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AERO – Aeronautical & Aerospace Engineering

AERO2703: Aerospace Technology

Lecturer - 9/10
Ease - 7/10
Interest - 7/10
Overall: 7/10 - The assessment structure is debateable with the tutor seeming to make more on how you do it rather then if it is correct and you showed how you did it.

ACCT - Accounting

ACCT1001: Accounting 1A

Ease: 8/10 - If you study consistently the whole way through and actually do the homework, you'll be fine. Midsemester was quite tough, but it wasn't too bad. Will be interested to see what my final exam mark will be.

Lecturers:
Abdul: 8/10 - Good bloke, although it pisses me off that he kept lying about the average mark for the mid-semester (to get people motivated to study harder he reported it at around 15 marks higher than the true average).
Sharron O'neill: 6.5/10 - Easy to understand, but the problem is that she liked finishing an hour earlier. Which isn't too bad, but a lot of the stuff was too rushed.
Rosina Mladenovic: 8/10 - as good as an accounting lecturer could be. Although she was just too happy and cheery, which pissed me off at times.

Interest: 8/10 - whoa. I can't believe I'm saying this, but I liked this subject. It was very different to all my other subjects (essay-based and subjective). It was kind of cool having a correct answer to every question. It was also good to think in a completely different manner, to what I was used to. Although, if I had to do accounting for more than 2 subjects, I'd probably die from boredom. A catch-22, if you must.

Overall: 7.5/10

ACCT1001: Accounting 1A
Ease - 7.5/10 (gets harder gradually)
Lecturers - 7/10
Interest - 7.5/10
Overall 7/10

ACCT1001: Accounting 1A
Ease: 7/10 (not hard if you just do homework regularly towards the end)
Lecturers: 5/10 (soooo slow and boring, stuffy theatre didn't help me stay awake)
Interest: 4/10 (content absolute shit, hated it)
Overall: 5/10
ACCT1001: Accounting 1A
Ease: 8/10
Lecturers: 7/10
Interest: 8/10
Overall: 8/10 (Pray to God ur practice set balances)

ACCT1001: Accounting IA
Ease: 8/10 - Gets a little trickier at the end, but it's manageable
Lecturer: 3(7)/10 - They got through the material well, too bad the lecturers are cunts
Interest: 7/10 - It's relevant stuff, but a bit dry at times
Overall: 7/10

ACCT1001: Accounting 1A
Ease: 6/10. This really depends. I'm doing it for the second time, so i give it an 8.5 for ease (yeah, i'm an ex-failure), but the first time i did it, it was bloody hard and so i give it a 3.5/10 for first-time ease. therefore, i've averaged it out and given you 6.
Lecturer: 7/10. Abdul & Sharron are fine. They're not amazing or brilliant, but they're not crap.
Interest: 1/10. This rates as one of the most uninteresting subjects ever.
Overall: 4.6/10

ACCT1001: Accounting 1A
Ease: 8/10 - not too difficult if you just do the work
Lecturer: 4/10 - uninspirational, nothing special
Interest: 7/10
Overall: 7/10

ACCT1001: Accounting IA
Ease: 7
Lecturer: 7
Interest: 3
Overall: 5

----

ACCT1002 : Accounting 1B

*Ease: 8/10 - most people were on close to full marks out of 40 before the final, and the final exam was not challenging at all (although there was some time pressure). Marks were also left unscaled, which was surprising. The difficulty lay in remembering the material from all weeks of the semester, as there was no midsem exam splitting the topics. Although you do need to work hard to get good results, hard, in this case, alludes to consistently each week. In ACCT1001 I was overwhelmed by all the new concepts and the plenitude of homework. Here, the homework load is greatly reduced, and you are simply adding to the skills learnt in 1A rather than learning a new way of thinking.

*Lecturers: 6/10 - Rosina, although annoying, is a great lecturer. Paul Blaney was also decent and had his unique teaching style, which was welcomed. However, the other lecturers were of relatively poor calibre. Nonetheless, it was taught significantly well.

*Interest: 8/10 - I can't believe I found the course 'fun'. I guess it balanced my very creative humanities oriented units that I have done in the past. It was awesome knowing that you have a right answer. Whilst doing this sort of stuff over and over again would bore me, in the short term, I quite enjoyed this unit.
Overall: 6.5/10 - Overall, though, the unit wasn't that great. I know my above comments were quite positive, but they also didn't take into account the more boring things we had to learn (such as financial statement analysis) and the horrible lecturers we sometimes had to endure. I can certainly see the relevance to my career though (even though I'm in marketing). Management accounting (the second part) was sadly boring, but relevant for me. Financial accounting was more interesting, but not really relevant.

ACCT1002: Accounting IB  
Ease: 7.5  
Lecturer: 6  
Interest: 3.5  
Overall: 5

ACCT1002: Accounting IB  
Ease - 6.5/10  
Lecturers - 6.5/10  
Interest - 7.5/10  
Overall 7/10

ACCT1002: Accounting IB  
Ease - 6/10 (noticeably harder than 1A)  
Lecturers - 5/10 (hate the lecture notes with half finished sentences so you have to copy down so much during lectures)  
Interest - 4/10  
Overall - 4/10

ACCT1002: Accounting IB  
Ease - 6/10  
Lecturers - 5/10  
Interest - 5/10  
Overall 5.5/10 (Mikes Bikes = waste of time)

ACCT1002: Accounting IB  
Ease - 9/10: This subject is ten times easier than ACCT1001. The exam questions are just tute questions with different numbers. If you can do the tute questions you can do the exam questions.  
Lecturers - 8/10: Rosina explained things very well so did Paul who also gave away what was going to be in the exam.  
Interest: 7/10  
Overall: 8.5/10

ACCT1002: Accounting IB  
Ease: 9/10 (Compared to 1A) Compared to Acct1A which I did with Abdul in Sem 2 last year, this is a cakewalk. I used to have to do all the homework every week to keep up with 1A but with 1B, the first few weeks was a rehash of basic concepts in 1A and needed little effort. Things got trickier once new concepts like Management Accounting came in but basically so little ground was covered that I hardly believe this deserves a whole module.
Lecturer: 7/10 - Lecturer was ... wait I didn't attend a single lecture for the whole semester. Just took everything off the slides and textbook. Sorry but someone has to help me out here. Anyway the lecturers were Rosina who lectured for most of the unit and Paul Blaney who did only the Management accounting sections i think.

Interest: 6/10 - Accounting - Either you love it or you hate it. How interesting can it get? The tutor I got did her best to liven things up and pass on her knowledge though, kudos to her.

Overall: 7/10 - Core module for graduating in B.Com once again I believe. I'm probably not the best person to rate this module but I personally think its easy if you have the fundamentals from 1A in place. Forgot to add, the coursework component was useless for marks. Everyone I know went into the final on 40+%. Check out the UOS for the coursework marks allocation there are way too much freebie marks.

----

Acct 1003: Financial and Accounting Concepts

Ease: 9.5/10. The content is not exactly easy but the midsem is 120 repetitive multiple choice questions. The assignment is pretty much a copy and paste exercise. The final exam is so easy! its 50 multiple choice and a few short answer questions which are tutorial questions with different numbers!!!!

Lecturer: 10/10 - FRANK PORTELLI IS A GOD. He makes accounting somewhat interesting and funny. The lectures are so funny and entertaining

Interest: 5/10 - the content is somewhat useful but if you’re not doing an accounting major its not much use.

Overall: 10/10 - It was a great subject. Frank is the best lecturer even though accounting is boring.

ACCT1004: Management Accounting Concepts

Ease: 8/10 - not as easy as 1003 was but still VERY easy. Its 1 multiple choice midterm. 1 assignment, 1 presentation where if frank likes you you get 10/10. and a final where its tutorial questions with different numbers.

Lecturer: Frank Portelli is why I took this subject. He is wonderful 10/10

Interest: 4/10- Accounting isn’t very interesting but frank makes it interesting somehow

Overall: 10/10- I really liked this subject. It was easy and the lectures were so entertaining

ACCT2011: Financial Accounting A

Ease: 0/10
Lecturer: 2/10 Both were as boring as batshit

Interest: 2/10 Zero stimulating material

Overall: 1/10 My least favourite subject ever

ACCT2012: Management Accounting A

Overall: 6/10 - Gay but not as gay as ACCT1002
ACCT2012: Management Accounting A
Lecturer - 5/10
Ease - 8/10
Interest: 3/10
Overall: 5/10 - pretty boring

ACCT3011: Financial Accounting B
Ease: 8.5/10 - Much easier than Fin A, it's been toned down a lot since the credit point adjustments im told. Consolidation is challenging but is only covered in the mid semester. One test, one group assignment and a final with no workshop participation required. 3rd yr accounting subjects are easier
Lecturers: 7/10 - Straight forward, 1hr short. Pretty much all on the net.
Interest: 8/10 - Kinda getting into the nitty gritty of financial reports, how they're constructed etc as well as the theory behind accounting standard setting (critical analysis/reflection about accounting)
Overall: 8/10

ACCT3011: Financial Accounting B
Ease: 5/10 Cunt of a subject. Financial accounting is the worst set of courses in the economics and business faculties. Fuck AASB standards up the ass.
Lecturer: 7/10 Indra's best lecture was his first where he made no sense, all downhill from there. the jewish guy was actually really good, 8/10 for him.
Interest: 2/10 Fuck intra-company transactions and consolidation accounting in general right up the coight.
Overall: 4/10 Shit course, lock and ban.

ACCT3011: Financial Accounting B
Ease: (8/10) - some people might find consolidation tough
Interest: (7/10) Pretty interesting deals with corporate groups and how they are accounted for
Lecturer: (5/10) - Various. Indra is shit doesn’t know what he is doing - mistakes in his lecture slides, tells us to study wrong examples for final etc. Matthew Egan is good but
Overall: 7.5/10

ACCT3011: Financial Accounting B
Like 2011, if you study hard you won't likely fail. It's one of the subjects where if you study a lot you will do well. The essay was a bit tricky, though. The lecturers are really nice and approachable.

ACCT 3012: Management Accounting B
Ease: 9/10 Mid semester not too bad, major essay is long but is doable. Open book 40% final was piss easy.
Lecturers: 8/10 Peter Edwards is a legend, the other guy is a bit of a bore.
Interest: 7/10 Kinda like business studies in yr 12, very little straight accounting focus.
Overall: 8.5/10
ACCT3012: Management Accounting B
Ease: 10/10 Piss easy
Lecturer: 1. 7/10 Pete Edwards was a funny kunt; 2. 2/10 Rodney Coyte was fair boring
Interest: 5/10 Nothing spesh
Overall: 7.5/10 Alright subject, I'll pay it

ACCT3014: Auditing and Assurance
Ease - 7/10 - One of the easier Accounting subjects I've done but I think it's marked pretty harshly.
Lecturers - 6/10 - She's good...but the material is so dry and she's not that good at making it interesting, had a great tutor though.
Interest - 0/10 - So so so so so boring. Dunno how anyone can find auditing interesting.
Overall - 5/10 - Meh not good, not bad. Hopefully D in it then I'll be happy as a pig in mud.

ANHS – Ancient History

ANHS1003: Foundations for Ancient History: Greece
Lecturers: Dr Alastair Blanshard, Dr Julia Kindt, Ben Brown
Ease: 8/10.
In terms of assessment load, this was the easiest subject I did this semester. There's only one piece of non-exam assessment, other than tute participation, which is a 1500-word essay on one of the tute subjects. Unfortunately they do the stupid thing where each essay topic is due in a different week, corresponding with the topic of the week's tute. This has the effect of discouraging people from doing the earlier topics, some of which I would've liked to have done, but I didn't feel confident enough to write a 1500-word analytical essay in my first couple of fortnights of uni. Literally half the people in my tute did the final week's essay. In terms of content, I don't think it's really that difficult a course. Some of the lecture material can be a bit difficult to start off with, because it does challenge a lot of the assumptions you have from HSC ancient history. In particular there's more focus on looking at how objects and ideas functioned within society, which can be a bit hard to start off with, and in your essays you need to focus a lot more on critical analysis of the sources than at high school. In the end, though, you don't really need to know all the content, because in the exam there are questions from each lecture and tute and you just pick two. So all you really need to know are your essay topic and one other, and the reading lists help out a lot with researching them.

Lecturer: 9.5/10 for Alastair, 8.5/10 for Julia, 7/10 for Ben.
Alastair is a fantastic lecturer. He's very funny and he has a flair for explaining things with real clarity, and he was probably helped out by the fact that he had some of the most interesting topics. Julia is also very funny - once you work out her accent (Bavarian), which might take one or two lectures - and she has a real passion for her speciality, the Delphic Oracle. She also kept us awake during less interesting lectures by interspersing them with amusing stories from the ancient texts. Ben... oh, Ben. I hated hated hated him for most of the course, because I thought his lectures (particularly the ones on Homer) dwelt unnecessarily on meaningless abstractions, but listening to them again while preparing for the exam I realised that he actually has a lot of really interesting things to say. Approach his lectures with an open mind. He's an appalling tutor - just talks for the whole hour instead of trying to stimulate discussion, so I gave up on doing the readings eventually - but some of the things he said in tutes were quite handy, like demonstrating to us the process by which the Cyreneans might have rewritten their history with reference to the example of Gallipoli.
Interest: 8/10
The course focuses on late dark age and Archaic Greece, a period which I and probably most other HSC ancient history people didn't have much experience with. (For the record, we pretty much start with Homer and Hesiod and then proceed thematically, but roughly chronologically, to the Persian Wars.) It's great to learn about this period, which had previously been pretty neglected academically but has more recently been acknowledged as the period in which a lot of the features of the better-known Classical period developed.* There's no real thread joining together the lectures, which is frustrating at first, but then I took a look at the course title and realised that the point of the course is really to introduce us to the key features and concepts in the study of ancient Greece, as a foundation for further study. I thought it did that pretty successfully.

Overall: 8.5/10.
Pretty easy, good lectures in a good lecture theatre (Eastern Avenue), reasonably interesting. No major complaints.

*I'd recommend reading over an introductory text about this period before starting the course, just to get an idea of how this period fits in to earlier Greek history. They don't really put it in context fantastically in the lectures. Try Pomeroy et al, *Ancient Greece: a political, social, and cultural history*, from the section on Homer onwards for a few chapters. The actual course textbook, *Greece in the Making* (which isn't at all necessary for the course), might also be good - I don't know, I've never laid eyes upon a copy.

**ANHS1003: Foundations for Ancient History: Greece**
Ease: 8/10 1 essay and an exam on only 2-3 areas
Lecturer: 10/10 for alistair and 6.5/10 for jimmy
Interest: 7/10
Overall: 8/10

**ANHS1004: Power and Persuasion in Rome**
Ease: 6.5/10. - This honestly should have been much easier than it was, given that it was largely a repeat of components of the HSC Ancient History course. That being said, the exam was horribly difficult - the questions were esoteric and I found a lot of them had very little to do with anything we'd done. There is a 400-page course reader for this course, most of which is ancient sources, so be prepared for a lot of readings. There is a 20% tute participation component, which I will never understand, because it's so subjective and it throws your whole mark into the air. There is a policy of being able to resubmit essays in a different topic should you not do as well as expected, which is quite a relief if you do badly. However, due to my procrastination I didn't do as well as I should have - so the difficulty of this subject was due to my lack of effort, not due to real difficulty.

Lecturer: Sarah Lawrence 5/10, Peter Brennan 9/10.
I didn't really like Sarah Lawrence's lecture style. Although she covered all of the course content, she did it in a very simplistic way and it often felt as though she was talking down to us. Maybe the simplistic nature of it was due to the sheer amount of content, as well as the fact that we'd covered a lot of the material during the HSC. I felt as though she had a very strong political leaning that was made very plain - for example, lectures on Tiberius Gracchus and on the election process in Rome were very politically slanted, which I didn't appreciate. I was, however, very glad that she put all of the notes on WebCT. Peter Brennan is brilliant. His lectures are always fascinating. I would have given him a 10/10 but I felt he was a better lecturer in ANHS2608 because that course covered his area of expertise.
Interest: 6/10. - While I'm interested in Ancient Rome, I much prefer late antiquity and this course covered a period too early for me to be truly interested in what it had to offer. I really only chose it because I'd done Augustus and the Julio-Claudians in the HSC and figured that this course would be an easy six credit points for this semester as well as fulfilling my junior credit point requirement for Ancient History. However, this course did have its moments. Some of the content was quite interesting - I quite liked Cicero and Cato, for one, and Caligula is always amusing. Tutorial discussions (held by Sarah Lawrence) were much more spirited than lectures, though occasionally they degenerated into political debate, though I find that interesting in itself.

Overall: 6/10. - This was an average course, really. I found some of it quite interesting but I didn't pick it so much on its merits as a) fulfilling a junior credit point requirement and b) it covering a lot of the same content as the HSC course. This was significantly helped by Peter Brennan's lecturing, which I felt was the redeeming part of this course.

ANHS1005 - Power and Persuasion in Rome
Lecturer: Dr Kathryn Welch

Ease: 8.5/10. - Conceptually, it was nowhere near as hard as ANHS1003, because it focused more on political events than on cultural and sociological stuff. I thought it got a bit trickier towards the end because of the insane complexity of the imperial family tree, where the emperor's son's wife's stepsister's brother-in-law decides to make a powerplay by assassinating his brother's granddaughter's aunt's ex-husband's lover or whatever, but because of the structure of the course you could ignore a lot of topics that you weren't keen on. Assessment-wise, ancient history was again my lightest subject for the semester. A fairly short (1500 words) essay was the only hand-in assessment, and then there was just the exam (OK if you prepared enough for it, no real tricks) and tute participation.

Lecturer: 9/10. - Kathryn was really excellent. Well-spoken, good sense of humour, illustrated her points with reference to both ancient sources and modern historians (which is a pleasant change for a history course). Plus, lecture recordings synchronised with the slides on WebCT! The guest lecturers, who were the tutors talking about periods or people related to their PhD theses, were pretty good too.

Interest: 9/10. - This is a really interesting period of history (roughly from the Gracchi to Emperor Tiberius, with a tiny bit of the rest of the Julio-Claudians), and the engaging way in which it was taught made the course pretty good. I liked the way they threw in a few tutes on non-narrative topics as background to the political narrative, like how the Romans viewed suicide or how elections worked. It would've been nice to have a bit more on Roman religion, but I guess that's more the role of classics units.

Overall: 9/10. - Really good course, strongly recommend it for ancient history buffs. Unfortunately they're changing around the junior ANHS courses next year, but I can't imagine that the new course will be that different.

ANHS1600: Foundations For Ancient Greece

Ease: 7/10
Lecturer: 9 for JK, 7 for BB, 6 for MM. I can't comment on the rest because I can't really remember showing up to any of their lectures.
Interest: 6/10
Overall: 7/10 - Read your textbook. That's the best advice for this course. Other than that, Ben's pretty cool but never finishes his lectures. Julia is just awesome and will reply to your emails ASAP (within like, 2hrs honestly). Maggie is the cutest old lady ever but she writes essays and reads them so I generally can't follow her lectures. She's really sweet though.
**ANHS1600: Foundations for Ancient Greece**
2008 Lecturers: Julia Kindt, Ben Brown, Magaret Miller, Rick Benitez, Peter Wilson and David Pritchard.

Ease - 8/10
Lectures are (mostly) easy to understand, readings not so much. The essay was fairly easy, they are very understanding of first-year problems. =)
TURN UP TO YOUR TUTES. They constitute 20% of your total mark.

Lecturers
MM - 8/10, only because I find archaeology to be boring.
Philosophy guy - 9/10. Very interesting, although not very useful.
BB - 7/10. He's great fun in tutes - if you start him ranting about America and Iraq, you can keep him happily occupied for half an hour at a time.
Unfortunately he only has one lecture style, involving text-heavy slides and many incomprehensible five-syllable words, often in ancient Greek. =( The two guest lecturers on drama, democracy & women in Athens were quite dull.

Interest - 8 / 10. Lecturers are quite good. Guest lecturers, however, boring.

Overall - 8 / 10. The exam short answer questions were needlessly pedantic - too many meaningless names and dates - but the exam essay questions were nice and broad.

**ANHS1601: Foundations for Ancient Rome**
Lecturers: Jeff Tatum, Paul Roche, Ted Robinson

Ease: 7/10 - Most of the exam was pretty good, had to do one out of 11 essays, then a bunch of short answers. I found one of the sections (material cultures) really hard though, as it required a lot of specific information, and had a lot less choice than the other short answer section. Besides that though, the exam was good. Also had 20% tute participation, and a 40% essay which you have two chances to hand in. I'd strongly recommend anyone doing this subject to hand it in for the first deadline, because we got great feedback, and I spent less than an hour fixing it up, and ended up getting an extra 12 marks for it

Lecturers: Jeff 10/10, Paul 9/10, Ted 6/10
Jeff was absolutely fantastic, extremely funny and knowledgeable, I think everyone doing the course loves him. His topics also tended to be the more interesting ones, and he was able to make all of his lectures interesting.
Paul is also really great. He explained things really well, and provided great notes on WebCT. His topics (mostly the literary ones) were also fascinating
Ted was quite a dry lecturer. Not as bad as everyone says, he had some interesting things to say, but his topics (material culture) were by far the least interesting

Interest: 9/10 - I found it mostly very interesting

Overall: 9/10 - Definitely recommended for anyone interested in history.
ANHS1601: Foundations for Ancient Rome
Lecturers: Jeff Tatum, Paul Roche, Ted Robinson

Ease: 8/10 - It was pretty easy, none of the ideas, or concepts, or anything, really, was hard to understand or grasp. Though the list of assignments questions were pretty hard, I found that I could only answer 1-3 of them without having to go the extra miles to get all the info you would need. The exam was fine, though the material culture section was a bit of a bitch - it required very specific knowledge.

Lecturers: Jeff 10/10, Paul 8/10, Ted 4/10
I think ill just copy and paste what spence said, since it's exactly how I feel about Jeff: "Jeff was absolutely fantastic, extremely funny and knowledgeable, I think everyone doing the course loves him. His topics also tended to be the more interesting ones, and he was able to make all of his lectures interesting." (thanks spence!)
I enjoyed Paul, even though I know a couple of people who found him dull; he did put up all his lecture notes on webct. There's not that much bad things I can say about him.
I couldn't stand Ted's lectures - boring, dry, uninspired; but then again, he did do all of the material culture lectures, so there wasn't much he could do for them - he just didn't seem to have any passion or enthusiasm for what he was doing.

Interest: 7/10 - I probably found about 2/3rds of the course interesting; some of it though was pretty dull - it also made me realise all the specific, and dull, knowledge you would need to know if you ever wanted to major in ancient history (well, Rome anyway).

Overall: 7/10 - It was a good course, recommended for anyone interested in Rome.

ANHS2601: Ancient Imperialism
Lecturers: Alastair Blanshard, Dexter Hoyos

Ease: 7/10 - The content for the most part wasn't terribly complicated, it is divided into two halves, the first focussing on Greek empires (Athens, Sparta, Alexander) and the second half focussing on Rome with mentions of some others (Carthage, Seleucids). The first half didn't have a course reader or a text book, we just had to print out some primary sources from WebCT, which I think unfortunately left us with mostly facts rather than theories or interpretations and that was insufficient to me for exam preparation, so it is encouraged to look at the secondary sources on the tutorial lists because otherwise you'll end up just describing rather than analysing things in the exam. The Rome half did have a text book (Roman Imperialism edited by Champion) which was very useful because it covers a wide variety of sources and ideas, though it is sometimes dry and boring.

