17	5.7	
Workload	0	0	5	50	21	16	7	4.7	
Difficulty	0	0	0	32	32	29	5	5.1	
Learn Exp	0	0	2	31	39	21	4	5.0	

Students found Lautens very approachable and knowledgeable. The idea of an oral exam was greatly appreciated. Most students felt that more examples and problem sets would have provided them with better preparation for the tests and exam.

### CHM 343H1S Organic Synthesis Techniques

Instructor(s): R. Batey; A. Dicks

	Resp: 33							Retake: 70%	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
<u>Batey:</u>									
Presents	3	3	3	9	42	33	6	5.1	
Explains	3	3	3	15	30	39	6	5.1	
Communicates	0	0	6	12	18	39	24	5.6	
Teaching	0	0	6	9	18	39	27	5.7	
<u>Dicks:</u>									
Presents	0	0	0	3	12	45	39	6.2	
Explains	0	0	3	0	12	51	33	6.1	

Communicates	0	0	0	6	12	42	39	6.2
Teaching	0	0	3	0	12	40	43	6.2
Course:								
Workload	0	0	3	16	41	19	19	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	3	29	38	19	9	5.0
Learn Exp	3	7	0	7	37	37	7	5.1

Both instructors were well-received by the majority of the students. A few felt that Batey was a bit rushed at times, however, he was enthusiastic and answered students' questions well.

Students felt that Dicks presented in a well-planned, timely and enthusiastic manner. He was very engaging and always available.

Overall, the course was appreciated. Most students felt the lab experience was very valuable, although it was time consuming. The lecture material complemented the lab component. The green chemistry section was found to be very interesting. The term test was very challenging.

#### CHM 347H1F Organic Chemistry of Biological Compounds

Instructor(s): M. Nitz

Enr: 123	Resp: 78							Retake: 77%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	6	23	33	37	6.0
Explains	0	0	2	1	22	32	41	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	3	14	42	39	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	3	17	46	32	6.1
Workload	1	1	3	64	18	6	3	4.3
Difficulty	1	0	2	56	18	14	6	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	3	33	29	27	6	5.0

Most students described Nitz as clear, enthusiastic and that he gave great lectures. The course material was found to be enjoyable. Some students felt that the tutorials weren't helpful.

#### CHM 348H1F Organic Reaction Mechanisms

Instructor(s): R. Kluger

Enr: 62	Resp: 38							Retake: 20%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	13	18	28	10	21	5	2	3.3
Explains	10	5	23	36	18	5	0	3.6
Communicates	2	5	2	15	31	31	10	5.1
Teaching	5	5	23	23	16	13	2	4.1
Workload	0	5	2	26	31	10	23	5.1
Difficulty	0	0	2	23	28	13	31	5.5
Learn Exp	13	10	10	40	20	3	3	3.7

Students generally felt that the workload was heavier than average. Students also found that the required textbook was not very coherent as it described too many specific cases.

Kluger was seen as unclear and at times could not explain concepts or answer questions.

#### CHM 379H1S Biomolecular Chemistry

Instructor(s): G. Shubassi

Enr: 31	Resp: 26							Retake: 71%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	15	11	26	30	15	5.2
Explains	0	0	7	15	26	30	19	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	3	26	26	42	6.1
Teaching	0	0	3	11	19	34	30	5.8
Workload	0	3	0	61	23	3	7	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	8	68	12	4	8	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	31	43	12	12	5.1

Shubassi was enthusiastic, energetic and amazing. Students felt comfortable with the lecturer and she was available for individual appointments.

The labs were fun even though more time should have been allotted to the final report. Weekly reports should have been added to prepare students better. Students enjoyed the laboratory experience.

#### CHM 410H1F Analytical Environmental Chemistry

Instructor(s): S. Mabury

Enr: 16	Resp: 12							Retake: 100%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	27	18	45	9	5.4
Explains	0	0	0	0	25	58	16	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	50	50	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	0	8	66	25	6.2
Workload	0	0	0	25	58	16	0	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	41	50	8	0	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	33	44	22	5.9

An overwhelming percentage of students thought Mabury was very enthusiastic and friendly. Most students believed the labs were practical and applicable to their everyday life. The high TA-to-student ratio reflected the help students received. Although slightly unorganized, the lectures were interesting.

#### CHM 414H1F Developing Techniques in Analytical Chemistry

Instructor(s): D. Stone

Enr: 43	Resp: 20							Retake: 81%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	20	30	25	25	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	5	40	25	30	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	15	45	40	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	10	26	31	31	5.8
Workload	0	0	15	57	15	10	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	5	63	21	5	5	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	42	42	7	7	4.8

#### CHM 415H1S Atmospheric Chemistry

Instructor(s): J. Murphy

Enr: 43	Resp: 35							Retake: 72%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	5	5	45	37	5	5.3
Explains	0	2	5	20	37	28	5	5.0
Communicates	0	0	0	8	37	31	22	5.7
Teaching	0	0	0	5	34	48	11	5.7
Workload	0	0	9	63	21	6	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	15	63	18	3	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	39	46	10	3	4.8

Students thought that Murphy was enthusiastic and very approachable. She spent time to attend to students' needs, however, more guidelines would have been appreciated for assignments. Overall, an enjoyable course.