Lecturers:
Alastair Blanshard (first half of the course - lecturer and tutor): 8/10
He's quite a favourite among ancient history students, and I understand why, he is engaging and entertaining and makes history interesting. However, I felt that a lot of his lectures were straight facts, like tribute tables or coinage descriptions, and this was not entirely useful for the exam because memorising facts is great, but it won't lead to any sort of analysis if all you do is just describe all the facts you know. His tutorials were a bit quiet because we had no ideas to bounce off because all the readings were primary sources only.
Dexter Hoyos: (second half of the course - lecturer and tutor): 8/10
Definitely amusing for the most part, you can tell he really knows his stuff, even if he sometimes gets so off topic you sit there wondering how on earth he'll get back to the point. There were more ideas in this half of the course rather than just numbers and lists and I appreciated that as I found it a lot easier to study for the exam. The tutorials were also a bit more lively because he focussed on what people had written in their essays and then people had things to say.

*Interest*: 4/10 - I personally didn't find this course particularly exciting. With the Greek half it seemed like just a more in depth version of the first year course. The Roman half deals with a part of Roman history that the first year course completely misses and I appreciated learning about the Punic wars because it was completely new to me. Otherwise it was not greatly enlightening, it did not change my perspective on anything, it just gave me a broader knowledge of the historical narrative. If you are looking for new theories and interpretations, I think this course is somewhat lacking, except maybe right at the end when we learnt about how Rome itself was changed because of its imperialism.

*Overall*: 6/10 - This course is not terrible, but it is also nothing exciting. It's a good foundation but I expected more than that from a second year course. However, I'm glad I did it just for the extra knowledge of periods I had never studied.

**ANHS2604: Pagans and Christians in the Roman World**
Lecturer: Peter Brennan

*Ease*: 7/10 - This wasn't easy but it wasn't overly difficult either. There were a lot of readings and several of the topics were fairly obscure although others were very well-known. How easy this is depends upon the topics you choose, really. The assessment for this subject is 40% essay, 40% exam and 20% participation including journal. I really dislike large participation components but at least it was somewhat less... completely subjective... than if we didn't have to complete a journal. The essay topics are reasonable if you choose correctly; though I didn't do as well as I'd liked, you get the opportunity to submit a second essay on the last day of the exam period, with the best of the two marks counting. I think that's really fair and really decent. The exam wasn't overly bad. With approximately 30 questions to choose from, if you can't find three you can answer somewhat satisfactorily you haven't put any effort into the course whatsoever. Be careful of the 400 page reader brick.

*Lecturer*: 9/10 - I chose this course specifically because he was lecturing it, though I must say I preferred him in ANHS2608: The World Turned Upside Down last year. I think that was more the fact that I preferred the course content for that subject. Peter is an awesome lecturer and is very approachable. Regardless of course content I recommend any subject he takes.

*Interest*: 7/10 - The course was split into two parts - one on paganism and one on early Christianity. The interest mark for this is bumped because I really enjoyed the second half of this course; late antiquity and church history are the things I'm really interested in when it comes to history. I found little to excite me in the pagan section of the course. Although there's a large reader brick, there are some interesting things in there - Sayings of the Desert Fathers, the sources on the martyrdoms of St Perpetua and Pionius, and Octavius by Minicius Felix were highlights. Steer clear of the Hellenised Isis readings if you don't want to be bored to death by overwrought, dull academic writing. This course is closer to religious studies than actual history, so be forewarned before you take it. I would have probably preferred more actual history in it, but it was still a relatively good course.

*Overall*: 7/10 - Solid but I've done better courses. It has a few things going for it, though - Peter Brennan and the later lectures make this worth it. It was interesting to see the choice of topics - I would have probably chosen somewhat differently if I'd designed the course.
ANHS2607: Rome 90BC-AD14 - Making A World City
Lecturers: Dr Kathryn Welch, Frances Muecke

*Ease:* 8/10. Basically average difficulty for an ancient history course, although there was quite a bit of reading. The toughest part was comprehending the ideas behind historical topography and why it's worth studying: once you get past that there's nothing really difficult about the content. Assessments were pretty average, 2500 word essay, exam and 1000 word reading journal - it was tough to fit five entries into such a short space for the journal though, because they asked you to do a lot in 200 words.

*Lecturers:* Kathryn 9/10, Frances 6/10. I love Kathryn. She's a really clear and intelligent lecturer, she has some fascinating ideas, she's really willing to go the extra mile to help out and to make life easier for students (her implementation of e-learning in this course represents best practice imo, really useful without being gimmicky) and she can also be very funny. It helped that she had what I thought were the more interesting parts of the course, on topography, architecture and intellectual history. I didn't attend a lot of Frances' lectures so it may not be fair to judge, but her voice just sends me to sleep. Her lectures also tend to be a bit unstructured and often don't have much of a point. I also wasn't that interested in Roman poetry, which is her speciality, so that didn't help.

*Interest:* 9/10. How space and architecture were used to make political points = fascinating. How Romans saw themselves, their city and their history, and how this changed as republic changed to empire = fascinating. Really really great stuff for Rome buffs.

*Overall:* 9/10. A great introduction to modern academic study of Rome and to the politics and ideas of the Augustan settlement. Also teaches you a lot about the Roman mindset in the late republic and early principate. Really awesome course, shame about the poetic sections with Frances but I'm sure they could have been better had they been done by a better lecturer.

ANHS2608: The World Turned Upside Down
Lecturers: Peter Brennan, Lyn Olson

*Ease:* 7/10. - Let me tell you, there is a lot of reading and a lot of Latin (and sometimes Ancient Greek too) terminology here. Our course reader was 300 pages and a lot of the readings could be rather dense. DO NOT LET THAT STOP YOU! If you stay on top of the reading, you will be fine. The exam was very fair and very straightforward - it has one compulsory question on Paulinus of Pella and you choose two electives out of about thirty different questions, so you have a lot of scope. The essays were also fine - unlike in first-year Ancient, you are able to hand in the essays the tute after you discuss the topic, not before you discuss the topic. Also, you can write more than one paper if you're not happy with your mark. Again, like ANHS1004, there is a 20% tutorial participation mark, but it's less subjective because you write a journal throughout the semester - a page a week outlining your response to the readings. As I said before, keeping on top of the reading is essential if you want to do well.

*Lecturers:* Peter Brennan, 10/10. Lyn Olson, 10/10. Not only did I get to have a subject with Lyn Olson again (I loved her in the Middle Ages course last semester), but I also get Peter Brennan, who is made of awesome. I was very lucky to have a course that not only focused on my favourite period in history but had the two best lecturers I've had so far in 30 credit points of history taking it. I think this was the only subject this semester where I really went to lectures regularly and actually absorbed the information. Seriously, I cannot recommend these two enough (I'm deliberately taking courses run by them next year - three of them as at pre-enrolment).
Interest: 10/10. - This is a course on late antiquity, which is my favourite period in history. You cover the period from 150-800, so from the Antonines, or the Golden Age as Gibbon refers to it, through the anarchy of the 3rd century, the fall of the Empire in the west in the 5th century, early Christianity, up to and including the Carolingian Empire of Charlemagne. I must admit the period up until about Tute 8 or 9, which was on Italy under the Goths, was the most interesting because I prefer it, but even the later parts of the course were pretty interesting. The tutes were quite good. You either had Peter or Lyn, so it was win-win either way. I had Peter, and his tutorials were quite insightful - there was actually proper historical discussion taking place in them and I learned a lot.

Overall: 10/10. - I cannot recommend this course highly enough. It is probably the best Ancient History course on offer, to be honest (though I'm yet to take Pagans and Christians in the Roman World, which in my eyes is the only other candidate).

ANHS2691 Ancient Historians Rethink History I
Lecturer/Tutor: Ben Brown

Ease: 7/10 - I haven't received any results yet, so it's hard to tell, but just going off the content throughout semester itself, this course wasn't too horrible in terms of difficulty. It is more philosophy than history, but to me that was a lot more interesting than lectures full of dates that I would forget anyway. I had done the history extension course, and postmodernism for english ex 1 in the hsc so a lot of the ideas weren't completely new, but what highschool made ridiculously boring, this course made really inspiring. Some of the concepts were different to what we are used to in traditional history, and you really have to approach it with an open mind.

Lecturer: 9/10 - First up, the video lectures were painful at times because the sound was a bit distorted, but they weren't really boring or anything so I could deal.

I've seen someone else complain about Ben Brown for another course, and I have to say that to me he has been one of the best lecturers/tutors I've ever had. Yes he does go off topic sometimes in tutes, yes he talks throughout most of the tutorial, but for me it was really a case of wanting to listen to him rather than the same people argue over and over about the same thing. I know others would disagree with me, but I feel like these tutorials have been the most useful I've ever had because he has a lot of interesting ideas that none of us could have ever thought of, and tutorials were really a case of expanding on lecture material rather than people guessing things to fill in the silence that I've experienced so often in other courses. We also had to write a journal which was a good way to get participation marks.

Interest: 9/10 - I would encourage anyone who is thinking of majoring in Ancient history (or probably HSTY2691 for history majors cause I think that is its equivalent) to do this course. You might not like it at first, or at all, but it is important to know what other theories about and approaches to history are out there. It is the most interesting course I have ever done and has given me new ideas about how to approach content in other ANHS courses.

Overall: 9/10 - Best course I've ever done.
AMME - Aeronautical Mechanical

AMME2301 - Mechanics of Solids
Lecturer: 1/10
Ease: 6/10
Interest: 1/10
Overall: 1/10 - The lecturers were both terrible, tutorial structure was fucked, I'll probably do bad because I couldn't bring myself to attend the lectures partially because of the lecturers but because Engineers to be are generally fuckwits. Although Attendance vs mark should be high.

ANTH - Anthropology

ANTH1001: Cultural Difference: An Introduction

Ease: 8/10 - Not too difficult, just an overview of general anthropological ideas and concepts, and the amount of tards doing the course because its the first one on the list in Arts means that if you are even half intellectual you will get really good marks.

Lecturer: 10/10 - Daryl Feil is by far the best lecturer I had at Sydney uni in my first semester here. Energetic, humorous and knowledgeable made listening and going to the lectures a shitload easier.

Interest: 9/10 - For some reason I was intrigued by the concepts in the course, absolutely and utterly intrigued at the different ways of thinking people all around the world have. They present you with some material that really makes you wonder about our own society.

Overall: 9/10 - Its fuckin awesome, definitely hit that shit up, if your considering it.

ANTH1001: Cultural Differences: An Introduction
2008 Lecturer: Daryl Feil (for the 1st 6wks, then Gaynor McDonald)

Ease: 8/10
Lecturer: 9 and 7 respectively
Interest: 6/10
Overall: 8/10

Course is a-okay. Lots of readings to do though, most of which required concentration to understand (aka if you can be bothered). Concepts are pretty easy to follow and understand. Darly Feil is an awesome lecturer, he's really funny even if his teaching style seems a bit all over the place. Gaynor's good too but intimidating!
ARHT - Art History and Theory

ARHT2642: Art in the Age of the Samurai

Ease: (9/10) - 10% for a tutorial presentation, 30% for an essay on that presentation topic, and 60% for a 3000 word essay. What this meant was that it was possible to present in the second week, then have no assessments until the final week of semester. It also meant that there was no incentive to read any tutorial readings beyond that for your presentation as there was rarely any discussion of them.

Lecturer: (3/10) - Dr. Ajioka was certainly a nice person, however lectures leaned towards incomprehensibility, tending to be little more than a series of images over two hours without much analysis, meaning they were extremely forgettable. There appeared to have been no clear themes for the unit, and only a slight sense of chronology. That attendance was taken for both lectures and tutorials was somewhat of a mystery, as no mark was given for it.

Interest: (6/10) - The fact that Japanese art history really is an incredibly fascinating subject simply did not come through in the classes, and an interest in the topic was often all keeping one awake. In the end, the thick, neglected course reader turned out to be quite good, even if unused for the most part.

Overall: (5/10) - This was a very unsatisfying unit, when it could have been so much more. Other than for one assessment there was no reason to buy or read the course reader, and really no incentive to attend lectures, which tended to be a slow parade of images with minimal explanation or history.

ARNE - Archaeology (Near Eastern)

ARNE1001: Archaeology of the Near East
Lecturer: Dr Dawn Cropper

Ease: 7.5/10. - Utterly shitty and pickily marked assignment in which you had to find an artefact and write about what it tells us about the society that created it. (And that was all the help we were given.) Had nothing to do with the rest of the course, which was basically historical rather than focused on material culture. 2000-word essay, which was pretty standard except for the overly vague and broad questions (there is NO WAY you can satisfactorily discuss 'trade' in New Kingdom Egypt in 2000 words, and that was one of the more specific topics available). There was a ton of material in the lectures and not much guidance as to what would be in the exam, but as it turned out you only needed to know a few areas to attempt it successfully. The content itself was very basic and simple (except for some difficult tute readings), but there was a lot of it.

Lecturer: 8/10. - Dawn was clear and concise in her lecturing, which I found a positive after bad experiences with ramblers this semester, Diarmuid. She had a very familiar style, particularly in the tutes but also in the lectures, which I think a lot of people appreciated but I found vaguely patronising. This was probably because I already thought of her as patronising because of her continual and annoying focus on essay-writing skills and referencing. She spent a full lecture and a full tute on these, time which we could have used actually learning course material, but instead we were subjected to basic stuff like topic sentences and 'why is referencing important?' and 'what is plagiarism?' and introductions, bodies and conclusions (seriously, that's year 7 material). If our writing was really that terrible - and no other lecturer I've had has ever found their juniors' writing so bad that it justified spending hours of teaching time on - couldn't she have just directed people to the Write Site or run a voluntary session, rather than wasting the time of people who are fine with writing essays and making them feel patronised? </rant> Apart from that, I thought Dawn was fine.
Interest: 7/10. - I expected this course to focus on archaeology - the study of material culture - but particularly in the later part it turned into a very potted narrative history of the ancient Near East. I’ve always seen the point of archaeology as revealing how ordinary people lived, especially in the Near East where the literary record is dominated by the elite, and we studied this sort of thing at first - I found the section on the early Levantine neolithic fascinating - but after about the Mesopotamian Early Dynastic we got caught up in a very sparse and shallow coverage of the narrative, without any reference to the archaeological record except the occasional victory stele or something. If I had just wanted to learn the political history, I would have signed up for a course that covered it in depth: people did this course for the archaeology, and there was really precious little of it. So in the second half of the course, I spent most of my time in the lectures half-asleep (didn’t help that they were scheduled at 10am, which means I had to get up at 6.30am and I’m really not a morning person), and most of my time in the tutes wishing for death to take me away.

Overall: 6.5/10. - I was disappointed with this course - it was nothing like it was advertised. Friends tell me that the equivalent classical archaeology course, ARCL1001, was much better, focusing on building a knowledge of the archaeology, rather than the narrative. I would have appreciated more linkage to the practical archaeological knowledge we obtained in first semester and to the process of finding meaning from material culture, rather than a dull historical overview.

ARPH - Archaeology (Prehistoric and Historical)

ARPH1001 Introduction to Archaeology
Lecturer: Dr Martin Gibbs (and his wacky crew of guest lecturers)
To be recoded ARCA1002 from 2009

Ease: 8.5/10.
Most of the material covered was reasonably basic, and the lack of an exam meant you didn’t need any deep understanding of it. The two 15% quizzes – which were mainly multiple choice with a few short answers - weren’t particularly challenging, just going over notes and memorising lists was good enough to get a decent mark. It probably wasn’t necessary to go to the lectures, since the textbook* and the notes on WebCT were pretty comprehensive. The essay was OK if you started early and picked a decent topic – I stupidly chose a complicated topic and started late, but I did it reasonably thoroughly anyway and got a D. The other element of assessment was a workbook based on the six workshop sessions. The main thing was not to put it off until later but just to do each workshop’s tasks soon after the workshop, to avoid it all piling up. The hardest task was Documents in Archaeology, which took a long time because it actually required thinking.

Lecturer: 9/10 for Martin, 6/10 for the guest lecturers.
Martin Gibbs is an excellent lecturer who can convey a lot of fairly dry topics humorously and clearly. He also has a ton of interesting examples from his own research in the Solomon Islands and thereabouts. Unfortunately, most of the lecturers from the second half of the course, ‘Themes in archaeological research’, were guest lecturers from the Department of Archaeology talking about their areas of expertise. Most of them weren’t much good at lecturing: lowlights were Sarah Colley’s excruciatingly boring lecture on environmental archaeology, Ian Johnson’s pointless lecture about computer applications in archaeology, and every lecture by Lesley Beaumont, who has the unique ability to make it sound like she’s reading her lecture word-for-word off the paper in front of her even though she actually isn’t.
Interest: 8/10

The first half of the course, ‘Definitions and techniques in archaeology’, was fascinating – looking at different aspects of practical archaeology like surveying, settlement patterns, excavation, chronologies and ethnoarchaeology. The second half varied, as it was pretty much a pick’n’mix of different areas of archaeological research – the stuff about the development of literacy and trade was interesting, but the stuff about the archaeology of identity and religion was awful. Some of the workshops were better than others – Identities in Rubbish, where we looked through people’s household waste to see what we could conclude about them, was really fun, but the stratigraphy one was basic, tedious and difficult at the same time.

Overall: 8.5/10

It was an interesting (and easy) course that provides a decent foundation for further study in archaeology. I’d rate it higher if not for some of the guest lecturers and a couple of boring and fiddly workshops.

*Don't bother buying it unless you're really committed. I just got it out of the library a week before each test to go through a few details that the online notes didn't cover in enough depth.

ASNS - Asian Studies

ASNS1002: Modern Asian History and Cultures 2

Ease: 6/10 - The ideas about modernity are rather abstract and complex, moreso if one comes from a non-Arts background, but the morale is clear and simple - modernisation is not static, westernisation was not modernisation (for the better), and imperialism impeded modernisation for colonies. Tutes were often embarrassing (the Indonesian ones anyway - one had a choice of Indonesia, Korea and Japan tutes - as Max Lane constantly made everyone feel stupid by highlighting just how little we knew about Asia , and readings were once again, too complex to decipher in one quick skim. A callous bitch that laughed at everyone's comments in tutes didn't help either. Essays were marked harshly too. Also, having to learn three separate histories and tying it altogether in a demanding exam is quite a task, so it's actually not one to be taken lightly.

N.B: Colonial history is so depressing (especially Indonesia's).

Lecturer:

Pankaj Mohan (Korea) - 5.5/10 - Incoherent, but too gentle to hate for this. It did make it harder to study Korea though.

Max Lane (Indonesia) - 6.5/10 - My own tutor, Admittedly, I rarely went to his lectures and only ever managed to show up for the last 5 minutes, so I can't really provide an accurate assessment. But I didn't find him as inspiring as I'd hoped.

Matt Stavros (Japan): 9/10 - Inspiring, intelligent and interesting American Princeton graduate. Had him as a substitute tutor in the first weeks, knew nothing about Indonesia but was fascinatingly (though not disturbingly) quirky.

Interest: 8/10 - Thanks in part to Matthew Stavros, but the content is intrinsically interesting, a sobering assessment of imperialism and westernisation.

Overall: 7/10 - Not necessarily a song and dance about 'Asian Pride', but rather a panacea for Asian inferiority/Western superiority complexes.
ASNS2618: Remaking China 1949 – Present

Ease: 9/10 - Not sure how well the rest of the cohort did, but if you've done some social or critical theory, and epistemology, this is a remarkably easy course. It's fairly interdisciplinary, and so would suit a range of academic backgrounds. Even so, the assessment structure makes it a cinch. Tute participation is 15%, a 'critical reading' assignment (1000 words, 20%); The final exam is a noteworthy mention - an in-class test in Week 8, one-hour, 2 questions, 20%, which you can ace so long as you've merely done tute readings. In the exam I'd managed to completely misconstrue the author of the mandatory textbook, but still managed to only just miss on an HD.

Lecturer: 9/10 - Dr. David Bray knows his stuff well. Lectures included videos in some weeks. Basic lecture-slides, but lecture recordings were also posted. Hongwei Bao took tutes, and was quite a character, but also had plenty to offer.

Interest: 9/10 - This course provides an overview of from China's Maoist past to its transition to a so-called market economy. Was highly relevant, particularly during the heightened interest in Tibet, and especially with the focus on China during the upcoming Olympics.

Overall: 10/10 - Easy marks, coherent course structure, reasonable readings, and lectures that were regularly interesting and insightful.

ASNS2661: History of Modern Indonesia

Ease: 8/10
During the semester, the course seemed more difficult than what my marks suggest - there were just so many complex issues to cover (much like the country itself), and each weeks topics and readings opened up a pandora's box of more considerations. Indonesian history is so complex and anarchic that one is often forced to completely discard what they've learned thus far. But it's still reasonably easy to do well. The exam was weighted heavily at 45%, but topics were given beforehand (2 questions, and one was able to take the course reader in). Most people barely studied for it. Again, I don't know about class averages, but I managed to HD by my calculations. The other marks come 30% from the essay 15% on a tute presentation based on your essay topic, and 10% on tute participation. This assessment structure will probably change as Adrian Vickers has professed a dislike for exams.

Lecturers: 8/10
A remarkable character (much like the rest of the Asian Studies staff), Dr. Adrian Vickers would often meander through his talks and talk off the cuff without lecture slides, as if he was telling stories rather than giving a proper lecture. This made for some fascinating lectures (with exception of the week on Indonesian historiography, in which Adrian systematically listed all universities and key academics on Indonesia). Half of the lectures were also taken by Liz Jackson, whose structured lectures (complete with power-point slides) complemented Adrian's old-school style. Eve Warburton took my tute instead of the lecturers (though she's not teaching it next year). Lectures were also recorded.

Interest: 10/10.
Readings often reflected the lecturer's personal interests and were skewed towards Indonesian social and cultural histories. Despite the randomness of some readings (short stories, and plenty of first-hand accounts), the course nonetheless covered colonial, post-colonial, Islamic, political, economic and regional Indonesian histories. The class perhaps reflected the general interest in Indonesia, or perhaps lack thereof - there were less than 30. In some ways it was disappointing to see such apathy towards Indonesia, but it made for nice a small class (and only 8 people in my tute, though there were about 15 in the other).
Overall: 10/10
I recommend this course at the risk of letting everyone else on a hidden gem of a course. If you're doing some sort of arts or social sciences (history, asian studies, govt, ecop), it's a refreshing change.

ASNS2663: Social Activism in Southeast Asia

Ease: 8.5/10
No final exam in the block, but a small in-class test, 1 hour, 4 questions, a cinch. Readings were heavy, but they were also very generous with tute participation marks. Essay heavily weighted at 45%, but assessment and several lectures were devoted to better help us write decent essays. Themes were explicitly consistent, so easy to keep on track even with minimal effort. That said, I would've given it a 9/10 but my raw mark of 86.2 was scaled down to 82, stupid bell curve.

Lecturers (Michele Ford): 9/10
Since the class was pretty small, lectures were pretty interactive and interspersed with group discussion. They try to learn names as well since it's so small (only ever 20-30 in a lecture most weeks), plus most were recorded. There was a spate of guest lecturers for about 4 weeks towards the end of the course, but Thushara or Michele would actually explain at the end how guest-lecture material fit into the course.

Interest: 10/10
Lots of variety in topics and teaching methods, with lots of eye-opening, dramatic, even haunting videos on refugee, nationalist, environmental and even gay movements, actual NGO work in Southeast Asia.

Overall: 9/10
Am slightly bitter that they scaled down my raw HD mark, but it remains the most enjoyable unit for the semester, and one of the best organised and taught courses around (which is impressive for its inaugural year).

ASNS2670: Mass Media in East Asia

Ease: (6/10)
The learning objectives were quite clear, as well as the topics being covered. A presentation with essay, and major essay making up most of the marks, though a final exam will be worth 40%, it always seems excessive when two hours can make the difference between a fail and high distinction. It was a bit irritating that by week 12 we’d completed only about 30% worth of assessments, which hadn’t allowed for much feedback. The unit was unexpectedly technical and dry, with very little on the social and cultural side of things, so things could be very boring at times, and the countries being covered often blurred together, with only endless lists of acronyms to differentiate them.

Lecturer: (5/10)
Ki-Sung Kwak seems like a pretty nice guy, and the points he was making were usually pretty clear. He went through a lot of PowerPoint slides, which were not provided on-line, so it was sometimes a matter of copying them down before he moved on, and what was there was rarely elaborated on. There was a strange tendency to avoid ending classes early if he finished his prepared lecture early, and seeming unable or unwilling to think of anything more to tell us about than what was on his slides. Tutorials were also extremely awkward, after presentations it was usually a matter of the class being asked questions followed by long silences, and again never ending tutorials early when nobody had anything to say. Readings were many, and usually far too dull to read.
Interest: (3/10)
All of the content was extremely dry, the subject was really about listing when different broadcasting technologies entered Japan, Korean, HKSAR and Taiwan, who they are run by, and how they are regulated. Attempts to connect these to the history or culture of each country were quite weak, it was really a matter of memorizing dates, regulatory principles, and acronyms, god, the acronyms. There wasn’t much substance on actual programming content or the experiences of ordinary people with it, it was really just about the bodies running the different mediums, so there wasn’t much of a sense of learning about ‘Asia’ as opposed to generic companies, and having done previous Asian Studies units won’t prepare you for the technical nature of this unit. It was interesting though to have a Japanese journalist guest lecturer who expressed support for systems that earlier classes had shown to be quite detrimental.

Overall: (5/10)
Only really recommended if you’re interested in the political and administrative side of broadcasting. Dr. Kwak is easy to understand, but there just wasn’t much of a way to bring the content to life. There was a constant feeling that the course being set in Asia was irrelevant. It would also be a good choice for anyone who really, really likes acronyms.

ASNS2676: Gender in Modern Asia

Ease: (5/10)
There was nothing too complicated about the unit, though unexpectedly low essay marks have brought down the score a little. The final exam was worth 40%, too much in my opinion, and essays were returned afterwards with virtually no feedback. Edit: Brought down due to unexpectedly low results

Lecturer: (7/10)
Dr. Yang was an intelligent, clear speaker, with many interesting anecdotes concerning her own fieldwork. My only problem was that too much of the lectures was spent covering the tutorial readings. Tutorials were also pretty informative and readings often appealing (though it was a bit rich expecting us to buy four books). The classes would follow a particular theme, like third genders, commoditised sex, gender in the public sphere etc, and each would be given a few country-specific examples. The result then was a clearer understanding of the concept, but a bit of a limited vision of its relevance across Asia, though providing a good basis for further study.

Interest: (7/10)
Definitely an interesting unit, with a lot of variety. It also introduced a lot of the basic theories on gender and sexuality and applied them to different Asian contexts (though an emphasis on China), usually focusing the changing ways that gender have been controlled and by whom.

Overall: (6/10)
Interesting course, informative and lucid lectures and tutorials and more than bearable readings. Really only held back by poor assessment structure (70% based on in-class tests and tutorial participation) and some inconsistent grading.
BCHM - Biochemistry

BCHM2072/2972 - Human Biochemistry
Lecturer: Gareth Denyer.

This is an excellent course. This course is based on metabolic biochemistry. You will learn about glucose oxidation, fatty acid oxidation, what metabolic processes occur during starvation (like how to replenish glucose in the blood), diabetes and a little on exercise. Unfortunately there will be four lectures based on cell signalling, though.

The main lecturer for this course is Gareth Denyer. He is absolutely fantastic. He will draw figures on the board, take photos of it, and post them up on WebCT. He also provides recordings of his lectures and narrated powerpoint slides. This guy has a lot of passion for what he does. His lectures are very engaging, and the lecture theatre is always full!

The other four lectures are by Simon Easterbrook-Smith. His lectures notes that he posts up on the web aren't very detailed so I suggest you turn up to all four lectures (not that his notes a fantastic there either, but at least he draws the processes up, which he doesn't provide on the pdf).

I'm not entirely sure if the advanced lectures will be exactly the same as this year, but every fortnight (if you choose BCHM2972), you will have separate lectures. This year, we learnt the stuff we learnt with Gareth in more detail (the molecular side of things). We also did some case studies, which involved patients who suffer from certain symptoms, and determining what is wrong with them (what's wrong with the metabolic pathway).

The labs aren't too bad. You'll have 5 hours of lab per fortnight, but usually you'll finish between 4.30 and 5. The first lab was colorimetry (boring). The next two labs were based on determining the rate of glucose oxidation in yeast cells by the incorporation of radioactive glucose into them. The last three weeks involve designing your own assay kit (you pretty much design your own company and all).

Overall: 9/10

BCHM2072/2972: Human Biochemistry
Human Biochemistry is da bomb with Gareth Denyer!! If you decide to do this subject you'll love his lectures and never ever want to miss them. He records his lectures too & even takes photographs of the blackboard he writes on. The downside are the pracs, run by MBLG demonstrators who are insane crabby bitches most of the time. If you get Andrea I am extremely sorry for you, never bother asking her for help, go straight to Debra if possible. The pracs are no where as exciting as first sem.. but you tolerate it in the end. And assignments are doable, just ensure you have a good lab group.

Overall: 10/10 lectures... 4/10 for prac

BCHM3071/3971: Molecular Biology and Biochemistry - Genes
Lecturers: Prof. Merlin Crossley, Dr. Hannah Nicholas, Prof. Tony Weiss and Dr. David Gell

Ease: 7/10 - Many of the things that are taught in this course would have been taught in MBLG2071/2971., such as DNA damage, transcription factors, etc. It's not exactly difficult, but there is a lot to learn.

Lecturers: 8/10 - Merlin Crossley is awesome, as always. Hannah Nicholas is lovely and her stuff on DNA methylation and imprinting is quite interesting. Her lecture notes are very thorough. Tony Weiss' stuff is interesting, but he pretty much just copies his lecture notes from the Genes VIII textbook, which is annoying. David Gell is okay.
Practical course: 8/10 - Did reverse transcriptase PCR, southern blotting to identify a transgene and restriction enzyme digestion to identify which lambda phage fragment was inserted into an E.coli plasmid. Pretty interesting. There are a lot of practical reports (mainly in-book ones, but one scientific paper).

*Interest:* 8/10 - Very interesting. Learnt about X chromosome inactivation, Imprinting (how either the maternal or paternal allele is silenced), DNA methylation, chromosomes/chromatin, intron splicing and autosplicing, DNA damage and repair, homologous recombination- all very interesting.

*Advanced Course:* The advanced course required 3 additional seminars in which we learnt about amyloids and protein aggregation. We had to do a presentation on amyloids as well.

*Overall:* 8/10 - I definitely recommend it.

**BCHM 3071: Genes**

Very broad at the start, but don't despair... they specialise after a few weeks. Theory work was not too difficult apart from having 9am lectures. However the notes are online and lectures are recorded for your convenience. The pracs are fine as well and assignments are easily passable. However Gill Johnson (the year coordinator) is an immensely bitchy lady who won't help or guide you in anyway. So try and avoid her at all costs. Oh and by the way, she may seem friendly at first... but BEWARE! She'll stab you in the back.

*Overall:* 6/10

**BCHM 3081/3981: Molecular Biology and Biochemistry - Proteins**

*Lecturers:* Dr. Joel Mackay, Dr. Jacqui Matthews, Dr. Simon Easterbrook-Smith

*Ease:* 5/10 - Much more difficult especially when the lecture notes are shocking.

*Lecturers:* 4/10 - None of them are fantastic, particularly Jacqui Matthews. Make sure you turn up to every lecture in the course, especially for Simon's lectures as he uses the whiteboard/blackboard and only puts up a summary of the lecture on WebCT. If you miss out on a lecture, make sure you listen to the audios on WebCT (assuming they'll still do that next year).

*Interest:* 4/10. - It wasn't too interesting. Joel's stuff was pretty bland on Stability of proteins, chaperones, ways to improve protein stability, etc. Jacqui's stuff on different ways to clone a gene and to investigate properties of proteins is okay once you begin to understand the stuff. Simon's stuff on protein import/export and membranes isn't too bad either. Overall, a lot of the stuff you'll learn you would have learnt in previous years.

*Practicals:* 7/10 - You'll pretty much do one huge experiment over 6 weeks. You'll be looking at the properties of the protein, Replication Termination Protein (RTP). You'll be overexpressing the protein, isolating and purifying it, and looking at it's DNA binding properties. Be prepared to stay past 1 pm for some of the pracs.

*Advanced Course:* 3 additional seminars learning the molecular properties of RTP. You'll have to do a report on it as well.

*Overall:* 5/10 - It isn't the best course, but I guess it depends on what you're interested in.
BIOL - Biology

BIOL1001: Concepts of Biology

*Ease: 4/10* - The final exam really killed. It isn't that fantastic with bad markers along the way. You won't enjoy it that much if you think it is like HSC biology. It was my HSC biology knowledge that got me pass this subject. Not one I would recommend if you want easy marks.

*Lecturers: 4/10* - Some where good. Some were terrible. I really do not like 'discussion' in lectures. I am there to listen not to talk. Talking is for practicals. Some are so boring that I catch up on my sleep in their lectures. I rarely met a good lecturer in this for some weird reason. Might be me, but seriously. It was NOT good.

*Interest: 4/10* - It is the practicals that made it worthwhile. The prac where the fun parts of this course. Playing with Blood, DNA etc is probably the best thing. But seriously, this put me off ever liking biology. And for someone who loved Biology in yrs 11/12, it is a sad thing. And since I did well in Bio for the HSC anyway, it was a let down of one of my favourite HSC course.

*Overall: 4/10* - Don't do it if you can. If you have to, the grit your teeth and get a pass. That was all I aimed for. Because it was just so not enjoyable. If you liked it, then good. But for me it was just bad, bad and more bad. I didn't bother going to lectures after week 6 because I found it was no use coz I didn't get the lecture anyway! And the text book is not much help, because you don't have a syllabus to show what is IN the EXAM. Felt like a headless fly when studying for the finals.

BIOL2011: Invertebrate Zoology

*Lecturers: Liz May (1,4,7-8), Rosalind Hinde (2-3), Adele Pile (5-6), Frank Seebacher (9-10), Fiona Clissold (11-13).*

*Ease: 3/10* - Too much to remember and barely any of it's interesting. There's only so many body parts to worms that you can remember without burning out. Two exams worth 60%, one for theory and one for prac so there's double the amount of stuff to revise. The other 40% worth of assesments were pretty easy, but those exams were killers.

*Lecturers: 5/10* - Liz was fine as usual and her lecture notes were superb. Seebacher and Clissold weren't as interesting but their lecture notes made it easy to revise. Hinde and May were ok lecturers who were let down by awful notes - you actually have to take notes with these two since they don't publish entire lectures, just basic outlines. Sadly though the material for the first half of the semester sucked balls, so no matter how good the lecturers were they couldn't make it interesting. Or maybe they could and they just failed. Either way, the lecturers aren't that impressive.

*Interest: 4/10* - First half of semester is horrible. You'll learn about sponges, jellyfish and worms in horrible detail. After that it goes onto molluscs with Liz which was really interesting mostly thanks to her lecturing. The material on crustaceans was nice since a lot of it was about general biology (ecology and all that crap) rather than zoology. The last part on insects started off fine but went on for far too long and went in to far too much detail to retain interest. They're invertebrates folks, so they're not going to be too interesting.

*Labs: 8/10* - Labs were pretty good. You'll dissect a silkworm, garden snail, yabby and cockroach which were all used in the prac exam. The labs were full of displays and dissections and whatever and the lecturers were always wandering around talking about their research interests, which was good. As with vertebrates, for certain labs experts from outside of the uni/other parts of the uni were
brought in to help us learn and whatever, so that was nice. There are new posters and preserved specimens up in the zoology foyer every week to assist with the labs too. Oh, plus there's the Macleay museum upstairs which has Australia's biggest insect collection, so that's cool. Only problem with the labs was that they sometimes became redundant - you've seen one worm and you've seen 'em all.

Overall: 4/10 - Not that impressive. Boring subject material isn't aided by mediocre lecturers. Like vertebrates, it was very well organised and the labs were good but they aren't good enough to bring the score of this difficult and boring subject up too far. I don't recommend it unless you really need it (do vertebrates though).

**BIOL 2012: Vertebrates and Their Origins**
Lecturer: Dr. Adele Pile (1-2), Dr. Liz May (2-4), Prof. Mike Thompson (5-8), Dr. Michael Letnic (9), Dr. Clare MacArthur (10-12), Prof. Chris Dickman (13)

*Ease: 7/10* - Pretty easy if you follow what's happening. There's a tonne of crap to remember though. If you can't remember specific keywords for topics then you won't like this course. The number of classes, orders, terms and whatever else you have to remember in 2012 is absurdly high. There's a tonne of learning material provided for you though. The lab book has material, the course text book is detailed (don't buy it though, it's not worth it. I didn't), the lecture notes are fantastic, WebCT is filled with information (videos, lectures, links and animations and whatever else), the lab CD that's given to you is well stocked and posters are put up in the zoology foyer full of information that are changed every week or so. The labs and tutorials also have a tonne of information to assist with lectures. So yeah, there's a lot to remember, but there's a lot of places to source the information from. The assessments are varied. On one hand, the mid semester test and those multiple choice questions were killers, but the final exam, speech, poster, essay and prac exam all seemed easy enough. There's a wide variety of assessment which is good, and exam assessment is mostly minimised.

*Lecturers: 8/10* - They're all pretty good. Liz (course co-ordinator) is pretty funny and dropped by every week or so in lectures to give announcements. Mike Thompson was pretty fantastic and interesting. Chris Dickman is one of those experts in the field so he's pretty cool. Clare MacArthur's really into her subject so she's interesting (plus she lectured on mammals, which is easy since they're one of the most interesting aspects). Adele Pile was ok, but she lectured on the "origins" part of the course which wasn't that interesting. Mike Letnic lectured on birds. That's unfortunate, given how much I love birds, because he's an abysmal, boring and monotonous lecturer who doesn't seem at all interested in what he lectures about. His notes were probably the best though, so meh.

*Interest: 8/10* - Yeah, it's pretty interesting. As said, lectures were good and so were the learning materials. The tutorials went through the info in a pretty interesting manner, and the labs were always pretty fun and interesting. The course material itself is nice as you take a little tour of vertebrate evolution and step back through time and work your way back up. If you love evolution and zoology you'll love this course.

*Overall: 8/10* - I liked it quite a bit. Lots of learning opportunities, lots of fun to be had and only a couple of boring parts/lecturers. Of note is that it looks as if they've minimised the "walk around and copy crap off boards" method in this unit and instead have gone to lengths to make labs interesting. You'll be doing a dissection every other week in this course, which is always pretty fun. The amphibians lab was awesome, as Australia's leading frog expert (or something) comes in and does it with you, and he's really awesome. A word of warning: You have to kill a sea urchin and a toad, and the marsupials really, really stink. If you like chicken you might want to watch out for the chicken dissection to (although it doesn't really bother me after i dissected one). Those toads that you kill move around after you kill them too, which is pretty unpleasant IMO.
**BIOL3011: Ecophysiology**

Ease - 8/10 - It's not a hard subject, though there's a lot of detail in the lectures and independent work involved in the two experiments you design and do. The field trip was easy - do your experiment at your own pace, and the lecturers are there if you need them (which is how the extended experiment as well).

Lecturers - 8/10 - They go slow, they go over the stuff in detail, and they're genuinely passionate about what they talk about and in helping you learn it. They use lots of real examples to demonstrate theory (often from their own research) and it definitely helps reinforcing the theory.

Interest - 9/10 - If you like biology, this is fascinating and makes a lot of sense once you understand the basics.

Labs - 10/10 - There weren't many, basically only for the independent group projects at the end of semester, which were "come in if you need to, leave when you're ready." Easy.

Overall - 9/10 - Great subject. People who hate group work need not apply, however. The exam was shit easy too.

**CHEM - Chemistry**

**General Comments**

Advanced Course (for advanced students):
Additional seminars comprising 1 hr per week. We did asymmetric synthesis and "green" power. We did two assignments in groups of 3-4. The first assignment was devising a way to synthesise a drug and the second was to present a seminar on different technologies for power (nuclear power, wind power, clean coal, etc). There's a lot of work involved.

Practical Course:
I must say that the practical course for third year chemistry is much more interesting than first and second years. I love the inorganic labs where you have to do 5 mini practicals and 2 major projects. You'll write up a report for the two major projects and have an interview with an academic regarding the experiment. The experiments available include x-ray diffraction, synthesising linkage isomers and using different techniques (IR spectra, UV-vis spectra, etc) to identify different properties, synthesising molybdenum compounds, etc. Very interesting. Experiments are done individually.

The physical labs involve four experiments comprising one large research project. There are three to choose from; construction of a dye-sensitised solar cell, biodeisel and some biophysical one. I did the solar cell one and it was quite interesting. We investigated the properties of titanium dioxide and the effect of particle size, surface area, etc on the performance of a solar cell. You'll do 3 major reports and corresponding interviews, one smaller introductory project, and another introductory project involving the use of solver. The experiments/reports are done in pairs.

**CHEM 1101: Chemistry 1A**

Ease: 8/10
Lecturer: 7/10
Interest: 5/10
Overall: 6/10
CHEM 1102: Chemistry 1B

Ease: 8/10
The course material wasn't at all hard, and the tutorials were structured and ordered in a way that followed lecture material closely, and prepared us well for the final exam (worth 75%). The tutorial quizzes throughout the semester seemed useful, and were also good preparation for the exam. My only complaint about ease was that at time, the solubility part of the course seemed a little iffy, with questions occasionally seeming as if they could be both one type of question, or another. So long as you know your material by going to lectures, and doing your tutorial sheets you'll be fine. My only complaint, is that the laboratory quiz was damn impossible, but that might have had something to do with my sloppy compound. Just make sure you study those ions well.

Lecturers: 8/10
Dr. Rutledge is an awesome lecturer. This must be said. His dry, Irish/English/Kiwi/Aussie wit is a perfect match for the sometimes formulaic world of organic chemistry. I love organic chemistry, of course, and find it exciting in whatever form its presented, but Dr. Rutledge made it just that little bit more spectacular. His habit of taking a break at the half hour point with his little "trips to Ireland" are a fantastic idea that every lecturer should make use of. I loved the way he integrated questions and practical examples (such as the non-working acid experiment) into his lectures, which were really quite relevant to both the final exam, and our tutorial quizzes. I also had the luck of getting both Dr. Rutledge and Dr. Rendina as my tutor, which was an added bonus.

Dr. Rendina was equally as good, once more integrating questions and practical experiments into his lectures. The 'hydrogen bomb' remains the high point. He's just as funny as Dr. Rutledge, but in a quite different way. My only complaint about Dr. Rendinas style was that he occasionally focused on talking to one person throughout the lecture, which occasionally was me. It's a bit distracting is all. That, and the material he was lumped with was a little crappier than what Dr. Rutledge got to present.

Interest: 7/10
Yeah, I found it pretty interesting. Organic chem would get a 10/10, but the heavy emphasis on acids/bases brought down what would otherwise be a fantastic course, in the Rendina part. If it had have been organic chem/everything else but acids and bases it would have probably got a 10/10, but yeh...damn those acids and bases.

Overall: 8/10
Good course, actually, quite a good course for a compulsory unit. I'd recommend it to anyone who's a little confused as to whether they want to continue with chem after 1101/1001. This will hopefully change your minds.

CHEM1901: Chemistry 1A (Advanced)
Ease - 8/10
Lecturer - 8/10 (First lecturer was a bit dodgy, but Kepert wasn't too bad)
Interest - 8/10
Overall - 8/10

CHEM1902: Chemistry 1B (Advanced)
Ease - 5/10 (quite difficult stuff)
Lecturer - 8/10 (They were both quite good, especially Trevor Hambley)
Interest - 7/10
Overall - 7/10
CHEM2401: Molecular Reactivity & Spectroscopy

Ease: (6/10)
Not that hard but not that easy. Effort is required, and readings have to be done elsewhere for the physical chem part. Took me a few times of reading over Tim Schmidts lecture notes before I understood everything. Organic chem was easy enough to learn from lecture slides and occasional reading from McMurry. Pracs are easy, as you get high scores by asking demonstrators and reading the manual. Thing that brings down the score was the final exam: It was a bitch. Questions were in there that I'd never seen before for the spectroscopy part, and some of Tim Schmidts stuff was pretty hard. Some of the organic questions were also pretty fringe concepts, I reckon.

Lecturer: (9/10)
Awesome lecturers. Chris McErlean (1-3) was nice enough and had concise lecture notes. Kate Jolliffe's (4-6) lecture notes weren't quite as good but she went through the material in a lot more detail (with curly arrows and real life syntheses and crap). Both of those lecturers taught organic chem so for me, they can't step too far out of line. Overall, they both made clear lecture notes, related theory to practise and were genuinely interesting and interested in their field. Only negative was that they both weren't that open to consultation and didn't put much stuff up on webCT apart from their notes. Tim Schmidt (8-9) was a funny guy. Kinda condescending and rude but all the same, he explained all the difficult maths and stuff pretty well. His lecture notes were kickass. Also, he took the time out to write a 40 or so page book explaining his course content in detail and provided a few links on the internet to resources that explained his stuff in more detail. Scott Kable (7, 10-13) is one of the uni's best lecturers, seriously. He took more lectures than the rest and it's probably reflected in the score. He makes the most difficult concepts easy and makes the most dull concepts exciting. He has a habit of coming up with analogies that help explain all the quantum theory concepts, which are a fantastic idea. His notes were very detailed and the amount of extra material he put up on webCT was staggering - seriously, he has a quiz for each lecture, he has pages of solutions for each of his tutorials, he does fully worked solutions for every past exam he gave us and was available for consultation at basically any time. The man's one of the most dedicated lecturers I've ever had. Oh, and he's a really nice guy. I was asking a question at the end of a tutorial one day and once I was done he asked about my [blue] hair and the chemistry of it and so on, and we talked about it (and chemistry) until we got to the lecture theatre. How many lecturers are that friendly and nice to students eh? I <3 Scott Kable!

Interest: (9/10)
Organic part covers substitution, elimination and benzene reactions/properties. This involves a lot of organic chemistry from a lot of areas, so there's lots of interest there for me. Tim's part's all about quantum theory, which was also (surprisingly) interesting. Scott's part was about spectroscopy, so it wasn't as interesting, but he makes it so. I didn't think I could ever enjoy physical chem but I was proven wrong. Organic labs are interesting enough but the inorganic ones are a bitch to have interest in.

Labs: (7/10)
It's split up into two lots of four weeks. For the first four you perform analysis in the inorganic labs. You know, detecting ion concentrations and crap. You basically spend three hours preparing absurdly accurate solutions, run a test of em, do some maths and go home - BORING. Easy though. I got an HD average for the inorganic labs. Organic labs were much better. It's pretty much potions mixing, so how can that be boring? Demonstrators were always there for you in both labs, but the organic ones had the bonus of having a "special guest" academic staff member teaching us in the lab. So you've got about three PhD students telling you how to do things, with one of the academic staff walking around to help out, which is pretty cool (staff members were Max Crossley, Richard Payne and Kate Jolliffe).

Overall: (9/10)
Very pleased with this subject. Interesting and fun. I'd definitely recommend it!
CHEM2401/2911: Molecular Reactivity and Spectroscopy (Adv)
Lecturers: McErlean, Joliffe, Schmidt, Kable

Ease: 6/10
Large majority was organic chemistry which I disliked personally. However, aromatic chemistry was quite easy. Quantum Huckel Theory and Spectroscopy were quite difficult to understand but once you understand them, everything falls in place quite nicely. The final exam is horrible. There was way too much stuff to learn and study for. There is only so much we poor students can fit into our brains. Labs were a bit of a pain overall. I preferred the analytical over organic labs because there was no report writing for homework...