#### CHM 416H1S Separation Science

Instructor(s): D. Stone

Enr: 23	Resp: 16							Retake: 92%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	6	6	56	12	18	5.3
Explains	0	0	0	18	25	31	25	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	18	37	43	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	6	37	37	18	5.7
Workload	0	6	0	46	33	13	0	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	46	33	13	6	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	20	10	30	40	5.9

Stone was genuinely enthusiastic and interested in the material. He was very approachable. However, the evaluations should have been spread out throughout the course. A very useful and enjoyable course overall.

## 40 CHEMISTRY

### CHM 417H1F Instrumentation for Chemists

Instructor(s): A. Wheeler

	Enr: 13							Resp: 12							Retake: 80%							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	16	33	16	33	0	0	0	16	33	16	33	0	0	0	16	33	16	33	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	8	50	8	33	0	0	0	8	50	8	33	0	0	0	8	50	8	33	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	0	41	33	25	0	0	0	0	41	33	25	0	0	0	0	41	33	25	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	8	33	33	25	0	0	0	8	33	33	25	0	0	0	8	33	33	25	5.8
Workload	9	0	9	45	27	9	0	9	0	9	45	27	9	0	9	0	9	45	27	9	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	9	36	45	9	0	0	0	9	36	45	9	0	0	0	9	36	45	9	0	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	12	12	50	12	12	0	0	12	12	50	12	12	0	0	12	12	50	12	12	5.0

Students thought Wheeler was good however, the tests were not reflective of the class material. Most students thought the instructor explained concepts clearly and in an interesting manner. Most students thought Wheeler helped make the course a good experience.

### CHM 423H1F Applications of Quantum Mechanics

Instructor(s): P. Brumer

	Enr: 12							Resp: 8							Retake: 57%							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	12	0	12	37	25	12	0	12	0	12	37	25	12	0	12	0	12	37	25	12	5.0
Explains	12	0	0	12	12	25	37	12	0	0	12	12	25	37	12	0	0	12	12	25	37	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	0	37	25	37	0	0	0	0	37	25	37	0	0	0	0	37	25	37	6.0
Teaching	0	0	12	12	25	37	12	0	0	12	12	25	37	12	0	0	12	12	25	37	12	5.2
Workload	0	0	0	25	37	12	25	0	0	0	25	37	12	25	0	0	0	25	37	12	25	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	12	37	25	25	0	0	0	12	37	25	25	0	0	0	12	37	25	25	5.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	50	25	25	0	0	0	0	50	25	25	0	0	0	0	50	25	25	5.8

Some students described the instructor as clear and organized. Problem sets were found to be time consuming and more feedback would have been appreciated.

### CHM 432H1F Organometallic Chemistry and Polymer Materials Chemistry

Instructor(s): J. Powell

	Enr: 18							Resp: 18							Retake: 88%							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	16	16	11	50	5	0	0	16	16	11	50	5	0	0	16	16	11	50	5	5.1
Explains	0	0	0	33	27	27	11	0	0	0	33	27	27	11	0	0	0	33	27	27	11	5.2
Communicates	0	0	0	16	33	33	16	0	0	0	16	33	33	16	0	0	0	16	33	33	16	5.5
Teaching	0	0	0	16	61	16	5	0	0	0	16	61	16	5	0	0	0	16	61	16	5	5.1
Workload	0	0	11	50	5	16	16	0	0	11	50	5	16	16	0	0	11	50	5	16	16	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	44	16	22	16	0	0	0	44	16	22	16	0	0	0	44	16	22	16	5.1
Learn Exp	0	0	6	46	20	20	6	0	0	6	46	20	20	6	0	0	6	46	20	20	6	4.7

### CHM 434H1F Advanced Materials Chemistry

Instructor(s): G. Ozin

	Enr: 17							Resp: 17							Retake: 80%							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	6	0	37	25	25	6	0	6	0	37	25	25	6	0	6	0	37	25	25	6	4.8
Explains	0	0	5	11	35	41	5	0	0	5	11	35	41	5	0	0	5	11	35	41	5	5.3
Communicates	0	0	0	5	0	52	41	0	0	0	5	0	52	41	0	0	0	5	0	52	41	6.3
Teaching	0	0	5	0	41	47	5	0	0	5	0	41	47	5	0	0	5	0	41	47	5	5.5
Workload	0	0	0	41	17	29	11	0	0	0	41	17	29	11	0	0	0	41	17	29	11	5.1
Difficulty	0	0	5	41	29	17	5	0	0	5	41	29	17	5	0	0	5	41	29	17	5	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	7	7	53	23	7	0	0	7	7	53	23	7	0	0	7	7	53	23	7	5.2