Interest: 6/10
Organic chemistry is like the biggest yawn for me. Thank god for Spectroscopy and Quantum theory. Even though they were hard to understand, the colourful lectures were far more interesting than the black and white overheads in the organic lectures.

Lecturer: McErlean: 6/10, Joliffe: 8/10, Schmidt: 7/10, Kable: 9/10
McErlean is such a showoff and makes hard exam questions. I particularly hate it when he says organic chemistry is so easy so frequently. He goes through the lecture rather quickly as well and that's worse for me as I do not like organic chemistry in the first place. He does show glimpses of a good lecturer, but its an uncommon sight.
Joliffe was a very good lecturer. She went through the lectures at a slower pace and really she really knows her stuff. She asks straightforward questions in exams which is an added bonus.
I've heard bad things about Schmidt but I never saw them in his lectures. He can lecture quite well and went at an alright pace. One thing I do like about him is that he was lazy enough to set the exact tutorial questions as the exam questions....LOL
Kable is an awesome lecturer. He provides heaps of support and is committed to helping us understand the material. He does make the lectures engaging and interesting. Unfortunately, he also likes to ask hard questions in exams....

Overall: 7/10
Organic was hard and boring, except for aromatics which was easy (but still boring) and the physical chemistry (quantum and spectroscopy) were very interesting but takes a while to understand. Final exam was hell, there's far too much content that can be examinable.

CHEM2402/2912: Chemical Structure and Stability (Adv)

Ease: 7/10
Personally for me much easier than the CHEM2401/2911 in terms of understanding the content. However, the exam questions for the metal complexes part are quite difficult. Quizzes were heaps hard though. Average for quizzes over the entire cohort was a FAIL....eep! Thermodynamics (statistical and classical) was easy (though we had to learn some formulae off by heart), though I'd imagine it would be difficult for those without a strong mathematical background. The carbonyl organic chemistry was somewhat easier than I expected. I liked the fact that this time everyone provided answers to their sections of past exams (except for Harrowell lol) which made life a lot easier.

This time the labs were organic (lvl5) and physical (lvl3) rather than organic and analytical (lvl4). Labs were similar to CHEM2401/2911 in difficulty for organic and physical was more about using computers to analyse results rather than experimentation which I guess made it a bit easier.
Interest: 8/10
The metal complexes section was quite interesting and because it's inorganic chemistry I definitely had more interest in it. Statistical thermodynamics was quite neat and interesting as well. I didn't expect Classical thermodynamics to be so easy and interesting. Carbonyl organic chemistry made me fall asleep.

Lecturer: Beattie: 7/10, Bridgeman: 9/10, Harrowell: 6/10, Hudson: 8/10, Baker: 8/10
Big problem I had with Beattie was trying to understand what he was saying. He was always mumbling the lecture rather than speaking out loud. If you can actually understand his mumbling then some of the stuff he says makes his material easier to understand.
Bridgeman is very committed and supportive. He provides extensive answers to virtually everything and actively participates in the discussion board. He explains things rather well as well and goes through the stuff very slowly. He does set some difficult questions though...
Harrowell is an absolute a-hole because he chucks a tantrum every time someone talks in the very slightest. His actual lecturing is good; he can explain things well, but his lack of tolerance and his impatience just gets in the way too much.
Hudson explains things decently and is very supportive. He usually asks easy questions in the exam (which were mostly plugging numbers into formulae). I liked his "flash quizzes" and his unusual "word of the day" presentations lol, some were quite interesting.
Baker took the organic carbonyl chemistry section. As much as I find organic chemistry hard, he actually made it quite easy. His exam questions were generally quite easy. However, he didn't make it anymore interesting though. It was quite monotonic...

Overall: 8/10
Definitely prefer this unit over CHEM2401/2911. Most of the material was more interesting (though some of it was quite hard to understand) and the lecturers were more supportive (overall). There's a bigger emphasis on inorganic and physical chemistry which favoured my way of thinking a bit more. Final exam was still horrible though; far too much material to study for.

CHEM2402/2912/2916: Chemical Structure and Stability
I found this course better than the first semester core Chemistry unit. It involves less organic chemistry. The first two lecture series involves learning about metal complexes, crystal/ligand field theory, the bonding of ligands to complexes and how that affects the reactivity, and a little on rate laws. The next two series involves statistical thermodynamics, which I found quite interesting, and classical thermodynamics (which I didn't like as much). The final series is a little on organic chemistry, but nothing too detailed (just SN1, SN2, E1 and E2 reactions).

The lecturers...well no one that actually stands out. If you guys have James Beattie, good luck trying to understand him. He mumbles.

The labs are horrible, as they are in first year. There are organic and physical labs. The organic labs aren't too bad, but the physical ones are shocking. You have to hand in your report by 5 pm that afternoon! You will have one lab each week, including weeks 1 and 13, which will run for 4 hours.

The only major difference between the advanced (2912) and normal (2402), are the questions asked in the labs for the lab report. CHEM2916 is SSP, and those students attend additional seminars as well as do some extra assignments.

Overall: 6/10
CHEM2402: Chemical Structure and Stability
Lecturer: Asso. Prof. James Beattie (1-3), Dr. Adam Bridgeman (4-6), Prof. Peter Harrowell (7-8), Dr. Toby Hudson (9-11), Dr. Rob Baker (12-13)

Interest: 3/10
Depends if you're an organic or inorganic person. This course has made it very clear that I'm an organic person. You'll be learning about ligands, d block chemistry, thermodynamics and so on for the bulk of the course. The ligands part was ok in terms of interest (once I grasped it), but 8am lectures made it a little hard to be interested in. Statistical thermodynamics was intriguing, but a little abstract to really be interested in. Normal thermodynamics was a little more practical, but wasn't terribly interesting at all. The chemistry of carbonyl compounds (organic omg!) was awesome though.

Lecturers: 4/10
As has been said, the lecturers for this course are a bit of a joke. James Beattie (3 weeks) stands and mumbles for the most part in a monotone. I'm not sure why, because he can be exciting if he wants to be. Adam Bridgeman (3 weeks) was excellent who was able to be interesting at 8am, provided a tonne of learning material to help us through the stuff was genuinely entertaining. Toby Hudson (3 weeks) is friendly enough, competent but not excellent. Rob Baker (2 weeks) was very good and explained everything quite well. His lecture notes were awesome too. So why the low score? The majority of assessment seems to fall under the shitty lecturers, and too much of Bridgemans stuff was picking up the pieces from Beattie.

Ease: 4/10
Ugh, hard. Final exam was hellish. Lab reports are fairly easy if you know what you're doing.

Overall: 3/10
I didn't enjoy myself in this course. The synthetic techniques labs and organic lectures were the only parts of the course where I could actually say I was enjoying myself. The assessment was difficult, the lecturers were shoddy. I hadn't done 2401 either (which isn't a prereq), which made a bit of the material in some labs and some lectures a little harder to grasp. If it weren't compulsory, I wouldn't recommend it. Try going to the 12pm lectures for sure.

CHEM2403/2913: Chemistry of Biological Molecules
I didn't really mind this course. You will be learning about sugars, how they react to form disaccharides, lipids, cholesterol, steroids, artificial sweettners, DNA and proteins. The second series consists of physical chemistry. You'll learn about osmosis, brownian motion, diffusion, muscle contraction and the process involved, heart function, kidney function, electron transport, colloids and a bit on proteins. The final series in learning about metal complexes in biology (eg. Pt used to treat cancer). You'll also learn about the chelate effect, unit cels, crystal growth and the crystal structure of teeth and bones.

You will have 5 labs in the semester, 4 hours each, and they are all inorganic labs. They aren't too bad (well, not as bad as the core chemistry).

Overall: 7/10
CHEM2403: Chemistry of Biological Molecules
Lecturers: Peter Rutledge, Ron Clarke, Peter Lay

Ease: 7/10 - Nothing too hard. The organic chem is easy enough to learn, and the inorganic material is a mixture of first year stuff and trivia. Only difficult part would be the physical chemistry, but luckily the exam questions are identical to previous year's, so you just have to know how to use the formula (and remember how to use them, rather than forgetting that in the final exam). Final exam was a bit tough compared to what I thought it'd be like, but nothing that challenging.

Lecturers: 8/10 Peter Rutledge is fantastic. Interesting, funny, good slides, makes lots of references to drug design and other practical applications. Peter Lay is good too. He writes on the blackboard, distributes handouts (with graphs and whatever), makes detailed lecture notes and generally makes things pretty interesting. Ron Clarke is the weak point - he's kinda shit. Faces the blackboard, reads off slides and whatever. Overall the two others raise the overall mark.

Interest: 9/10 - Yeah interesting subject. Organic chem was lots of fun, inorganic chem was surprisingly interesting (learn about the chemistry of teeth and cool stuff like that), but physical chemistry was a bore.

Labs: 5/10 - Eh. Pretty crud. Demonstrators were shit and didn't give very good advice. Labs were long and boring and kinda not that related to the lectures. Plus they do them on level 4, and there's a distinct lack of fumehoods on level 4, which makes things cramped. Oh, and feedback was nonexistent.

Overall: 8/10 - Apart from the labs and the physical chem, it was a very good subject. Highly recommended.

CHEM2911: Molecular Reactivity & Spectroscopy (Adv)
Pretty interesting. The Spectroscopy and Aromatic Organic Chemistry is quite good. The Quantum stuff is not so good, especially when the lecturer is quite boring. The last part of the lecture series included an overview of AAS, AES and other methods of analysing samples - it was quite boring.

CHEM 3010: Biomolecules
Involves lots of DNA background for the first component of it all. So if you have done 2nd year MBLG and BCHM, you'll be passing this with flying colours. Lecture notes are online but you are FARKED if you don't go to chem lectures... you write all over the notes in the end. Organic reactions are involved here too unfortunately, so quite a bit of memorising... Good for people with photographic memory. Pracs are randomly allocated... 4 hours a week. Iooong... and boring!

Overall: 8/10

CHEM 3112/3912: Materials Chemistry
Lecturers: Assoc. Prof. Brendan Kennedy, Dr. Chris Ling and Dr. Adam Bridgeman

Ease: 5/10- It's pretty hard (even though the exam was open book), especially Chris Ling's stuff on bonding and x-ray diffraction stuff. I think scaling was my saviour for this subject...

Lecturers: 7/10 - All of them are pretty good. Although you should listen to them carefully, particularly for Brendan Kennedy and Chris Ling as the lectures notes are not detailed enough for the former, and the lecture notes are too complicated for the latter.

Interest: 6/10 - Wasn't the most interesting course. If you like inorganic solids, fullerenes, lattice defects, unit cells, x-ray diffraction and superconductivity, then this is the course to do.

Overall: 6/10
CHEM3113/3913: Catalysis and Sustainable Processes
Lecturers: Assoc. Prof. Tony Masters and Assoc. Prof. Sebastien Perrier

Ease: 7/10 - Unfortunately I had no idea what was going on throughout the semester due to me not paying attention, but once you study, you'll realise that the course is quite interesting and not that difficult to understand.

Lecturers: 7/10 - Both a quite good. All lecture notes are thorough.

Interest: 8/10 - I quite enjoyed it and I wish I did pay attention throughout semester. You'll learn about polymerisation (free radical and "living"), different catalysts and their properties (metallocenes, zeigler-natta, etc), different catalytic cycles (decarbonylation, hydrogenation, hydroformylation, etc) and zeolites.

Overall: 8/10 - I definitely recommend it.

CHEM3911: Organic Structure and Reactivity
Ease: 10/10 for content 4/10 for exam <- everyone does well... so if you make a silly mistake, you are gone...
Lecturer: 10/10 - mal's just gold... i wanna be just like him *sighs dreamily
interest: 10/10 - organic person... what can you say =p
overall: 9.9/10

CHEM3913: Catalysis and Sustainable Process
Ease: 3/10 - rather hard... polymer + sustainable part
Lecturer: 10/10 - bob gilbert + tony master are LEGENDS!!
Interest: 8/10 - quite interesting... though none the less hard
Overall: 9/10

CHEM3914: Metal Complexes
Ease: 8/10 - it's hard, but lecturers are super... trevor is legend of legend... AND I am in his honour group this year!!! YAY!!!
Lecturer: 10/10
interest: 10/10 - interesting stuff... esp heavy metal poisoning etc... metal complex is interesting too...
tho james beattie's kinetics is hell'ish (not the lecturer... the difficulty)
Overall: 9/10

CHEM 3915: Medicinal Chemistry
Ease: 8/10 - not too hard... lots to remember though
Lecturer: 8/10 - peter rutledge is a nice lecturer... if you can stand his ireland 5 min each lecture
Interest: 10/10 - can't argue with organic =D
Overall: 9/10
CHNS - Chinese

CHNS1101: Chinese 1A

Ease: 5/10 - Had a reasonable amount of difficulty with this subject as memorising the characters/words for the weekly vocab tests (2.5%) each is a big pain. Homework is due every week (lab work and written homework), and this is strictly enforced, no homework on day its due (or if your lucky, the next day) = no marks. The HW marks saved me(at least I think they will). HW is not too hard, just takes ages. There are 2 large (20%) tests in the semester, testing writing/listening etc, I found them hard, but others didn't. Mainly memorising again. I aced the speaking part of the course and found it easy, but others didn’t fare so well. This subject had an overwhelming amount of work and we did 1 chapter a week 😪(way too fast)

Lecturer: 5/10 - Dr Kong is a good lecturer, interesting and always helps you out, however I didn’t listen to most lectures as the class test is at the end of the lecture, so i usually revised during the lecture, thus missing it. Lectures get 5/10 as they are structured poorly i.e. tests at the end, which makes you miss the lecture out as most people are compelled to do some last minute study

Interest: 8/10 - Fairly interesting, depends on the individual. Classes were quite fun, my tutor was awesome (but she isn’t returning next sem 😄). You always get picked on to answer questions so it makes you study.

Overall: 7/10 - Would have been higher if there was less work. Overall quite fun, but a lot of work, but its very rewarding when you can understand other mandarin speakers (to some extent).

CLAW – Commercial Law

CLAW1001: Commercial Transactions A
Lecturer: Giuseppe Carabetta

Ease: 7.5/10 - it is quite difficult learning to think from a very different perspective. However, it is also very rewarding. The final exam was way too long and I didn't get to finish it, thus putting me out of HD range. There is also a lot of reading to do, but the readings are very interesting.

Lecturer: 9.5/10 - Giuseppe is amazing. His delivery of course content is always fascinating and interesting. People are actively engaged during lectures, as he asks lots of questions. He's also a very funny and charismatic guy, although he does like to show off quite a bit (but then again, if I achieve as much as him, I would flaunt my achievements, too). Most people come to lectures, even if the times are inconvenient for them (i.e. their only class for the day).

Interest: 9/10 - some course content was a bit boring, but that was the very small minority. Overall, the course was amazingly interesting. I really, truly loved it. Also, you can apply everything you learn to the real world: something which can't be said about most other subjects.

Overall: 9.5/10 - a great subject which I would recommend anyone to take. It is relevant, interesting and very rewarding in the end. All in all, I would describe it as 'fun'.
CLAW1001: Commercial Transactions A

Ease: 7/10 - The research assessments are really good, with plenty of time and topics that have plenty to research. Some ppl (like me mates) found the amount of topics to understand were too many, especially when we only spent one lecture per topic. There's not much reading...but if you wanna do well read up on extra material as much as you can. The exam is long answer/essay type questions...That, in my opinion is much harder than the written assessment/tutorial work.

Lecturers: 9/10 - Giuseppe is awesome! But does go really fast through the material. Lectures are never boring. But the only thing that is totally crap is the lecture notes....WAY to brief...it's like one word per slide...shhheeesh!

Interest: 9/10 - It's only interesting when u read up on the latest developments and attend G's lectures.

Overall: 9/10 - Thought it was relatively easy and interesting. But note...some of the tutors are crap as!

CLAW1001: Commercial Transactions A
Ease - 7.5/10
Lecturer - 10/10
Interest - 10/10
Overall - 9.25/10

CLAW1001: Commercial Transactions A
Ease - 7/10
Lecturers - 10/10
Interest - 9/10
Overall - 8.5/10

CLAW1001: Commercial Transactions A
Ease - 8/10
Lecturers - 9/10
Interest - 8/10
Overall - 8.5/10 (Easy enough just don’t talk in lectures)

CLAW1001: Commercial Transactions A
Ease: 9/10 (Straight-forward content; identifying ALL of the issues in some of the problems can be a challenge. Also our major essay question lacked any point that was arguable.)
Lecturer: 10/10. (Guiseppe is also one of the best. I hear behind the scenes though he can be quite ruthless in his administration of the course)
Interest: 10/10. (Love the stuff. Cant get enough)
Overall: 9.5/10

CLAW1001: Commercial Transactions A
Lecturer - N/A
Ease - 8.5/10
Interest: 7/10
Overall: 7/10 - didnt go to any lectures, pretty fucking easy, pretty interesting

CLAW1001: Commercial Transactions A
Ease: 8/10 The topics weren't too difficult and were taught well
Lecturer: 9/10 Giuseppe is a champ
Interest: 6/10 The law isn't my cup of tea
Overall: 6/10
CLAW1002: Commercial Transactions B
Ease: 8/10
Interest: 9/10
Lecturer: 8/10
Overall: 8/10 – This subject deals primarily with property law. It has obvious practical real world relevance. A nice, solid subject that I would recommend to all.

CLAW 2201: Corporations Law
Ease: 8/10. Just covering the Corporations Act and important sections. Mostly statutory law, not much case law (different to CLAW1001).

Lecturer: 7/10. Lecturer makes a huge effort to be interesting but structure and time management is godamnawful. Spend 45 mins explaining the definition of one piddly little thing and rushes through 60 slides in the remaining 10 minutes. Textbook sucks too. Ask around for good recs on textbooks. Lipton and Herzeberg text is stupid. Actually, just read the legislation.


Overall: 8/10. Good subject though most people wouldn’t care cos they would be doing it for CA/CPA req anyway.

CLAW2205: Trade Practices and Consumer Law
Lecturer: Patty Kamvounias
Topics: Restrictive Trade Practices (Anti-competitive agreements, misuse of market power, exclusive dealing, resale price maintenance, mergers and acquisitions,) Consumer Protection (Product Liability, Misleading and deceptive conduct, False Representations, Unconscionable conduct.)

Assessment: Multiple choice exam (15%), Participation (10%), Essay (25%), Speech (10%), Group Essay (40%)
Ease: 8.5/10. - Its a clearly structured, straight forward subject. If you can handle the earlier claw subjects, this one shouldn’t be too difficult. The workload is manageable.

Lecturer: 9/10 - Great lecturer. No complaints from me. It probably helped that she also took all the tutorials and was thus able to get to know everybody.

Interest: 9/10 - Like many claw subjects, its relevance to everyday real life situations is immediately apparent. I was able to stay quite interested throughout.

Overall: 9/10 - Probably the best claw subject I’ve done so far

CLAW2207: Legal Ethics and the Professions
Ease: 10/10 - RIDICULOUSLY easy if you can tell wrong from right/black from white/up from down…you get my drift. Tutorial answers can be written in about 15 minutes flat and get 4/5 or 5/5. Essay is a little long (3000 wds) but is marked really easy. 90% of the class gets Distinctions and 90% of students would be sitting on 50/60 and above by the time final exams roll around. Final exam is open book and piss easy as well.
Lecturer: 3/10 - So boring. Bring a pillow to class. If you have notes from a friend, no need to attend. She is also the tutor and you can get 5/5 for tute participation by attending a few tutes just for the sake of it and never turn up again.

Interest: 6/10 Not as bad as I thought it would be. It’s about how ethics in the professions of lawyer/accountant/auditor/banker/business person blah blah. And a little re-hash of ethics from Accounting 1B.

Overall: 7/10 Good filler subject for CLAW major or people looking for easy electives to finish off their degree in the E+B Faculty.

**CLAW3201: Australian Taxation System**
Ease: 4/10 - Friggen hardest claw subject ever
Lecturer: 1. G-Dogg 6/10 Love the guy, so misogynistic; 2. Cynthia 4/10 Not a big fan
Interest: 6/10 - Quite interesting can be dry
Overall: 6/10 - The tutor in this ruined my whole sexperience, still I like CLAW subjects

**CLAW3202: Tax Strategies in a Business Environment**
Ease: 9/10 One group assignment, tutorial marks for hand ins (you get to choose) and a 40% open book final which resulted in me copying down answers word for word i had already done for 2 hours. Some had passed before the final.
Lecturers 7.5/10 - antony is ok, not engaqqing enough but hes reasonable.
Interest: 8.5/10 - Somewhat interesting tax law stuff
Overall: 8/10 - Recommend if you did tax law 1 and are looking for a cruisy 3rd yr subject.

**COSC - Computational science**

**COSC1002/1902 - Computational Science in C / (Advanced)**
Most students are computing ones, but there will also be some physics and maths students too.

Lecturer - 8/10: Last years lecturer was Mike Wheatland. He isn't the best lecturer (although he's not bad), but his notes are awesome and well prepared. Probably the best ive seen. PM me if you want the complete 2005 notes.
Ease - 8/10: This subject probably favours people who are strong in maths more than computing. You'll have to learn C, but its just basic stuff like control flow. Pracs are pretty easy, most can be finished within the hour (of a 2 hour prac). Would give it 9, but the first prac assessment pretty much owned most people. He subsequently made the 2nd one easy, so maybe he'll continue to make them easy. Most of the final exam seems to be taken from previous year exams.
Interest - 7/10: Found the computing part boring (things about precision, errors), but the maths was pretty good. Continually solving DÉs gets repetitive after a while.
Overall - 8/10: If you're good at maths a decent at programming i'd recommend it as a subject where HD is easily attainable.
COMP - Computer Science

COMP3520: Operating Systems Internals

Ease: 8/10 - Pretty easy course, the assignments are just extending the skills learnt in COMP2129 (making a simple shell and threads and synchronization, so it does incorporate bits of INFO2120 in it too, i suppose). All the rest is boring rote learning. I probably could've done a bit better on the rote learning part.

Lecturer: 2/10 Bing Bing Choi
DO NOT WANT. One of the worst lecturers i've ever had. I couldn't understand what he was saying most of the time and all he did was read off the lecture slides found on the textbook's website (the EXACT same slides too). To be fair though he marked our stuff (asides from the final exam) fairly quickly. Textbook is pretty handy for the rote learning stuff. No tutors and tutorials were optional. No-one turned up after the first week to tutes, and the lectures shrank from about 45ish to less than 5-10 within a couple of weeks.

Interest: 5/10 - The assignments were interesting (2 of them, programming in C), but that's about as far as interesting goes for this course.

Overall: 6/10 - If you were mildly interested in COMP2129 and the serializable stuff in INFO2120 then this course will probably appeal to you. I guess it's a plus since you don't have to turn up to any contact hours if Bing Bing's running it next year (unless he finds tutors or something). I guess good filler credit points towards a computer science or IT major?

ECMT - Econometrics

ECMT1010: Business and Economic Statistics A
Ease: 3/10 (but I didn't do maths in year 11/12)
Lecturer: Tig - 7.5/10; Murray Smith - 0.5/10
Interest: 2/10
Overall: 2/10

ECMT1010: Business and Economic Statistics A
Ease: 8/10
Lecturer - 7/10 (only had Tig)
Interest: 5.5/10 (not that bad really, once you get over the whole 'statistics is boring and useless' thing)
Overall: 6/10

ECMT1010: Business and Economic Statistics A
Ease: 7/10
Lecturers - 8/10 (tig) (-)4/10 (murray)
Interest: 7/10
Overall 7.5/10
ECMT1010: Business and Economic Statistics A
Ease - 8/10
Lecturers - 9/10 (Tig) : 3/10 (Murray). Murray was awful, Tig was awesome. 😊
Interest - 8/10 (Interested me more than other commerce units anyway)
Overall - 8/10

ECMT1010: Business and Economic Statistics A
Ease - 7/10
Lecturers - 9/10 (Tig); 0/10 (Murray Smith)
Interest - 7/10
Overall 7.5/10 (For 4/5 weeks Murray Smith will make ur life hell)

ECMT1010: Business and Economic Statistics A
Ease: 6/10 - It's hard, but if you just sit down and focus you can get it. You have to put effort in.
Lecturer: 4/10 - You CANNOT learn anything from Murray. Tig was cool- he explained things a little better, but for me textbook+lecture slides+workshop questions was how I understood the content.
Interest: 6/10 - I don't know how you can be interested in statistics. It's just something you do, like maths.
Overall: 8/10 - I only like it because I get it.

ECMT1010: Business and Economic Statistics A
Ease: 6/10 - Theres a reason why so many people fail
Lecturer: 5/10 - Tig was nice, Murray's a tightarse and he speaks in a monotone, though i managed to learn shit during his lectures
Interest: 6/10 - I hear 1020 is more interesting...
Overall: 5/10 - Most boring course this semester by far

ECMT1010: Business and Economic Statistics A
Ease: 6
Lecturer: 0.5
Interest: 3
Overall: 3

-----

ECMT1020: Business and Economic Statistics B
Ease: 9/10 easy stuff... though had no idea how come i got only a D...
Lecturer: 10/10 GOODHEW is a LEGEND!!!! tutor ain't the best, but hey! can't wish for all good things eh?!
Interest: 9/10 will probably do a ecmt + finc major
Overall: 9/10

ECMT1020: Business and Economic Statistics B
Ease: 7/10 - It's about the same difficulty as ecmt1010. You learn multiple regression, and use more distributions (like chi squared, t, f,... you barely use z-stat and normal). There are random topics that seem completely useless, like learning how to work with matrices. There are stupid quizzes worth only 5%, a relatively easy mid- semester test, and an assignment involving regression, with heaaaps of data. The exam is just a repeat of previous exams’ questions. It is exactly the same- do them, and you will be completely prepared.
Lecturers: 8/10 - John Goodhew is very friendly and polite - even to the people that are constantly rude to him in lectures with their talking. He goes very very fast though sometimes through the content. Though he provides handouts, we were always writing fast to get everything down without being able to listen properly to his explanation.

Interest: 7/10

Overall: 8/10

**ECMT1020: Business and Economic Statistics B**
Ease - 7.5/10
Lecturers - 8/10
Interest - 7/10
Overall - 8/10

**ECMT2110: Regression Modelling**
Lecturer: Diane Dancer

*Ease:* 9/10 - Though the final exam has allot of content and you need to be totally prepared for that. Make sure you never forget how to derive the ordinary least squares estimator. There is also an assignment towards the end of the semester, though Diane Dancer has retired and is no longer taking the course - so I don't know how it will change in the future.

*Lecturer:* 7/10

*Interest:* 8/10 - Good overall knowledge of linear regression analysis. The text book by Gujarati is dense, and you end up reading half of it. But it is interesting.

*Overall:* 8/10 - You have to take it to complete your econometrics major, or if you intend on doing honours in economics.

**ECMT2110: Regression modelling**
Ease- 6/10. This subject isn't hard when you understand what's going on. But when you don't its really hard to understand. Its pretty much 1020 but strike it up 40% harder with more content. But no time series crap thank god.
Lecturer - Andrey Vasnev 1/10. He makes good quotes but apart from that you don't learn much at all.
Interest: 0.5/10. After doing this course i realised i really have no interest or passion for statistics. As much as it is useful it is boring and dry.
Overall 5/10. Don't do this subject unless you like statistics. At least the marks were higher than expected

**ECMT2120: Analysis of Discrete Choice Data**
Lecturer: Hajime Katayama

*Ease:* 8/10. - The hardest thing you need to do is learn how to derive Maximum Likelihood Estimators, but that's not even hard. The rest is interpretation and prediction. Midsem exam, tutorial solutions to hand in each second week. The program that was used is LIMDEP, though SHAZAM has been used in the past.

*Lecturer:* 9/10 - No text book required, the lecturer goes through his excellent lecture notes each week and that's all you need to know.
Interest: 8/10 - If you're interested in discrete choice data - where the dependent variable is binary, a probability, multiple choice, a positive integer i.e. not continuous without any limits. Models to suit that - like tobit, logit, probit, count data.

Overall: 8/10 - Final exam was pretty good, compared to past papers. If you learn tutorial questions and what the lecturer tells you to learn for the exam, then you'll at least pass.

ECMT2620: Management Science  
Lecturer: Daniel Oron

Ease: 10/10 - Maybe because I was familiar with linear programming and lagrange equations, but all you need to do is identify decision variables. Then the objective function. Then constraints- for all kinds of problems, networking, transportation. And you put it in excel solver and it produces a result for you. The most tricky thing is binary variables.

Lecturer: 8/10 - He went through the text book, and answered questions clearly in class. Tutor is good too.

Interest: 8/10 - Very simple problems, though I imagine it would get complicated in the third- year unit. It is interesting to consider those kind of problems, not unbearable.

Overall: 9/10 - Take it as I was also advised for easy ecmt.

ECMT2630: Managerial Decision Making

Ease: 9/10 - I think the easiest second year subject in ECMT, though 2110 was easy as well. If you have done a few stats or ecmt subjects along with a finc you won't find any surprises in the course. All the assignments and exams are relatively straight forward and easy. It's one of those study the night before walk out with a good mark type subjects.

Lecturer: 9/10 - Daniel Oron is a good lecturer, really fair. I love his Jewish accent he only loses are mark cause he kept saying eeerrrrrrrrrrrrrr all the time 😛. The tutor who was Prasad this sem is a gun though I did know the guy before hand.

Interest: 6.5/10 - I had done quite a few things before in the course, so it did get boring at times. Plus I only took the course since they canceled the third yr financial metrics I wanted to take.

Overall: 8/10 - Pretty good bludgey subject, though this subject is my worst ECMT mark though i cbf to do one question in the exam which I am sure if i was bothered to think about I could have easily solved.

ECMT3110: Econometric Models and Methods

Ease: 8/10 - The only thing in the course that i had to re-read a couple of times was large sample theory but our lecturer Vasilis had warned us that it was the hardest topic. All the other topics are straight forward. If you do the work for the course and attend your tutorials the final exam will not have any surprises in it. Literally about half the questions were exactly the same as the tutorial questions. The mid-semester was straight forward as well though many people stuffed up the last question probably 'cause they didn't revise their log and differentiation rules or got put off by the summation signs.
Lecturer: 10/10 - Vasilis is a gun and you have got to love that Greek accent. The other half of the Greek invasion, Anastasios is an awesome tutor, definitely clarifies things that were left a bit iffy in lectures.

Interest: 10/10 - Really enjoyed this Econometrics subject, different to the ones i had done previously probably cause it was more theoretical.

Overall: 9.5/10 - Whilst people say it is the hardest metrics subject definitely the most rewarding.

ECOF - Economics and Business Faculty (General)

ECOF1001: Communication & Critical Analysis
Ease: 7/10
Lecturers: 7/10 - she is a bit confusing, but really nice
Interest: 8/10
Overall: 8/10

ECOF3001: Business Strategy
Ease: (8/10) - essays given for final. pretty easy same old stuff from previous years - resistance to change etc
Interest: (2.5/10) - like work and govt subjects = BORING
Lecturer: (6/10) stephen is a wanker the other guy is ok.
Overall: (5/10) - assignments are marked too hard. many people just passed the 1st assignment and the 2nd assignment wasnt even marked before final

ECOF3001: Business Strategy
The final project was so much fun! When I did it it didn't feel like I was just doing an "assignment". I think I got either the highest or second highest mark for the assignment. If you're not a student who studies by just MEMORISING everything without actively thinking/considering real life stuff. then this subject may be hard for u, and you might think "oh but I put so much effort!" when you get ur results back.

ECON/ECOS - Economics

ECON1001: Introductory Microeconomics
Lecturer: Natalia Ponomareva
Ease: 8/10 - straight forward stuff. If you haven’t done maths at all, some of the content may baffle you at first though.
Lecturer: 5/10. - I don’t go to lectures anymore. She’s not that bad I guess, but Mirco can be a pretty dull subject and the lecturer can make it more interesting; something Natalia fails to do.
Interest: 6/10 - Most of it is quite simple to me, so I quickly lost interest.
Overall: 7/10
ECON1001: Introductory Microeconomics
Ease - 7/10 (depends on lecturer)
Lecturer - 8/10 (Dennis is great, but he's gone... De Roos is a douche bag. Tutors are shit))
Interest - 5/10 (fairly boring, only lifted by lecturer)
Overall - 6.5/10

ECON1001: Introductory Microeconomics
Ease - 9/10
Lecturers - 9/10 (I liked Nicholas De Roos, very organised lecture notes and well structured lectures. Not a particularly sociable lecturer, but I liked his lectures.)
Interest - 8/10
Overall - 8/10

ECON1001: Introductory Microeconomics
Ease - 6/10
Lecturer - 2/10
Interest - 5/10
Overall - 5/10 (Nick De Roos should be shot for his crimes against excitement)

ECON1001: Introductory Microeconomics
Ease: 8/10 The concepts were easy enough to grasp
Lecturer: 6/10 I had Natalia, if you could work with the accent it was alright
Interest: 9/10 I like economics
Overall: 8/10

ECON1001: Introductory Microeconomics
Ease: 8/10 - Like ecmt, you need to focus, and then you can understand easy.
Lecturer: 6/10 - Like ecmt, individual learning+tutorials was best. I had Natalia Ponomareva-apparently Andrew Wait is good?
Interest: 8/10
Overall: 8/10

ECON1001: Introductory Microeconomics
Ease - 2/10 - THIS SUBJECT WAS HARD DAMMIT. I never had done eco before and so everything i was learning was from scratch and WE COVERED SO MUCH MATERIAL i couldn't handle it. i failed this as well.
Lecturer - 0/10 - I might get charged for slander but andrew wait has got to be the WORST LECTURER IMAGINABLE!!!!!!! Asshole of a personality, Crap lecture slides, and terrible public speaking voice!
Interest - 0/10
Overall - 0.7/10

ECON1001: Introductory Microeconomics
Ease: 6.5
Lecturer: 5.5
Interest: 5
Overall: 6

ECON1001: Introductory Microeconomics
Ease: 8/10 - Its not a very hard subject. Its just solving equations and drawing graphs. Simple ones too. When i did it it was 2 mid sems and a final where the finals is mainly the last few topics.
Lecture: 8.5/10 Jordi was a good lecturer.
Interest- 9/10 no where near as interesting as intermediate micro but there wasnt a topic which wasnt interesting
Overall 8.5/10 I really enjoyed this subject. You can get through with just the lecture notes really.

----

**ECON1002: Introductory Macroeconomics**

*Ease: 8/10* - It's not very difficult. You need to be able to understand and apply models, and refer to them in the use of macroeconomic policy... cause of issue, ways to correct it. There are two in-class tests each 4-weeks of the semester that examine immediately relevant content. The final exam focuses most on everything that hasn't been tested in the in-class tests, which was really good. Alot of the difficult concepts from the opening weeks did not appear in the final exam, at all.

*Lecturer: 9/10* - I had Matthew Smith. He's really good. He's quite intelligent and explains things very well, beyond the provided lecture slides.

*Interest: 8/10*

*Overall: 9/10* - The only stupid thing about this subject was that the recommended core text, that was purchased by almost everyone, was close to useless. I used the course reader more often, and had to access other books. The lecturer actually advised us for one topic NOT to refer to the text book. The tutors for the subject are okay, and the assessment structure has an actual focus on tutorials themselves (individual and group presentations, participation and attendance mark) unlike econ1001.

---

**ECON1002: Introductory Macroeconomics**

Ease - 5/10 (geez those essays are awful)
Lecturer - 7/10 (tutors are shittier than 1001)
Interest - 7/10 (more interesting than 1001)
Overall - 6.7/10

**ECON1002: Introductory Macroeconomics**

Ease - 7/10
Lecturers - 9/10 (Catherine is really good - her exams are more comprehensible as well - try to get into her stream. All the tutors are bad.)
Interest - 8/10
Overall - 8/10

**ECON1002: Introductory Macroeconomics**

Ease - 7/10
Lecturer - 7/10
Interest - 7/10
Overall - 7/10 (Why is every Economics tutor, Indian?)

**ECON1002: Introductory Macroeconomics**

Ease - 5/10 - still a bitch of a subject, but easier and more 'grasp-able' than micro.
Lecturer - 5/10 - Sorry Jordi...you probably know your stuff, but you're not crash-hot at explaining it.
Interest - 4/10 - I hate economics and am only doing this to get my ground units for commerce out the way but by god I like this much MUCH more than micro!

**ECON1002: Introductory Macroeconomics**

Ease: 9/10. - They don't make this subject very hard. The tutorial questions are easy marks if you have a good group.,. The mid sem was very short and easily doable if you attend tutorials and lectures.
Interest 7.5/10- I prefer micro over macro but exchange rates were good
Lecturer- 8/10 Anu is a good lecturer. She can explain things well. But she can;\text{t} really control a class i suppose. Michelle is a wonderful tutor!
Overall 8/10 Its not a hard subject, somewhat interesting and the exams are straightforward.

**ECON1002: Introductory Macroeconomics**
Ease: 6/10
Lecturers: 6/10
Interest: 8/10
Overall: 6.5/10

**ECON1002: Introductory Macroeconomics**
Ease: 8
Lecturer: 5
Interest: 8
Overall: 7.5

----

**ECOS2201: Economics of Competition and Strategy**
Ease: 2/10. - No idea what the hell this course was about. Very micro-economics based. Big re-hash of Intermediate microeconomics. Basic assessments (2 mid sems and a final)
Lecturer: 0/10. - Nasty lecturer, totally snide and rude too.
Interest: 3/10 - I would‘ve been more interested if the lecturer wasn’t so awful.
Overall: 2/10. - Very misleading subject from the subject description in the handbook. Thought it would be awesome, turned out awful and difficult to boot! Very maths based, be warned.

**ECOS2201: Economics of Competition and Strategy**
Ease 8/10- Its not a very hard subject to get marks especially if you have Olleski.
The content is easy and straight forward, although some consumer theory was at times a bit confusing.
Lecturer 8/10- Olleski was pretty good. I liked attending is lectures and he made things simple and easy!
Interest 10/10. The content in this subject is so interesting. All the topics were enjoyable to learn. But i really like microeconomics
Overall 9/10- my favourite subject last semester. I would recommend people who like economics to do this subject

**ECOS2901: Intermediate Microeconomics Honours**
Lecturer: Kunal Sengupta

*Ease: 8/10 - It's not very difficult at all, both the lecturer and tutor are fantastic. A midsemester and final exam worth 40% and 60% respectively. Lots of time given for both. Make sure you completely learn tutorial questions. The lecture notes can replace the text book, though I studied both.*

*Lecturer: 10/10 - Couldn't have been better. (10/10 for tutor as well).*

*Interest: 10/10 - So much more interesting than intermediate macroeconomics honours. It's just more straight- forward and clear.*

*Overall: 9/10*
ECOS2902: Intermediate Macroeconomics Honours
Lecturer: Jeffrey Sheen

Ease: 7/10 - It's quite confusing and there's a lot of content put into each week, so you need to make sure not only to keep up but also relate each week's chapter to what you've previously learnt. Otherwise it's confusing and overwhelming. The honours course attempts to cover the whole book (but we only made it up to ch22) whereas the normal intermediate (ecos2002) only goes up to ch14. 3 multiple choice quizzes throughout the semester, tutorial work 'marked' (checked for completeness), and a midsem exam. A lot of marks go towards multiple choice so master it. No tutorial answers are put up at all, so you have to go by what the tutor might/might not have done in the tute.

Lecturer: 7/10 - He goes through the textbook that he wrote with set slides.

Interest: 6/10 - I really don't like macroeconomics, though a lot of people do.

Overall: 7/10.

ECOS2903: Mathematical Economics A

Ease: 6/10 - The content is easy once you get it but the mid-sem exam was very difficult and completely abstract. No calculators were allowed because questions were completely numberless. Most people didn't 'pass' the mid-sem after massive scaling. The final exam went better though because mid-sem questions (which we had limited solutions for) were repeated, and the lecturer made the questions more clear.

Lecturer: 6/10 - Our lecturer was Don Wright. The lectures were mainly rewritten sections of the textbook with the lecturer's reworked examples. So we basically covered all of 'Essential Mathematics for Economic Analysis' except for maybe a chapter and a few sections (thankfully before it got too difficult).

Interest: 5/10 - I was generally not interested in cobb-douglas functions and the like represented in three-dimensional planes. A lot of the mathematics we did was too complex and abstract to actually be interesting, in terms of its relevance to economics. Maybe derived demand functions from solving a lagrange equation (with multiple constraints) was kind of okay once you finally got to a simple answer?

Overall: 6/10 - I feel a lot more capable in mathematics having passed the unit, but it's hard to see its relevance to economics just yet.

ECOS3002: Development Economics

Ease: 8/10 Very basic. No nightmare economics graphs or complex equations. Theory based subject (which suits me) and more than a little left-leaning…

Lecturer: 1/10 If it's Dilip, run for your life. Apparently, lecturers for this subject change a lot but I got stuck with Dilip. Impossible accent to understand (and I have an ACCT major and have had my fair share of accented lecturers!!). Good textbook though and class follows textbook closely so no need to attend really.

Interest: 6/10 Lots to do with poverty/the environment/welfare economics. I found it boring and I'm actually interested in those issues…makes no sense.

Overall: 7/10 Ok I guess. Easy subject to fill up an economics major but I don't see why you would do it otherwise.
**ECOS3003: Hierarchies, Incentives and Firm Structure**  
Lecturer: Dr. Andrew Wait

*Ease: 9/10 - Very easy. You just need to learn the theory in the textbook and the algebra in lectures. Assessment questions are easy multiple choice mostly based on textbook facts and short answer. No essays. It's all about the theory of the firm, incentive compensation, and decentralisation of decisions. You don't need to do the set readings if you follow the lectures properly because everything you need to know is covered there.*

*Lecturer: 8/10 - Lecturer was okay, he went through all the algebra really well

*Interest: 8/10 - Pretty interesting, if you prefer microeconomics to macro. If you like interest rates and the budget, do monetary policy in semester one or international trade or something else, because there's none of that here.*

*Overall: 8/10 - Pretty good, but if I had put more effort in it would have been better. Only two mid-semester exams in week 5 and week 10 that go for an hour, and a straight-forward exam that focuses on material mostly after week 10.*

**ECOS 3006: International Trade**  
Lecturer: 9/10. If it’s still Mark Melatos, it’s still good  
Interest: 5/10. Boring because whenever anything interesting is covered, the numbers/graphs get in the way of learning the good stuff. But depends on the individual.  
Overall: 6/10. There are easier ecos electives around to take.

**ECOS 3011 Public Finance**  
Ease: 4/10 NOT a cakewalk. One of the harder economics electives I’ve done. Lots of complex graphs with about 8-10 squiggly lines running in all directions (in all colours!) and you have to understand what happens each time one moves - ____- Assessments are also quite harshly marked and I see no evidence of scaling happening in this subject.

Lecturer: 9/10 Stephen Cheung. Pretty good. Not a drone, actually makes an effort to teach. EXCELLENT lecture notes, very organised content, good coverage, fair assessments and good pace. No tutorials though.

Interest: 7/10 Very interesting if you’re into public/govt/fiscal economics

Overall: 7/10 Good subject for the keen but takes a fair amount of effort to get a good mark.
ECOP – Political Economy

ECOP1001: Economics as a Social Science

Ease: 7/10 - The content is simple enough to understand, it's just actually knowing how to answer broad ecop1001 tutorial/assessment questions properly that is difficult.

Lecturer: 8/10 - Frank Stilwell is a nice person that cares about students and the academic standards of the discipline and faculty. He's the most helpful and friendly staff member I've known so far at the university. He used to lecture in microeconomics, then together with some other people founded the political economy discipline at usyd. His lectures though are extremely similar to the actual text (that he authored) - I remember him even using the exact same examples/jokes from his book in lectures. So you really can replace lectures with the text. I found that the only thing extra in lectures were fun cartoons he put up on the overhead.

Interest: 6/10 - I was interested in the beginning, but by the end it just seemed so pointless. Why learn about Marxist solutions to economic problems when the entire world operates within a variation of the neo-classical model? Do the policy rectifications hence not come from that?

Overall: 5/10 - The whole subject is a general overview of the oh-so complex conflicting forms of economic thought. Political economy isn't that extraordinary. There is no direction in the unit other than a limited examination of classical political economy, marxism, keynesianism etc in a chronological sequence. It was very difficult for me to understand exactly what we were meant to analyse in assignments/ the exam. It is based in theory, but tutorials/lectures encourage a personal individual relation to such concepts rather than collective economic. Examining the Marxist labour theory of value, neo-classical quantity theory of money etc seemed pointless to me without any clear relation to policy. But I assume it will become more focused in further ecop units (which i will not be taking).

ECOP1001: Economics as a Social Science

Ease: 8/10, Lecturer: 10/10, Interest: 7/10, Overall: 9/10

Frank Stilwell is possibly one of the best lecturers you will have. Very funny guy, and presents material in a way which is engaging and interesting. Be weary of course, of the bias of any university lecturer. Frank, for all his legendariness, is no exception. As an Economic Advisor to the Australian Greens, be prepared for a strong politically leftwards bias in this course.

As for subject matter – ECOP 1001 provides a good, solid overview of different strands of economic thought, including classical Political Economy, Marxian Political Economy, Institutional Political Economy, Keynesian Political Economy, Neo-Classical Economic thought (often referred to as orthodox economics) as well as discussion about alternative Political Economy such as feminist and green.

Many students enrolled in the Bachelor of Economic and Social Sciences will take this course, and it provides a broad overview of the discipline in general. No requirement is needed in terms of math, or previous experience with Economics as HSC level. Those who have taken Economics in the HSC may be placed at both an advantage and disadvantage. The advantages include that you will be familiar with terminology that arises from the course and your grasp of the Neo-Classical section will be excellent. The disadvantage is that the patterns of thinking are very different and a strict adherence to what has been taught at HSC level will possibly result in less than desirable results, if only because of the aforementioned left leaning of the course (and indeed, the entire department)
**ECOP1001: Economics as a Social Science**

Ease: 8/10
Lecturer: 100/10 (Frank deserves the highest praise imaginable)
Interest: 9/10
Overall: 10/10 - They say that the ecop faculty has had to fight for survival. It shouldn't have to, because the introductory subject, ecop1001 was aMAZing. Hopefully the move to the arts faculty will secure it's place, 600+ students were enrolled this year.

The course is engaging, you look across the history of economic thought, most significantly classical political economy, marxism, neoclassical economics, institutional, keynesian and modern political economy.

The subject matter allows so interesting discussion in tutes, which are normally fairly relevant to what's going on in the lecture, each tute also has a representative who looks after you at faculty meetings- there was a very caring, sharing feel in the course and the tutors and Frank really looked after you.

Lastly, Frank. Frank Stillwell is without a doubt the BEST lecturer I have encountered so far at Sydney. He's witty, intelligent, imaginative, engaging...I can't explain how great he is.

YOU MUST DO THIS COURSE. I can't recommend it enough. 5 stars.