### CHM 437H1S Bio-Inorganic Chemistry

Instructor(s): R. Morris

	Enr: 44							Resp: 23							Retake: 65%							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	4	39	39	14	0	0	0	4	39	39	14	0	0	0	4	39	39	14	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	4	22	59	13	0	0	0	4	22	59	13	0	0	0	4	22	59	13	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	13	27	45	13	0	0	0	13	27	45	13	0	0	0	13	27	45	13	5.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	21	52	26	0	0	0	0	21	52	26	0	0	0	0	21	52	26	6.0

Workload	0	4	8	56	4	26	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	52	30	13	4	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	38	61	0	0	4.6

Many students found Morris a very good instructor. He was also very enthusiastic and engaging. Students also found him very approachable, clear and helpful with questions. However, a few students thought the slides had too much information on them.

A lot of students found this a very interesting course on the "importance and applicability of transition metal chemistry", with lots of useful information. The project and the poster presentations were really appreciated by the students, who felt they learned a lot from it. Some students felt that the exam should have weighed less and a midterm would have helped them review the material better.

### CHM 440H1F The Synthesis of Modern Pharmaceutical Agents

Instructor(s): A. Yudin

	Enr: 25							Resp: 13							Retake: 69%							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	15	0	30	15	7	23	7	15	0	30	15	7	23	7	15	0	30	15	7	23	7	4.0
Explains	0	0	15	30	30	7	15	0	0	15	30	30	7	15	0	0	15	30	30	7	15	4.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	33	41	25	0	0	0	0	33	41	25	0	0	0	0	33	41	25	5.9
Teaching	0	0	7	15	53	15	7	0	0	7	15	53	15	7	0	0	7	15	53	15	7	5.0
Workload	0	0	0	69	15	15	0	0	0	0	69	15	15	0	0	0	0	69	15	15	0	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	30	30	30	7	0	0	0	30	30	30	7	0	0	0	30	30	30	7	5.2
Learn Exp	0	8	16	33	25	16	0	0	8	16	33	25	16	0	0	8	16	33	25	16	0	4.2

### CHM 441H1F Spectroscopic Analysis in Organic Chemistry

Instructor(s): S. Skonieczny

	Enr: 29							Resp: 22							Retake: 78%							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	4	9	22	40	22	0	0	4	9	22	40	22	0	0	4	9	22	40	22	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	4	45	31	18	0	0	0	4	45	31	18	0	0	0	4	45	31	18	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	4	27	40	27	0	0	0	4	27	40	27	0	0	0	4	27	40	27	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	4	40	36	18	0	0	0	4	40	36	18	0	0	0	4	40	36	18	5.7
Workload	0	0	0	38	38	19	4	0	0	0	38	38	19	4	0	0	0	38	38	19	4	4.9
Difficulty	0	4	0	57	14	14	9	0	4	0	57	14	14	9	0	4	0	57	14	14	9	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	6	20	26	20	26	0	0	6	20	26	20	26	0	0	6	20	26	20	26	5.4

Most students found the course to be extremely beneficial for further studies in research and graduate work. Many would have appreciated the course notes to have been posted online. Some would have liked a supplementary textbook. The labs were not too useful as the time was mostly spent gathering data, which could have been given ahead of time.

The instructor was a good lecturer who was well-organized. He returned assignments and tests quickly with helpful feedback. Many students would have liked more time on tests and assignments.

### CHM 443H1S Physical Organic Chemistry

Instructor(s): M. Taylor

	Enr: 19							Resp: 12							Retake: 100%							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	16	33	50	0	0	0	0	16	33	50	0	0	0	0	16	33	50	6.3
Explains	0	0	0	0	8	50	41	0	0	0	0	8	50	41	0	0	0	0	8	50	41	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	8	33	58	0	0	0	0	8	33	58	0	0	0	0	8	33	58	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	0	8	41	50	0	0	0	0	8	41	50	0	0	0	0	8	41	50	6.4
Workload	0	0	0	70	10	10	10	0	0	0	70	10	10	10	0	0	0	70	10	10	10	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	0	60	30	10	0	0	0	0	60	30	10	0	0	0	0	60	30	10	5.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	20	40	20	20	0	0	0	20	40	20	20	0	0	0	20	40	20	20	5.4

Many students felt that Taylor was a wonderful instructor. He was extremely enthusiastic and explained concepts thoroughly. Lectures were very well-planned, with many interesting examples. Students found him easily approachable and kind when answering questions. Overall, students really enjoyed the course.

Some students found the course a bit challenging and felt that more time should have been given for writing the midterm. Students thought it