---

**ECOP1001: Economics as a Social Science**

Ease: 7/10
Lecturer: 10/10
Interest: 9/10
Overall: 10/10 (can't recommend this enough, i'm sure everyone will agree)

---

**ECOP1001: Economics as a Social Science**

Ease - 7/10
Lecturer - 10/10
Interest - 9/10
Overall - 9/10

---

**ECOP1001: Economics as a Social Science**

Ease - 10/10
Lecturer - 10/10
Interest - 9/10
Overall - 9/10

---

**ECOP1001: Economics as a Social Science**

Ease: 7.5/10 (There is quite a lot of content here too. Its presented very well, but for people like me who did economics at high school it can be hard to adjust your brain into a Marxist/Institutionalist/Classical economic analysis)
Lecturer: 10++/10 (Frank is the best lecturer ever.)
Interest: 9/10 (A great course for getting into arguments with your liberal voting buddies. Reading the neoclassical theory sections is a drag though)
Overall: 9/10 Great course. Everyone should do it.

---

**ECOP1001: Economics as a Social Science**

Ease: 8/10 (After having done HSC economics, and having Keynesian/neo-classical theory hammered into you as absolute fact, it is interesting having it all challenged with alternative views.)
Lecturer: 10/10. (Stillwell is one of the best.)
Interest: 8/10. (Interesting content, certainly gives a great overview of economic thought. I found some of the discussion in tutes to be quite left-wing though...)
Overall: 8.5/10. (Definitely something you should do if you get the chance)
ECOP 1002: Economy and Policy.

Ease: 5/10
Lecturer: 3/10
Interest: 3/10
Overall: 4/10

Gabrielle Meagher (who was the acting Chair of Department) wins my award for driest, most boring first year lecturer. In contrast to Frank, there is such a difference between their lecture styles. Most annoyingly, I found that Dr. Meagher treated us like 4 year olds, insisting upon absolute silence, attention etc. in her lectures. I mean, okay, most students will accord you that manners anyway, but she was tough on enforcement and, more annoyingly, difficult to listen to.

Again, Dr. Meagher’s bias lies with feminist political economy (her area of speciality) in particular, how oppressed and down-trodden women in Australia are (yes, hear the sarcasm dripping from my voice) Watch out for this in her lectures.

Speaking of lectures, each week was like a lets-see-if-I-can-beat-last-weeks-record-for-the-number-of-transparencies-I-can-put-up. It was, ridiculous. Tables and charts flowed freely, but unlike wine, there was not much fun had by all. If the situation can get more ridiculous, the statistics used in these lectures are mostly from around 1993, which is pathetic at tertiary level. When you consider HSC Economics textbooks are updated 4 times a year, you would expect that a research Professor such as Dr. Meagher could at least make new slides for the new millennium. Apparently this isn’t the case.

The course was difficult only because turning up to and staying away in lectures was difficult. For someone like moi, who is lazy and doesn’t do readings, the reader brick we had to purchase made a nice paperweight for all the help it was.

The redeeming factor for this course was my excellent tutor, Anna Samson, who at least tried to apply relevance to the material we were learning in lectures to current political and economic events.

ECOP1002: Economy and Policy

Ease: 5/10 - The actual content isn't difficult to understand, but the course is so dry that it is difficult to concentrate on the lectures - and I don't think _anybody_ could put themselves through using the reading bricks. The assessment tasks were fairly standard

Lecturer: 5/10 - I actually didn't find Gabrielle to be the nazi-feminist everybody thinks she is...I quite liked _her_, but her lectures are very dull. Half the time she is just explaining graphs and tables. Too much description and not enough analysis.

Interest: 3/10 - I really loved ECOP1001 - which is an introduction to the economic theories, but ECOP1002 is more of a practical 'What is actually happening in the Australian economy' course. Very difficult to be interested in this subject - and I really didn't learn anything this semester that I didn't already know from studying HSC Eco or ECOP1001.

Overall: 4/10 - v. disappointing 😞
ECOP1002: Economy and Policy  
Lecturer: Damien Cahill  

Ease: 8/10 - I found most of the course pretty easy, despite not having done ECOP1001. Assessments were good, a mini-essay, an essay, tute participation and a 90 minute exam. The exam was good, just had to pick 2 essays from a list of 7, and we got the essay topics in the last lecture. 

Lecturer: 8/10 - I thought Damien was really good, he explains everything very well, and gives good lecture notes. Not the most engaging lecturer, but still very good. Also had two guest lecturers, one of which was pretty good (Evan), and one was great (Dick). 

Interest: 9/10 - I found almost all topics interesting, and the assessment structure basically means you can ignore the ones you don't like. Tute discussions were very interesting. 

Overall: 9/10 - I really enjoyed it, highly recommended.

ECOP1002: Economy and Policy  

Ease: 7/10 - I beg to differ with previous posts - though somewhat mundane, all we really had to do was analyse statistics and data in light of its socio-economic context, then arrive at the oh so shocking conclusion about the interconnectedness of the state, market and family. By simply taking a typically leftist, critical stance, it was hard to go wrong, and easier to bullshit in tutes (for me anyway). Results pending, points are nonetheless lost because of the incredibly demanding exam - too much to write in so little time and space, and the topics tested in '06 bucked the trend for once and threw everyone off. Personal exam performance could change my opinion. 

Lecturer: 6.5/10  
Gabrielle Meagher - condescending, demanding and hoarse-voiced, but means well and knows her stuff. Her asides may not compare to Frank Stilwell's, but she tries. And yes, some stats are surprisingly outdated, but she explains why (this doesn't necessarily suffice though for some). A coffee will do wonders for one's attention span. 

Interest: 6/10 - ECOP1002 is hardcore, gritty, real-life economics - but doesn't really live up to the excitement of this character description. In practice, this is where the dryness of economics glaringly shines through, and does put off a lot of people. I personally feel a lot more enlightened when it comes to economic issues, but also feel that I've become duller and more boring as a man. 

Overall: 6.5/10 - Nothing spectacular, just a simple course for ECOP kids to go through the motions, but essential for future progress nevertheless.

ECOP1003: International Economy and Finance  

Ease: 9/10 - It's very broad. You can talk about anything that has to do with 'international economy and finance'. There's little analysis of the international situation in political economy terms. There's a stupid tutorial presentation (based on the certain week's readings.. you're not expected to go any further than that in research), a stupid essay with very general questions, and an even stupider exam. 

Lecturers: 6/10 - As much as Bill Dunn seemed a nice person, he came to lectures unprepared and talked about nothing. Really nothing.. he would speak sooo generally. It was painful listening to him trying to make a point. The lecture slides were a few random points that seemed only helpful in guiding him in his talk. I remember a few times students asking him questions, and he'd ask the rest of the class if anyone knew the answer, or the 'specifics' of what he himself was talking about. I still can't believe it. 

Interest: 9/10 - International trade, development objectives.. it's interesting. 

Overall: 6/10 - The readings provided were absolutely irrelevant. Some just detailed historical events, like the development of imperialism or the world trade organisation that didn't really critically analyse.
anything at all. The tutorial questions were also very broad... and it was impossible to answer them with the content of tutorial readings or the lectures. Stuff like 'can the WTO achieve a fair trade regime?' or 'who cares about the exchange rate?' Though my tutor was really good, and brought forward new questions and sort of guided us through discussion. The final exam was absolutely ridiculous. One of the questions was 'Is financial globalisation reversible?'. How the fk could anyone reasonably answer that? If you have room for a spare subject, like i did, before you can start senior units in areas that you want to continue, do not choose this subject. Though the content is interesting and relevant to economics+business etc.. the course structure and teaching is horrible.

**ECOP1003 International Economy and Finance**
Lecturer: Bill Dunn

Ease: 7/10: Personally, I found that this wasn’t the most easiest course, but thats probably because I never did economics in high school, or was ever that economic-literate (if you know what I mean). But after reading over everything I found that most of it was pretty straight forward, well, thats until you get down and dirty into the advanced elements. And the exam would have been hard, if Bill didnt generally outline what to expect in the exam.

Lecturer: 8/10: I liked Bill, he had a passion for what he was teaching, and he was never really boring to listen to.

Interest: 8/10 - Ive never been that economic-literate, so studying this was in my interest just to learn the basic of int economics - and I did. It was really interesting in the end.

Overall: 8/10 - Definitely recommended.

**ECOP2011 - Economic Foundation of Modern Capitalism**
Lecturer - 8.5/10
Ease - 8/10
Interest: 8.5/10
Overall: 8.5/10 - pretty fun, good lectures, good content, fairly bludgy

**ECOP2011: Economic Foundation of Modern Capitalism**

*Ease: 2/10*

Apparently the hardest Political Economy course, and now I've been through this rite of passage, I can see why too. However, they don't pretend that it's an easy course. Readings were thick and often cryptic. The algebra scared everyone. Lecture content is complicated, everything was just so damned confusing, you try and try and then just give up, bloody economic theories.

*Lecturer: 6/10*

Some may see this as a bit conflated, and I was tempted to give a 2 because of the perceived suffering we felt we had to endure. At the same time I feel this is not enough and fear it would do too much discredit to a man who we are actually privileged to be taught by (but we're just too selfish, hedonistic and confused by the course to see this). It's weird, in lectures Joseph Halevi seems to make things sound even more complicated than they really are, but then what he's teaching is complicated enough as it is. However, he writes the most useful 20 page lectures notes week by week (and even more simpified course summaries at the end - not that we didn't have enough reading with such a massive 555 page choad for a reader). And apparently with lectures, he just speaks off the top of his head, totally extemperaneously. Some hate him with a passion, others absolutely love him, but make no mistake, he is quite an enigmatic, peculiarly brillia

Also a noteworthy mention, albeit for all the wrong reasons, was tutor Roni Demirbag. From what I gleam, not the most helpful tutor in the world - ask him for clarification on something, and his stock
standard response, in a rather frustrated tone, is 'it's actually really easy, just do the reading again [you lazy fool (under his breath, I presume)]'. Had him for the first tute, Dr. Halevi substituted for two weeks, and suddenly became our permanent replacement, which was probably a good thing, albeit intimidating (regretably, he had that effect on me).

**Interest: 2/10**
Inherently boring, sometimes demoralising. For most of the course, I just didn't 'get' economic theory. No matter how much I wanted to work on it more, it was just too off-putting (again, it was that 555pg course reader).

**Overall: 5/10**
I've probably written so much because I've felt so strongly about this course. However, when the semester's over, and/or you come to do other senior ECOP units, it's only then that you'll realise the incredible value of what ECOP2011 taught you.... if you manage to understand any of it.

### ECOP2011: Economic Foundation of Modern Capitalism

**Ease: 4/10** (but only if you stick to Marxian Political Economy, if not its more like 1/10)
**Lecturer: 2/10**
**Interest: 3/10**
**Overall: 3/10**

Joseph Halevi is an interesting character. Advance skill and copious quantities of caffeine are required to maintain consciousness in his lectures, as accent, monotone and dry subject matter combined do not make for a very appealing combination. However, the discussion on fairies and dragons was insightful and interesting.

Bias from Joseph lies in his Communist past – and hence, a great love for Marx. The course material is similar to ECOP 1001, except more intensively focused upon the ACTUAL economics rather than the theory. Indeed, the course is focused upon outlining the economic rationale behind each school of though – then systematically deconstructing the paradigm to prove how and why it is incorrect. It seems that the eventual conclusion of the course is again, a variation on the same thing

1) All schools of economic thought are deficient in accurately accounting for the human element in economic function.
2) Attempting to factor in this as such, inevitably leads to a deficient framework by which to analyse the economy effectively
3) Thus, Neo-classical Economics is still the best thing we’ve got, so put up and shut up.

There were copious quantities of algebra in this course as well, of which many of the students did not understand AT ALL. For a discipline which trumpets the fact that no maths skills are required, there was a large amount of algebra. Despite the tutors best efforts to emphasise that the need to understand all the algebra was not necessary, it seemed that making an effort to learn it is what separates the students in this course. This, again, is another reason why to stick to Marxian Political Economy in this course – it minimises the amount of algebra that needs to be learnt.
ECOP2911: Political Economy Honours II (Methods in Class Analysis)

Ease: 8/10
It's all about class theory, but soo relevant to the real world. No final exam, just a seminar + paper, essay, tute participation, and most interestingly, an imaginary piece where you critique/outline your vision of a 'good' society' (no marks lost for totalitarian ones either, seriously, most people had centralised control in societies.

Lecturer: 10/10
Elizabeth Hill is truly one of the greatest, oh-so kind. The 'seminar' style class was basically what a tute should really be, small class numbers, learning through discussion, that sort of thing which doesn't happen enough.

Interest: 9/10
In short, people just come together, sit in a room, and talk about class analysis for an hour and a half, once a week (no lecture). Believe it or not, class theory is a lot more complex than one would expect. A couple found class theory discourse a tad 'wanky', maybe because it was more arts than economics in part, but the course really does encompass all types of political economy, sociology, history and philosophy all in the one course. The perfect antidote to ECOP2011.

Overall: 10/10
I have to give it full marks, truly one of the best and most useful units I've ever done. Also one of the classes where everyone spoke, one of the best tute classes I've had to date in terms of members, kudos to all 10 of them, never a moment too awkward or silent.

ECOP3017: Political Economy of Human Rights

Ease: 7/10
Assessment marking was explicitly strict on extensive use of data/empirical evidence, as the Social Sciences would be, but they were very clear on it here, which is probably a good thing. However, got a shit mark for an essay seemingly because my sentences 'were too long' and made it difficult to follow my arguments, yet the marker was still able to understand my essay enough to comment that my use of 'evidence' to substantiate my arguments was 'one of the better' instances she'd seen (I'm having the essay remarked).

Lecturer: 7/10
Some found Tim Anderson slightly uninspiring as a lecturer. Lots of short film documentaries in class, controversial lecture content, but it all came across as somewhat dull. However, this may have be intentional on Tim's behalf, to appear more balanced and avoid coming across as a ranting, cliched, anti-establishment leftie, which could've easily happened.

Interest: 9/10
Really does open your mind to human rights atrocities, even if you're already 'predisposed' to this sort of thing. Some of the best tute discussions too, even got heated at times, but never any hard feelings (except for this dickhead fascist who wasn't even in our class but would just rock up from time to time, it was as if he hadn't learned anything all semester, I'd like to think he was just a great actor, but, no).

Overall: 8/10
Had high expectations, and they were generally met. Interestingly, it really crossed over well with other units I was doing, particularly GOVT2119.
ECOP3018: Economic Policy

Ease: 6/10
The material seemed straight-forward enough, but the marking criteria standards were a little unclear. There was a group essay worth 30% (unlike in 2007 under Frank), a 2500-3000 final essay (35%), a final exam worth 30%, and only 5% of 'bonus' marks for voluntary post-lecture discussions (in lieu of a tute participation mark). Exam topics were given beforehand, but the marking standards were perhaps more stringent because of this. It was a really small cohort of less than 30.

Lecturer: 6.5/10
Evan Jones (who came out of retirement to cover for Frank Stilwell, who was inundated with work from the doubling of enrollments in ECOP1001). Evan is quite a character, full of vitriol and always explicit about his bias. This got a little tiresome at times, but the man was genuinely concerned for people's intellectual welfare, and took the time to write up comprehensive lecture notes and discussions. To the more conservative, I wouldn't say that he shoved his views down our throats (edit: but if he sensed you may feel this way, he'd announced whenever he was giving his opinion). But he nonetheless encouraged one to be more discerning with theories (both inside and outside the course).

Interest: 7/10
In true ECOP form, lectures and reading material were a mixture of post-war Australian economic history, sociology and politics. Several were a bit of a drone. There were no compulsory tutorials, but rather post-lecture group discussions that often meandered through awkward bouts of silence and confusion, or random, less relevant tangents (for instance, private, religious schools vs public secular education in the week on Privatisation). This was owing to a disconnect from the prescribed readings (which were rarely referred to in discussions), and perhaps a lack of direction from the lecturer himself. These discussions only began midway through the course - the first half was devoted to groupwork, where groups could remain in the lecture room and discuss projects, or "work elsewhere" at their discretion.

Overall 7/10
Had high expectations, but finished the course feeling a little disappointed, and feel like I should probably lower it to 6.5/10. Also, I was doing another ECOP course which covered some more fundamental topics in a lot more depth (and caused the other 'pass' ECOP courses to pale a little, in comparison). I guess it's like sliced white bread, it's 'Economic Policy' after all.
EDUF - Education (Foundations)

EDUF1018: Education, Teachers and Teaching
Lecturer: Lesley Scanlon

Ease: 9/10 - It wasn't a hard subject at all. Lectures and readings provide more than enough information for each topic, and the structure of seminars (speech/tutor summary) summarises each subject in quite a good manner. The only time someone wouldn't find the material easy, I imagine, would be if they had zero interest in the subject matter.

Lecturer: 8/10 - Depends. Lesley Scanlon was a fantastic lecturer who articulated everything in an interesting and concise manner, and Robyn Ewing (curriculum/knowledge) was able to do the same, albeit in a much nicer tone. The men who took the teaching technologies and empathy related classes were quite good too. Other than that though, there really weren't any lecturers to write home about. Quite frankly, other than the ones mentioned the lecturers were really quite shit. Sometimes this was dependant on the subject matter (aboriginal teaching), other times the lecturer was just horrible (hidden curriculum). It's a good thing that Lesley and Robyn took most of the lectures.

Interest: 9.5/10 - I found most of the subject matter quite relevant, thus interesting. The material was far more tailored to suit first year interests and needs than any UNSW course was. In other words, putting education students into the fram of mind of being a teacher is by far more important than just launching them right into it, ala' UNSW. Regardless, the course was aimed at getting students to get into the teachers frame of mind. I feel that this was acheived for the students who would naturally have an interest in the matter. Those who were not interested, might do well to get out of teaching? Then again, maybe I've just been brainwashed by Lesley.

Overall: 9/10 - Course would have got a complete 10/10 if it had have been not so obviously oriented towards the arts students. Maybe just a little on the educational psychology side of things would have made the course a little better...maybe. None the less, a relevant, interesting and quite fun course. Peaks were the seminar discussions and the lectures of Lesley, troughs were the lecturers who took only one lecture and then moved on.

EDUF1018: Education, Teachers and Teaching
Ease - 9/10
Lecturer - 1/10 - I despised the Head Lecturer, and since she took most of the lectures, it was crap. the one who took "Knowledge" was equally crap, and spoke to us like we were 5 years old.
Interest - 3/10 - it made me rethink my degree choice.
Overall - 3/10 - I was definitely considering changing degrees. it was a crap subject and it was really boring

EDUF1018: Education, Teachers & Teaching
Ease - 6/10. I really didn't like this course. The essay was boring and difficult, the exam was really boring and really difficult. You have been warned.
Lecturers - I skipped most of these. Some of ’em were good. The Curriculum lady was incredibly boring, way too much like Umbridge.
Interest - 7/10. Historical stuff was very interesting, curriculum stuff was dull. Some people may disagree. *shrugs*
Overall - 6/10. NOT what I was expecting. Only do this if you need it for teaching.
EDUF1018: Education, Teachers and Teaching
Ease: 7 (apparently 25% failed the major essay)
Lecturer: 4 (Lesley was good, but the subject matter killed me. It was vacuous and at times overly PC. The history of classroom methods wasn't bad.)
Interest: 8 (due solely to tutorial discussions)
Overall: 6 (I'm expecting next semester to be much worse.)

EDUF1018: Education, Teachers and Teaching

Ease: 9/10. - I found quite a bit of the content to be stuff that you could probably figure out on your own from common sense. It was well structured and clear. I kinda wanted to go a little more in depth into some of the topics (now, say what you will against it, but I actually found the child protection unit interesting and I wouldn't have minded if we did more on it. It was a bit of a drag at the time but when I went and read some more I got way into it, I don't know if anyone else did?)

Lecturer/s: 6/10. - Lesley was brilliant. The six marks go to her. The other lecturers were...I hesitate to say shit, but, they kinda were. Especially the lady who did Aboriginal Education, oh god, I wanted to throw my lecture pad at her the whole time. And I actually had an interest in the content there, I just hated her lecturing style, her whole demeanour...everything, ew. But kudos to Lesley, she was tops.

Interest: 9/10. - I've been told by several people that the first couple of years of my degree will be largely irrelevant as far as real-world teaching goes, but having not had any teaching experience yet I'll definitely say that this was really interesting. If you want to be a teacher, chances are you did/will as well. I honestly think if you didn't/don't find the content interesting then you probably don't really want to teach, deep down. This was the only course out of the ones I did this semester where I actually minded and got annoyed if I had to miss a lecture because of transport issues or whatever. Every other subject I skipped at least a couple of classes to go do fuck-all; this was the one I always went to unless I really couldn't, I think that says something.

Overall: 8/10.

EDUF1019: Human Development & Education
Lecturer: Stephen Juan

Ease: 11/10
Half of the essay criteria was made up for technical stuff (periods, sentence structure), the speech criteria was insanely easy, the exam was essentially spelled out for us in the last lecture and anyone with a computer experience can pass the compulsory computer skills exam. Nothing too taxing, and interesting to boot imo, which makes it easier. There's not too much difficulty to be had in understanding three or so human development theories, which is what the majority of the course was based off, so as long as you do the reading then you'll be fine. I was scaled down for this course. I was averaging well into the HD range and was scaled to a high distinction. Doesn't affect the ease of the course, which next to other uni courses, was baby food. Actually, a word here about something else. The fact that this course (among other art/ed subjects) is worth the same as a chemistry or biology angers me a bit. By comparison, I would have spent about five times as long doing chem/bio work than I did doing ed work. That's including class hours though. But seriously, the workload for science subjects >>>>> the workload for arts subjects. They shouldn't be worth anywhere near the same. It's dumb. </rant>
Lecturer: 9/10
Ahhh Dr. Stephie. I found what he said to be interesting. I found the way he said it to be fun and engaging. He's one of those public speaker people who goes around giving speeches and frequently appears on TV, he has his own books, so he's got experience on how to talk and he uses it well. Does he have the tendency to ramble? Yeah, he does, but most of his ramblings are on the subject. And in any case, they liven up the lectures quite a bit. imo, none of the stuff was really in need of too much attention in lectures. However, if you think that lectures need to remain on subject (that's what you're paying for) and if you don't like his ramblings on human development and whatever, then i can understand. Malfoy's criticism of the mans lecturing style was understandable. I, however, loved his style, loved what he had to say and loved his style. He couldn't maintain control, which is what brings him down to 9/10. Oh, and he emailed out totally comprehensive and well written lecture notes. So kudos for that.

Interest: 9/10.
The only part I didn't find interesting was the crap on birth statistics and such. That only took up one lecture though. You'll cover all human development theories and the development of a human in general, so it's pretty interesting. What would have been more interesting, is if they cut out some of the early childhood stuff and talked more about adult behaviour, but that wasn't within the confines of the course so I can't really fault Juan for not putting it in there. Tutorial discussions rocked too. Margarita is a totally awesomastic tutor, and if you get her you're lucky to have her. She stops presentations frequently so we can talk about the topic, which is actually very beneficial for teachers-in-training. When she stops it, if you're able to get a class discussion going then she'll pretty much butt right out of it. This is fantastic in this course, because the tutorial discussions that arise from the topics (we had a great talk about genetic engineering in a speech about teenagers, I believe) are absurdly interesting. My most fond memory of the course was doing some irl trolling and getting the class into a debate about the supposed benefits of engineering all humans to be alike so that they're as happy as can possibly be. Probably a bit philosophical really, but damn it was an interesting debate and the class had one every week. Fantastic tutorials. I loved them to bits. The ICE component (computer skills) was pretty shitty though, but I got an exemption since I did HSC computers, heh.

Overall: 9/10.
Great course. ICE (computers) was shit, but that's it. Lecturer was fun, subject matter was interesting, assessments were [too] easy. I loved it! I reccomend the course to everyone looking for a stimulating, rewarding and easy course to do.

EDUF1019: Human Development and Education

Ease: 7/10.
The assessments and exam for this course were really easy. The exam for it was basically rote learning and memorisation of some theories, and took only about 45 minutes to complete out of the two hours allocated. There was some personal opinion thrown in there as well, which was a surprise. Dr Juan gave us the exam topics and basically the questions as well in the last lecture, which helped me immensely as it was one of the few I attended. I had some issues with them that were not related to ease. For example, I do not believe that ICE should be an assessable component. Is there anyone these days who does not know how to cut and paste in Microsoft Word, for an example? It's a joke! I also was unimpressed by the fact that the first three weeks in Dr Juan's tutorial groups got automatic full marks in their seminar presentations, by virtue of the fact they did not have as much time to prepare, while those in other groups did not. Since I was not in his tutorial group, but was in the first three weeks, I felt at a disadvantage.
Lecturer: 3/10.
Dr Juan is a nice guy, to be sure, but I really did not enjoy his lectures. He had a tendency to ramble on some topics, and furthermore half the time I was just plain disinterested. He also had some very strong political viewpoints, which is to be expected in Education lectures in my experience (most memorable being that the will of the collective was more important than the freedom of the individual, which was in one of the beginning couple of lectures and repeated in the course readers). I gave up on attending lectures after the first couple of weeks, actually, because they were so painful. Be warned that he does not use WebCT or anything like that, although he did end up emailing the notes to us at the end of the course. Many people enjoyed his lectures, so do not take my opinions on face value.

Interest: 0/10.
I only took this course because it was compulsory. I was not interested in any aspect of it at all. In fact, I loathed it from the time I read the course description when I enrolled for second semester. It was not relevant to my degree, either, so it was just a painful experience, particularly given my aversion to stuff about early childhood. A lot of the course seemed focused on social justice - notions of gender, and of third world development, and other such things, which I found got rather irritating after a while. I did not have a particularly good tutor, either. She didn't do much to facilitate discussion, even at the conclusions of seminars - just kind of sat there a lot of the time. I guess the fact that tutorials were a bit of a waste of time - seminar presentation after seminar presentation isn't really conducive to discussion - meant she didn't really have that much to teach.

Overall: 1/10.
This course is plain awful. It was boring, irrelevant and just completely not my thing. I think a lot of people had the opposite experience to me, so as I said, don't take this review at face value. I just had a lot of issues with this course, its assessment, and the way it was run.

EDUF 1019: Human Development and Education
Dr. Steve Juan

Ease: 9/10 – Assignments required an understanding and implementation of the entire course. This was really useful, as working on the essay also prepared us for the exam. The lectures were accessible and the theories were interesting =)
Interest: 9/10 – This course overlaps a lot with the more interesting and accessible parts of psychology. It was all relevant and up-to-date =)
Lecturer: 10/10 – Great stuff. He also emailed us his entire lectures, word-for-word, so cramming for the exam was about as painless as cramming will ever be.
Overall: 9/10 – This was SOOO much better than education 1018. However, I did not enjoy the tutorials/seminars, otherwise would have been 10. I'm worried about teaching now, because my seminar presentation marks are consistently low. =( 

EDUF1019 - Human Development & Education
Ease - 9/10
Lecturer - 10/10 Dr. Stephie is the best
Interest - 10/10
Overall - 10/10
EDUF2006: Educational Psychology

Ease: 5/10
This was ridiculously hard compared to first year education subjects. There are about a billion theories and theorists you have to remember, and there's a big, fat, $100 textbook that you have to read which only somewhat clarifies things. Assessment is 40% essay, 30% exam, 30% tutorial presentation and group essay. The essay was what got me through - if I hadn't gotten 37/40 for it I'd have failed this subject. The tutorial presentation was ridiculous because it had a group essay component. If you think groupwork is bad, try writing a coherent essay with four different writing styles and whatnot. I find the very notion of a group essay ridiculous. The exam was hard - you had to really know your content and I certainly didn't. As I said, you have to know a lot of theories and theorists and I just... didn't.

Lecturer: Richard Walker, 7/10
Richard Walker knew his stuff. He was very solid - clear and concise. I found him very accommodating, especially when I had problems handing things in due to illness. An overall good lecturer, if slightly uninspiring at times due to the material. A special mention must be made of my tutor, Wayne Leahy. If you get him for your tutorials you will not enjoy them. This was the general opinion of most people in our tutorial, at least.

Interest: 3/10
It wasn't as bad as EDUF1019, which was made terrible by the lecturer and the general irrelevance of the subject matter. This had more relevance to actual teaching, somewhat, but was still concerned with a lot of theory. As far as I'm concerned, generally the theoretical side of things doesn't actually predict what will happen once you're out in the practical side of things. Too many names and studies and theories for it to hold my interest, as well. Tutorials were painful, as well - listening to a seminar presentation per tutorial, plus having a horrible tutor, does not make things particularly fun.

Overall: 4/10
It wasn't as bad as EDUF1019 but that was really its redeeming feature. For a compulsory education course it was solid but uninspiring. Too heavy on the theories. Richard Walker did the best he could with dull subject matter.

EDUF2006 - Educational Psychology

Ease: 9/10. Learn the theory, remember the theory, regurgitate theory in exam which is given to you beforehand. Easy. The only possibly hard thing is remembering the many many names of the many many people you will look at. But whatever, I went to about 10% of the lectures and I did fine (exam results pending lol).

Lecturer: 2/10. Richard Walker is the most boring lecturer I've ever had. His voice literally put me to sleep. Hence hardly ever going to lectures.

Interest: 8/10. I enjoyed it. A couple of topics were a bit meh but overall it's good.

Overall: 7/10
EDUF2007 : Social Perspectives on Education

Ease - 5/10
I've done surprisingly well in this course so far but I don't think it's a particularly easy course. There are four assessments and an exam (25%) for it. The exam is perhaps the easiest part; you are given the exam format and exact questions in the final lecture so there's no excuse for not doing at least decently in it - plus it's only an hour and a half, which is reasonable for two mini-essays (10% each) and four short-answer questions (5% total). Also rather straightforward were the seminar presentations (15%) which are standard fare in an education course; I was lucky and got to talk on libertarian education policy, which is something I'm interested in, but that was only after twisting the seminar topic - it was quite obvious they wanted me to present the "anti" viewpoint but there was no way that was going to happen. (Seriously, the list of sources we were supposed to use couldn't have been more unbalanced if it tried.)

Where this course fell apart was the assessment relating to the research project. Basically, the course requires you to design and write up your own research project with a partner (35%; 4,000 words) on something to do with social conceptions of education. This is supposed to prepare you for later educational research. However, given the limited time frame and the wide scope for topics, it was difficult to perform well in the project. Also, for 35% of the mark it was a lot of work. Once you add in appendices and results and whatnot, my essay ran to 44 pages. Most other courses allow you to hand in a 2,500 or 3,000 major essay which is not only shorter but worth more of the mark!

There were also two other assessments relating to these projects. The literature reviews (15%; 1,000 words) were not explained particularly well. There was a second presentation (10%) in the form of presenting project findings in the last two weeks of the course. Most people either did not take the projects seriously or made up statistics and results - it was a very silly way to assess us in all honesty.

I really felt there was too much assessment here and that the workload was too high, particularly when you consider how little most of the assessments were worth. Plus the conception of the project was probably okay in theory but didn't work in practice mostly, and a lot of people found it hard to do well because it was hard to pin down what was specifically required.

Lecturers - 0/10, various, mostly only remember Anthony Welch
This course was atrocious in terms of content. It was ridiculously ideological, the lecturers were biased as all hell, the lectures did not follow a common thread and I honestly only went to three of them because the bashing of any views right of Karl Marx's got old after a while.

I know I was not alone in this distaste for the lectures, for two reasons. Firstly, our tutor was absent one week and the course coordinator took the seminar and asked everyone if they attended the lectures. He then said that wasn't possible given he counted less than ten people in the room for that week's lecture. Furthermore, we received at least two emails exhorting us to attend lectures from him because he kept saying attendance was slipping/not particularly good. This suggests that most people didn't find the lectures worth going to. I know at least one person earlier in this thread took the course last year and agreed.

Interest - 0/10
I'm just going to reiterate how useless and awful this course was. It had zero relevance other than to serve as indoctrination, for one thing. I don't even understand why it was included as a core subject. Basically, we covered all the standard left-wing fare - gender, class, race, indigenous issues, anti-private school rhetoric, blah blah blah. Complete waste of time and I resented being told how to think.

Also, it had that awful format of seminar presentations week in, week out. Given that seminars were two hours long it was really, really painful. A lot of people ended up walking out early (I did it myself many times - for a course with a 90% attendance requirement I don't even think I managed half that). Our tutor was a nice guy but liked to ramble a lot on tangential issues and so it made the tedious seminars even more sleep-inducing. Our seminar group was also totally disinterested which meant...
there weren't even many debates or discussions save for maybe the first week or two when people still cared.
In a word: painful.

**Overall: 0/10**
You know a course is painful when you find yourself wishing to hear more of Dr Juan's rambling political statements rather than waste one more minute in these mind-numbing classes. There was not one redeeming feature of the course, from the horrible lectures to the uninspiring and deadly boring two-hour seminars to the insane workload.

This course cemented my decision to change from a teaching degree to something more suitable. I've always found at least one thing interesting or relevant in a course - whether it be de Mause's six modes of childrearing (EDUF1019) or medieval Christendom (HSTY2001) or Caligula (ANHS1004) or problems with collaborative learning (EDUF2006), and those are all from courses that I didn't particularly enjoy! For me to have not found a single thing interesting, redeemable or enjoyable in a semester-long course was pretty surprising.
Education people: you're stuck with it, unfortunately. Everyone else: avoid, avoid, avoid!

**EDUF2007: Social Perspectives in Education**

**Ease: 8/10.** - I went to maybe four lectures (I gave up after the Aboriginal Education one, which was exactly the same as the corresponding lecture in Education, Teachers and Teaching in first year), and still managed to pass before the exam was done. Everything in this unit depends on the tutes, and if you've been in the school system (public or private), you're pretty much guaranteed a pass (at the very least) in this one. Oh, and the fact that the exam was given to us word for word helped too.

**Lecturer: 1/10.** - I went to less than half of the lectures. There is a reason for this. It was generally a mis-matched set of lectures, jerkily put one after the other with no apparent theme at all. The tutes were good, though.

**Interest: 5/10.** - Only the tutes were interesting. There were lots of debates about public and private schooling, gender stuff, the media, and a whole lot of other factors that are relevant to schools.

**Overall: 5/10.** - For a compulsory subject that's pretty much a repeat of Education, Teachers and Teaching, it wasn't too bad. The unit's redeeming feature was the tutorials, but that's something that comes down to how good your group is.

**EDUF2007: Social Perspectives on Education**

Ease - 9/10 They pretty much feed you everything they want you to know (which leads to immense boredom but I'll go into that in a sec). You get the exam questions well in advance. The content is hell easy, if you can handle it being annoyingly biased at times you will be cruising. The only reason its not a 10/10 is because of the research project which is probably the reason that everything else is so easy. If you get yourself a dodgy partner or are not organised it'll be a nightmare, but I found it pretty sweet. You'll probably be up all night before its due but whatever. You're only allowed to miss one tute without a doctors certificate which is probably standard in a lot of faculties anyway.

Lecturers - 4/10. Craig Campbell is a nice guy but his monotone is, well, monotonous. And he has this really annoying way of kidding around, idk if it bugged anyone else but :S The lectures pretty much consisted of slides which summarised the textbook chapters, read out nearly word for word with the odd painful joke. Protip: get the textbook and don't bother with lectures til the last week when he hands out the exam. I only went to about 3 and probably slept through them.
Interest - 4/10. The aforementioned lectures made it boring. Also once you worked out what angle each social issue was being approached from you could almost parrot the lecturer as they talked, v. predictable.

Overall - 6/10. Very easy but not sure if ease is worth being bored to death for 3 hours a week

**EDUF 3024: Adolescent Development**

*Ease*: 8/10. Very straightforward. Every topic was presented and addressed clearly, and readings that were provided were relevant to what we needed to know. Assessment-wise, resources weren't difficult to come by since I actually know how to use the electronic databases (which is more than can be said for many education students).

*Lecturer*: 9/10. Some people didn't like Tracy's style, thinking she was disorganised. I, on the other hand, found her easy to listen to (if a little repetitive at times), particularly because she spoke to us the way I would speak to my friends. The lectures themselves were presented in a casual way, with lots of examples, and were just enjoyable to go to. I also found that Tracy was a good person to just talk to without feeling stupid or like you weren't worth the time. She was always ready to give feedback, and actually had a sense of humour (she let me tell an emo joke during my presentation on depression and suicidality!).

*Interest*: 9/10. This unit is not only related to the age group I want to teach, but it's also related to a lot of things that I have gone through in recent years from a developmental standpoint. Because this entire unit was dedicated to adolescents, it's not just glossed over with a quick reference to Kholberg. Instead we look at things like sexuality, drug use, depression and suicide, eating disorders and all kinds of other interesting topics. Assessments were pretty good because everything was pretty much left to us, where we could focus on the areas we found most interesting, while still getting a lot of info from people who were interested in everything else.

*Overall*: 9/10. Most interesting and enjoyable course this semester.

**EDUF3030 - Australian Secondary Schooling**

*Ease*: 9/10. If you attend lectures and pay attention you will have no problems. It's basically a history course. You get given the exam questions beforehand. Assessment is a 3,000 word essay which is probably the most difficult of the lot and it's a pretty standard essay, albeit longer than I was used to, and they give you detailed advice on how to go about answering all the questions you can choose from along with a list of recommended reading so it's kind of like they've done half of it for you (although you do have to find your own material as well and you have to get to the library early or people will steal all the books). The other assignment is 3 tutorial reading guides - you get assigned them at the start of semester and you read the chapter or article or whatever, summarise it in note form and give copies to the class and your tutor who marks it. You have to discuss the reading during the tute. Not hard.

*Lecturers*: 8/10. I don't remember the name of the main guy who did it (sorry dude) but he was fine. Helen Proctor took some of the lectures and also has an engaging, clear style.

*Interest*: 10/10. I really got into it. That's really all I've got to say. It was just interesting. I thought it would be a bit meh and a couple of topics were a bit that way but the interest factor of the rest of it cancels out the boring bits

*Overall*: 9/10
EDSE: Education (Secondary)

EDSE2001: Craft Knowledge and Professional Practice 1

Ease - Realistically, 6/10. For me, 4/10.
The reason I differentiate between the two marks is because there is a 'seminar' component of the course, where you spend two hours a week doing public speaking, mock teaching and groupwork exercises. I find said things horrifically difficult (and I'm reconsidering my degree at the moment because of it). Most people who are going into teaching probably wouldn't find this anywhere near as difficult as I do, so realistically you'll find this easier than I did.
The real problem with this unit is the assessment model. The assessments were vague and not in traditional formats, so one is often left without an idea of what the tutors/lecturers expect. The first assessment was a "teacher narrative" which is kind of like an essay but with personal experiences and perspectives incorporated; I got marked down on this for not "personalising" it enough but I don't think it's really fair to expect students to lay out their hearts/feelings in an assessment like that. Aside from that, the structure of that is pretty vague. The second assessment was three discussion entries on WebCT. Most everyone I have spoken to thinks this is not only vague and bordering on inassessable but a ridiculous idea for an assessment. You'll see why when you do it. The third is a case study, which is basically an essay and which is totally fine. Thankfully, that's worth 50%.

Lecturers - Kelly Freebody, Michael Anderson, John Hughes - all 10/10, guest lecturers varies
For such a short unit there were a lot of lecturers! All three main lecturers were excellent - they are all former Drama teachers (John Hughes might be English, not entirely sure) and are really engaging and funny. You actually want to attend lectures with these guys, which is good because they mark the roll in lectures and there's a 90% attendance requirement.

As for guest lecturers, Llian Merritt who took the first lecture was good, Roslyn Arnold who took the one on empathic intelligence was fairly boring, and the lady who took the one on classroom management was excellent.

Interest - 9.5/10
I won't give it a perfect ten because there were a few things that were a bit irrelevant/woolly/flat out boring but that's mostly in the readings so your hour of tutorial a week can get a little tedious.
However, the actual lectures were excellent, and since they form the bulk of the content this one scored really high on the interest factor. The stuff you do in the seminars is pretty interesting, though I did spend my time trying to get out of it because I'm fairly phobic of these situations - but watching everyone else was a real experience, and some of the debates we had were great. Nearly perfect, but not quite. One major asset of this course is that unlike everything you do in Education to this point, it's actually relevant to your practical experiences (unlike Social Perspectives, for example, which is pretty much political preaching week in, week out).

Overall - 9/10
Overall, an excellent course. Lectures were inspiring, it was relevant, the seminars were essentially practice for your practical work and it could be a lot of fun. The only real downside were the vague and downright stupid assessments.
ENGL - English

ENGL1000: Academic Writing
Co-ordinator: Rebecca Johinke

Ease: 8/10 - would be 10, except the online lecture system makes it a bit difficult to remember that you have to do it, and I found that I only be doing it 10 minutes before rushing off to uni. That said, the material is non-existent and its pretty much based on your own abilities. You learn a bit about rhetoric and the philosophies behind different types of rhetoric, and while philosophy is gay, you don't really need to understand the stuff to ace this sub.

Lecturer: No marks, because we didn't have lectures, but Johinke co-ordinated the course well, kept students up to date and gave good feedback on assessments and stuff.

Interest: 3/10. It's really not that interesting. You don't really learn anything and you just read essays and see what's wrong with them. Not a subject to do out of interest, which many international students have made the mistake of doing.

Overall: 7/10 - relatively useful, and the textbook. Soles' Essentials of Academic Writing is useful for everything as it covers everything you'll need for an essay for future use. A downer is the 2 hour tutorial which you must attend. Also the online lecture thing - gotta be motivated to do them. But otherwise, relatively easy and you should find easy marks here if you need them.

ENGL1000: Academic Writing
Lecturer: Rebecca Johinke/PC

Interest: 0/10 Online lectures are dull. Essay topics are dull. Marking is anal, and dull.

Lecturer: 5/10 Rebecca did a fine job of writing clear lecture notes, which is good because there aren't any actual lectures. Still, learning from a computer screen kinda sucks balls.

Ease: 5/10 Pretty hard to get a fantastic mark for writing when they mark you down over pedantic crap. Also the lack of interest.

Overall: 1/10 Easy English credit points lol. Shit subject. Tutor was a self-centred bitch. Tutorial discussion was dull, duddy and one sided, and worst of all didn't even count towards the end mark. No speech despite heavy emphasis on public speaking. Essay subjects were shit. Don't do it!

ENGL1000: Academic Writing

Ease: (8/10) Online lectures, 20% of your assessment mark based on online discussion posts, an essay plan and essay based on a ginourmous range of questions, and an open book exam to finish. Could you ask for anything more? The only terribly difficult part of this subject is maintaining an attention span throughout... more on that later.

Lecturer: (6/10) All the lectures are online, so that's a plus, but they tend to be long-winded and repetitive.

Interest: (4/10) It felt like they spent half the semester telling us all the different ways to plagiarise, and finished up by telling us not to do so. Everyone already knows what plagiarism is, and if they want to try and get away with it they will. There's no need to ram it down our throats. A positive, though, is the aforementioned range of essay topics - if you can't find something to interest you there, you're struggling.

Overall: (6/10) Positives: easy marks, online lectures. Negatives: boring, boring, boring. I only did this because it was a degree requirement, and I wouldn't recommend it unless you're the same. Go do something more interesting.
ENGL1000: Academic Writing
It's an online course, so no lecturers.
Ease: 7/10
Lecturer: n/a
Interest: 3/10
Overall: 6/10
This course needs some major motivation on your part to complete the online discussions which contribute to 20% of your grade. Also, it isn't learning to write an essay. It's learning the godforsake history of rhetoric. Final exam should be okay - since I haven't sat it yet - it's open book PLUS you get the questions. All that's required is you marking an essay written the year previous, then writing an essay about the one you've read and answering short answer questions.

ENGL1000: Academic Writing
Ease - 10/10
Lecturer - 10/10 (Had her as a tutor - SO NICE! Didn't actually go to lectures)
Interest - 6/10
Overall - 8/10
ENGL1000: Academic Writing
Ease - 9/10 - Incredibly easy.
Lecturer - 9/10 - Essentially was my computer. Wasn't a complete lefty nut like my HSTY 1045 lecturer and wasn't too boring like my HSTY 1025 lecturer.
Interest - 0/10 - Polynesian rhetoric.
Overall - 2/10 - Gas yourself to death before you do this subject.

ENGL1000: Academic Writing
Ease: 7/10 - some people say its seriously easy but having to read online lectures is so not motivating, also they are really anal about the smallest things like word count and referencing
Lecturers: 1/10 - that was probably an overstatement cause it was mainly online lectures
Interest: 5/10
Overall: 5/10 - seriously i learned nothing in class, i dont see how so many people can hate it cause you only have to attend one tutorial, but still, its pretty useless

ENGL1002: Narratives of Romance and Adventure
Ease: 7 (I managed to finish my major essay in 1.5 hours)
Lecturer: 2 (I quit going to lectures after the first three)
Interest: 0 (As I said, I gave up on going cause I was that bored)
Overall: 3 (The subject matter is completely dry. I feel completely unable get into it. Our tutor isn't particularly inspiring either... even those who've been into the subject material have been complaining.)

ENGL1002: Narratives of Romance and Adventure
Ease: 7/10. As always there was a lot to read, but if you knew your stuff and were willing to read everything there was no problem. A lot of the assignment questions were quite broad, so there was a lot of latitude in what you wanted to argue or explore based on the text.
Lecturer: 10/10. Great lectures, both informative and genuinely interesting (and funny!) by Liam Semler. Even people I know who weren't that into the course enjoyed the lectures.
Interest: 8/10. Great texts, I found this much better in developing general English critical thinking skills about narrative and discourse than Engl 1025.
Overall: 9/10. Loved it
ENGL1005: Language and Image
Ease - 7/10
Lecturer - 7/10 Nick Reimer was probably the best
Interest - 4/10 the “maths of english” was incredibly hard. it started off really well, until about week 7-8 when the topics just started getting tedious and pointless.
Overall - 7/10 only because my tutor gave me good marks...otherwise i'd give it a 5

ENGL1007: Language, Texts and Time
Ease - 0/10 and if I could give it a negative number I would do so
This is hands-down the hardest course I have ever taken at university. It has a very, very complex textbook along with a 500-page reader brick, which lets you know from the very outset that this course is going to be not only very intensive and a lot of work, but a lot of hard work.

The assessment is broken down into two grammatical exercises (15% each), in which I failed the first one and by some miracle scraped a pass in the second one. These are ridiculously hard, and vague to boot. I spent longer writing those exercises than I usually do on major essays -- and I still only managed to either guess or Google the answers to half the questions.

There's a major essay (1,500 words; 40%) which is rather difficult because the questions were pretty esoteric, but I found one on intellectual property which meant I could somehow twist it into a political/historical essay. It's scary that the essay was the easiest part of the assessment schedule because it seriously took a lot more work than most do.

The exam (30%) is tomorrow and judging by practice exams available on WebCT, I'll be lucky to salvage five marks from it. Seriously, we're expected to know the phonetic alphabet, a million complex grammar rules, poetry techniques, Old and Middle English and a bunch of semiotics and cram that all into a 90-minute exam. I'm doomed.

To put it simply, I ended up being totally lost by the end of the first two weeks and never recovered. It remains the only subject in which I have ever failed an assessment, and as far as I know I've not spoken to anyone who's really done exceptionally well in it. Even the WebCT anonymous discussion boards are filled with people who are totally lost.

I'm doing two senior English courses this semester and even if you combine them in difficulty it doesn't touch this course. I don't know what the fuck the English department were thinking when they made this a first year course.

Lecturer - Nick Riemer, 5/10
I stopped attending lectures after a while because I got too confused, and Eastern Avenue auditorium didn't have anywhere convenient for me to plug my laptop in so I couldn't type up notes (my laptop has a very, very short battery life) anyway. Nick Riemer is a nice guy and very approachable, but he's softly spoken and doesn't explain things particularly well. He seemed to waffle for a fair bit and launched into insanely complex topics without much background or explanation.

I'd mark him down but the fact he made himself so available for consultation and on WebCT was a real bonus - you really needed the clarification sometimes!

Interest - 2/10
I thought this could be interesting (most first year English subjects are pretty awful and this looked to be the best) but I don't have much to say about it because I zoned out very early on due to the overly technical and complex nature of the subject. The fact that I ended up so lost meant that I stopped being interested very early on. In fact, I wouldn't even be able to tell you what went on in more than one or two of the tutorials because I just ended up daydreaming (or occasionally writing fic on my laptop).
Overall - 1/10
Like I said earlier, this could have been an interesting course but they just crammed too much into it. Not only did they cram a lot of material in, but it was a lot of complex material. This could easily have been two or three courses. It was just too much to learn.

I will never understand why they made this a first year course. It was much more difficult than any senior English unit I have ever done and it would have probably been better as a 3000-level unit - no, I'm not kidding, that's how difficult it was!

ENGL1007: Language, Texts and Time

Ease: (6/10) There is a lot of subject material to learn in this unit. But it's manageable if you're committed. The assessments are a little on the difficult side, too, but the highest marks remain achievable with effort.

Lecturer: (7/10) I've seen subject reviews about this unit before, and I think Dr. Nick Riemer gets a bad wrap. He's got some complex ideas to explain at times, but he gets them across well. His lectures are always very clearly structured, and well linked to the readers. He's quirky, which adds a bizarre sense of humour at times.

Interest: (7/10) I'll admit, some of my classmates found this subject terribly boring. I didn't find it so bad, though, even if the readings can be incredibly tedious at times. There's a lot of interesting stuff to get out of this unit, if you want it.

Overall: (7/10) I think this unit has been getting overly negative reviews. It can be difficult, but high marks are within reach, and the lectures rarely get bogged down on one boring point for anything more than 10 minutes. If the handbook outline sounds interesting to you, don't be put off this unit by word of mouth.

ENGL1007: Language, Texts and Time

Ease and Interest - 5/10
I definitely didn't find this easy, seeing as I failed the second assignment. As said before there's a lot of stuff covered here, the upside being you're probably bound to like at least one topic here given it's broad-ness (mine were the politics of English and EME). There's a lot of downsides so I won't bother going into it I would recommend going to the lectures rather than dodging it and instead going through the brick. If you were doing linguistics simultaneously the phonetics and semantics stuff were covered in both units.

Lecturers - 6/10.
My mate and I thought Dr. Nick sounded like Hamish Blake. haha, his style of delivery and presentation was alright but it does look a lot better compared to the "guest" lecturers: Dr. Warner was funny but I didn't get anything out of him. Dr. Anlezark (sp?) was boring and I got nothing out of him, so he pulls this rating down. Although it would be have been a lot better had they given us a detailed criteria how they were going to mark the essay.

Overall - 6/10
Definitely the hardest course in my first semester. It made me seriously think about dropping my sem 2 ENGL unit, but thinking about it my effort reflects my mark - average. It's definitely not a "filler"/"bludge" subject. Only do it if you're persevering to do an English major.
ENGL1007: Language, Texts & Time
Ease - 6/10. Quite difficult, this one. Assessments are VERY much 'trial and error' & 'hit and miss'!
Lecturer - 8/10. I enjoyed most of the lectures. Guest speakers were good, Nick Riemer was good also. LOTS of note-taking though. =( Interest - 6/10 overall. Some bits were 8/10, some bits were 3/10. Opinions vary.
Overall - 7/10. Only for those who really LOVE English, and I mean the language itself, not the writing-wanky-essays part.
The exam was very difficult, by the way. =( 

ENGL1015 - Inventing Modernity
Ease: 3/10. I didn't understand the first assignment questions at all, to be honest. I guess getting that assignment was the point where I realised that not only do I not comprehend the subject, I don't want to comprehend it. The texts were also hard to slog through.
Lecturers: 5/10. There were six; the only one I really remember was Melissa Hardie, who wasn't fantastic but wasn't as godawful as the one I had for ENGL1002. My tutor was wonderful - she wasn't waffly and she was a nice woman, so the mark gets bumped here.
Interest: 1/10. As grk_styl said upthread, it focused way too much on gender/sexuality readings to the exclusion of anything either interesting or relevant. A lot of the time in the tutes, even those more English-minded students were like, 'I can't see where we're meant to be reading sex into this!' When you think that most of us are teenagers just out of teens and probably all have rather dirty minds and can see sex into everything, you wonder what kind of crack the lecturers are smoking to see all this imagery. I hated the texts with a fiery passion... next time I think I'll avoid any course with Virginia Woolf!
Overall: 2/10. I think I was too harsh on ENGL1002 last semester; while it was deadly boring and I loathed it, at least the course and the assessments made sense, and the texts were generally more interesting if treated in an odd way. This seems to be one of those esoteric English subjects with little relevance to anything... I'm guessing it's really just not my thing.

ENGL1015: Inventing Modernity
Ease - 6/10
Lecturer - 2/10 I don't remember liking any of them
Interest - 1/10 pointless pointless subject. The lectures consisted of finding the sexual undertones in all of the texts
Overall - 1/10

ENGL1020 - Literary Mythologies
Ease - 7/10
Lecturer - 8/10
Interest - 5/10 boring as bat shit
Overall - 5/10
ENGL1025: Fiction, Film and Power

Ease: 4/10- couldn't understand what was expected of us for the first half of the semester, and had no idea what was expected for the exam or therefore how to study for it.

Lecturer: 5/10- Stefan seems like a really lovely guy, but his lecturing style was horrible. Basically he'd write a 50 minute essay and recite it during the lecture, thus giving only one viewpoint that was often hard to follow or see relevance with the unit overall. He also liked to draw on paintings and convoluted rants from famous theorists.

Interest: 2/10- maybe it would be good if you were a die-hard film noir fan. When I chose the subject, the overview made the unit sound really dynamic and interesting. Instead it was a lot of 1940s texts with a few others thrown in, all tenuously tied through links such as "simulacra" or "the panopticon".

Overall: 3/10. Bleuughh. That said, I somehow managed to get a high credit, which was surprising, because I expected a low pass.

ENGL1025: Fiction Film and Power

Ease: 6/10. Extremely tough going at first and I had trouble finding a distinct thread linking all the waffle together for the first few weeks. Once you get used to Stefan's lecturing style and come to expect him to pitch the content at a higher level than you might be used to (especially right out of the HSC) it becomes easier. There were a couple of concepts which I never really fully understood ("end games" for example) and if I was to try to give you a summary of what this course is about I would be here all day, but suffice to say that once you get used to it, it's not so bad. I wouldn't recommend skipping lectures though for your own sake. Stefan is against WebCT so you won't find any summaries for you there. Oh, also, Stefan likes to use art to illustrate his points in a roundabout kinda way. Sometimes I didn't see the point, other times it was actually pretty cool. But don't freak if you walk in expecting english and see all this abstract art on the powerpoint, it's just what he does.

Lecturers: 6/10 Stefan did the vast majority of the lectures. He's a nice guy and all, very friendly and unintimidating. But his lecturing style can really be a bit confusing/boring/complex/all of the above...you have to listen hard. If you lack a vocabulary, acquire one, because he has an extensive list of intelligent phrasing that he likes to use (I was so absolutely lost in the first lecture because of this). But like I said he's really nice. The other lecturers we had were alright, nothing spectacular. The V for Vendetta lecturer guy had some interesting points.

Interest: 6/10. it's interesting once you manage to cut through the waffle and actually get a grasp on the concepts. I found some stuff boring though, notably the simulacra concept.


ENGL 1025 – Fiction, Film and Power
Warning: The film of Bliss is not pleasant, and may scar sensitive viewers.

Ease: 7/10 – Essays were straightforward. Plenty of different assignments, so there wasn't too much pressure on any one thing. Exam was also straightforward. The theory became more difficult as the course went on, but I got by alright via occasional name-dropping.

Interest: 9/10 – Tutorials were great, absolutely fantastic tutors. The texts were challenging as well as (mostly) accessible. The Day of the Locust, The Talented Mr Ripley, The Big Sleep and Bliss were ALL interesting texts. Fun stuff.
Lecturer: 5/10 – I don't know because I flat-out stopped going after the first assignment. I don't advise this to anyone who's not a born-and-bred English nerd, as I struggled to make sense of the sparse and cryptic notes on the powerpoints.

Overall: 8/10. Great tutorials, really can't say about the lectures.

**ENGL2613: Literature and Politics**

*Ease - 8.5/10*

The assessment for this course is fantastic. You have one tutorial presentation (10%), one reflection on the discussion that evolved out of your presentation (10%, 500 words), one mini research essay (35%, 1,500 words) and one major research essay (45%, 2,000 words). I think this is essentially as close to perfect as one can get for an assessment schedule, especially given there's no participation marks and no exam, and there's no way Arts lecturers will stop with the format of tutorial presentations week in, week out (I hate tutorials because of this). Everything is straightforward, you have a lot of leeway in topics for all assessments and for the major essay you can invent your own. The only thing I found moderately difficult was the first mini-essay (the 1,500 word one) because I didn't "click" with the politics of the person I was writing about and so I found it hard to stop being sarcastic in my essay.

*Lecturer - Dr Peter Marks, 8.5/10*

Dr Peter Marks is absolutely fascinating (apparently he gets applauded at the end of every lecture in the other unit he runs, which is Literature and Cinema). I also had him as a tutor. He knows his stuff, he has an opinion but he doesn't force it on you, he's interesting and he's approachable (for example, he marked me down for having a friend sit in on my presentation, when I explained the reasoning behind it he agreed to revise my mark). Also, he allows you to have debates in class and allows all viewpoints (edfac could learn from him) and he's happy for anyone to develop essay topics that interest them even if they're not course material (my major essay was on libertarian theory). The only problem I had with him was that either his microphone was broken or his voice wasn't loud enough - this could have been possibly the room we were in for the lectures, I don't know. It just made things a little hard to hear sometimes.

*Interest - 8/10*

I loved the idea of this subject - politics and reading, what could be more interesting, particularly since it was an examination of the politics in the texts and not a "let's force this opinion on you" course.

It lived up to my expectations, mostly. Most of the material was left-slanted but it was balanced enough that I enjoyed it. Also, a lot of the texts were fascinating - you get to do Orwell (The Road to Wigan Pier) and Solzhenitsyn (One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich) which to me is a huge bonus. Langston Hughes was awful (if you're radical left you'll enjoy him, maybe it was that I wrote an essay on his poems and had trouble taking them seriously), LeCarre (Spy Who Came In From The Cold) and Algren (Man With The Golden Arm) were meh. On the whole, the text selection was varied and decent and Dr Marks even put in Friedrich Augustus von Hayek (*love*) as one of the supplementaries!

Tutorial presentation/seminar format was boring, to be honest, but I always have that problem. Sometimes the resulting discussions were fabulous, other times I wanted to tear my hair out, and other times I was watching the clock.

Bonus marks for allowing us to write on our interests and for interesting tutorial discussions at times.

*Overall - 8.5/10*

This is hands-down the best English course I've taken for assessment structure, lecturer and interest value. It also has the best selection of texts (and considering I'm currently doing a course with Harry
Potter as a text, which runs a close second, that's saying something). I love the balance of the course, it didn't feel like Dr Marks (even though he was left himself) was pushing opinions on you, you were encouraged to think, and it ended up being really fascinating. Anyone who's even remotely politically-minded (of either end of the spectrum) who is doing English should look into this course, it's wonderful.

ENGL 2617: Postmodernism

Ease: 6/10. - I went to about 1/3 of the lectures at most. I did about four readings, and spent most of my time in tutes having no idea about what was going on. I managed to get 77% in the assessment (not including the final essay), so I must have done something right.

Lecturer: 5/10. - Julian was a good lecturer, but there were a lot of assumptions made about prior knowledge that I didn't quite agree with. I also thought that he went through the lectures too quickly, with no actual link to how each lecture fit into the course as a whole.

Interest: 4/10. - Postmodernism is pretty big in the HSC syllabus at the moment. I only did this course because I thought it might be useful in the future. I did, however, find some of the theories very interesting, and the photo essay I chose to do at the end was a lot of fun to set up and write (though it wasn't very good for my bank account).

Overall: 5/10. - Difficult information with a couple of interesting readings thrown in, reasonably easy assessments and decent marks. Can't bring myself to give this less than a pass.

ENGL 2617: Postmodernism

Ease: 6/10. A varied range of texts and some very intimidating theory (Adorno and the Language poets in particular), though as always, if you're willing to make an effort it all comes together etc.

Lecturers: 8/10. Both Julian and Stefan were great lecturers in my opinion, very knowledgeable and enthusiastic. The above post said something to the effect that the lectures didn't seem to hang together as one whole course, but for me that was part of the appeal; there was so much subject matter that you really could pick and choose which aspects of the course you liked or disliked before applying your knowledge to any given text. Some very antimated and enjoyable tutorials were also a highlight.

Interest: 8/10. As I said before the vast range of material meant that there was something for everyone, and I really loved Pynchon, Hedwig, and Baudrillard. Also giving students the chance to do a photo essay, blog, or short story for the final assessment was a welcome change.

Overall: 8.5/10. Loved it.

ENGL 2627: Reading Sexuality

Ease: 5/10 - A load of wanky intellectual wankery about crap. We studied quite a few good films which was fun, BUT the lectures were hard to follow and always crammed in too much to think about in one hour. The readings were similarly obscure and half the time had absolutely nothing to do with the films we studied and went off on weird tangents about...I don't even know. Luckily it's one of those "give your own interpretation" kind of subjects so it's not like you were going to fail if you neglected to analyse the films from their wanky perspective but still. It was hard. English nerds would
probably disagree with me. I'm just finding uni English in general to be shit. Oh yeah and the exam was a bit WTF as well

Lecturers (mainly Melissa Hardie): 5/10 - As above, lectures were too hard to follow. Points for attempts at humour but otherwise meh

Interest: 5/10 - Some things were interesting, most of it had me scratching my head in confusion or frustration or sleeping out of boredom

Overall: 5/10. Don't do it unless you like over-analysing everything to death in a really weird way

**ENGL2632 - British Romantic Literature**

Ease: 7/10. It's not hard but you have to keep up with the reading, of which there is a lot, or you'll fall behind like I did. Also would help to have a previous interest in the subject matter because the lecturer would often talk with the assumption that you were familiar with particular poems or authors, which I personally never was. If you don't like poetry this course is not for you, if you do like it you'll have a ball.

Lecturer: 8/10. Will Christie is awesome. 'Nuff said. He's engaging and witty. Interesting dress sense. The only reason he's not a 10 is that I felt his lecture style was a bit all over the place. I prefer lectures to follow a clear structure and the way he just seemed to kind of talk about anything that was even vaguely relevant to the topic left me with some pretty confused notes lol.

Interest: 6/10. Largely dependent on whether you find Romantic literature interesting and how widely read you are in it.

Overall: 7/10

**ENGL2649: The World of Fantasy**

*Ease: 6/10*

I actually thought this would be a lot easier than it was, but the major essay (2,000 words; 50%) was marked reasonably harshly. I liked the fact, however, that the essay was the major component of assessment. The exam (30%) was fairly decent in that you only had to know two texts from a selection of five in the latter half of the course. We were also essentially given questions and format prior to the exam, though it's one of those subjects which is difficult to study for because you're not entirely sure what to study. However, I found the exam straightforward and not particularly difficult - it was one hour long and was comprised of one mini-essay and one extended response in point form. There was a 10% tutorial presentation (as is usual with Arts subjects) and 10% participation (which as usual is useless).

Overall, assessment format was decent, the material was mostly straightforward and if you kept up with the texts you could do well. It is also entirely possible to do 60% of your assessment on one text, which is very useful.

*Lecturer - 7/10, Daniel Anlezark*

I enjoyed his lectures very much and they were reasonably decent, however I have very little to say on the matter as scheduling conflicts (i.e. them being reasonably early in the morning and the first class of the day) meant that I stopped attending them post-Harry Potter lectures. He was funny and interesting for the few I attended, though, and most people seemed to be genuinely enjoying the lectures.
Interest - 8/10 for first half, 4/10 second half

I did this course solely because it offered Harry Potter as a text and I needed some English credits. I really enjoyed the portion of the course to this point because I'm a Harry Potter-obsessed fanfic geek and I figured any course which would let me wax lyrical about that fact would be rather wonderful. I also really liked the 19th century Rider Haggard texts and CS Lewis.

After this I felt the texts went downhill. I really dislike both movie and book versions of Lord of the Rings, and the fact such a large part of the course was devoted to them meant I spent about four or five weeks in the middle really bored. Medieval texts were a mixed bag; I enjoyed Lanval but didn't particularly enjoy Chaucer or Sir Gawain and the Green Knight. Lady of Avalon was largely unreadable for me. However, if you're really interested in fantasy fiction and its historical origins (or if you really like Lord of the Rings) you'll enjoy this. I'm not a fantasy fan as a general rule so a lot of the material didn't appeal to me.

Furthermore, there's the usual problem with seminar presentations in that some were incredible (mostly the first few, obviously, because they catered to my interests) but most of them I spent watching the clock and wanting to be somewhere else, because I couldn't get into the source material and listening to people present bores the hell out of me.

Overall - 6/10

Solid but largely uninspired in parts because I didn't enjoy the source material. Lectures were decent and some tutorials were good, it obviously depends on your group. I'd recommend this course only if you really like fantasy works though - I really enjoyed the beginning of the course but it kind of gets repetitive after a while.

ELEC - Electrical Engineering

ELEC1601: Professional Computer Engineering
Ease: 4/10 - Way too much stuff to learn. It's great if you want to learn about how things work at the machine level of the computer.
Lecturer: 7/10 - Colin Jones was ok. He read off the lecture slides which made the lectures boring but ran the course quite well actually.
Interest: 5/10 - Unless you're interested in Logic Circuits and coding in BASIC/MIPS, you'll hate this subject.
Overall: 5/10 - There's way too much stuff to learn in this subject which made it really hard to cram...

ELEC3305: Digital Signal Processing
Ease - 5/10 - Everything up to the mid sem is easy enough to get your head around. Then it's a total mindfk for the last few weeks. Yash took it this year and made a buggery of a final exam. Think about the last 2 questions on a 3-4unit maths paper. The final exam had 7 of those questions (10 total). Scaling does heaps though. I only finished half the questions and i'm pretty sure i only answered about 3 properly (needed 45% to pass), yet i walked out with 61.
Lecturer - 8/10 - Yash is a brilliant guy. He mightn't have known much about circuits in first year but signals/control/dsp is supposed to be his speciality. He was very quick to reply to emails and his tutorials were very helpful.
Interest - 7/10 - The labs were the most interesting parts. But you had to trudge through the mundane tutorials for the first 6 weeks to get to the good parts. Digital filter design if you're interested in that stuff.
Overall - 7/10 - Basically ELEC2302 with easier maths (unless you actually like all that continuous stuff) and real life applications.
ENGG – Engineering (General)

ENGG1804: Engineering Disciplines (Intro)

Ease: 7/10 - Not too hard but the labs can get a bit confusing. Some fudging and looking like you've attempted the stuff always works though.

Lecturers:
Stefan Williams (8/10): He has a canadian accent and was ok.
Trevor Cole (7/10): Knows his stuff but can get a bit boring sometimes. Nice guy though.

Interest: 2/10 - It's a boring subject.

Overall: 6/10 - It's a bludge subject which looks at all the stream B disciplines (Electrical/Software/Computer/Telecommunications/Power + Mechatronics). Most people use it to get into Mechatronics in semester 2.

FINC - Finance

FINC2011: Corporate Finance I
Major assignment was better than sexpected...so was the final. Should go well, touch wood.
Overall: 8/10

FINC 2011: Corporate Finance I
Ease-2/10 This was one HARD subject. The mid sem was bearable. The assignment was so hard, it didn't matter how early you started, the night before you would still be up crunching away at it. The final was even worse, many walked out knowing they had failed, i walked out with about 10% certain. However, the marks were better than expected
Interest 4/10- Im interested in finance but not enough to major in it. Economics is much hotter
Lecturer- 8/10 Julianne is so funny and entertaining. No one can make finance bearable the way in which she can. Frino 6/10 ...knows his stuff but not very entertaining. Tro 0/10 dont even bother going in his weeks
Overall 3/10 definitely a hard subject. Dont do it if you just need to fill an elective. There are other subjects with much easier marks. This is a risky elective as many people fail finance.

FINC2012: Corporate Finance II
Ease: 6/10 Fair difficult, but I love finance
Lecturer: 1. Van De Vyer 2/10; 2. Partington 6/10 OK overall
Interest: 8/10 I love it, when you're dancing in my arms
Overall: 8.5/10 Fair cool subject

FINC2192: Finance Honours
Ease: 1/10 Possibly failed this course, even though I'm a gun at finance
Interest: 10/10 For a purely intellectual standpoint most interesting course I've done, especially the Behavioural Finance part
Overall: 6.5/10 Fascinating subject but deplorably difficult.
**FINC3011: International Financial Management**  
With Juan Yao  

Ease: 8/10 – An overall pretty easy subject. Mid-exam (25%) was probably the hardest assessment. However if you can get your hands on a previous mid exam, then you should be set; otherwise it comes as a bit of a shock if you expect it to be the same as tute questions (in terms of ease). Group assignment (20%) was straightforward (putting together 20 pages on your own topic of interest). In lectures, not much new stuff after about week 9, and there is a lot of repetition in the concepts the whole way through. Final exam (45%) was fair; everything to know was from the lecture notes/tutes. Tutorial attendance/participation = 10%.  

Interest: 6/10 – Some topics were really interesting (e.g. forecasting), the other half were just shitty financial theory (e.g. parity conditions).  

Lecturer: 8/10 – Juan is clearly no linguist, and always copped the slack for it. Nevertheless, the lecture notes were pretty much perfect: much more helpful and detailed than other senior level finance subjects. Plus Juan was really helpful in person and responded quickly to emails.  

Overall: 8/10 – Once you get used to Juan’s speaking, and past learning some of the tough new concepts, the subject is actually quite easy and fair.

**FINC3013: Mergers and Acquisitions**  
Ease: 3/10 - Probably not that hard if you do the work, but that's abit unlikely considering how fucking boring it is.  
Lecturers: 1/10 - Shit. Didn't go after Mid-Semester. Was told by my friends this was a wise decision.  
Interest: 0/10 - Thought I'd be really interested in this..was sorely disappointed.  
Overall: 1/10 - Easily the worst Finance subject I've done and my expected average performance in it will probably preclude me from doing honours.

**FINC3015: Financial Valuation: A Case Study Approach**  
With Joel Fabre  

Ease: 5/10 – The three very anal individual case studies were a constant struggle. They are worth only 10% each (should be worth twice as much in my opinion). However despite the difficulty, it is easier to score higher assignment marks than in other finance subjects. Also there are no questions or homework, and through the case studies you are forced to really grasp the concepts and thus study. Plus you can use all of your knowledge from the individual case studies in the group case study worth 35%. The final exam (worth 35%) was fair, there was not much study required; about 1/3 of it was based on prior finance subjects (such as capital budgeting and cash flows).  

Interest: 8/10 – Interesting subject, only pulled down by the mental rape inflicted by the individual case studies.  

Lecturer: 8/10 – Seriously boring lecture, but Joel was very responsive to questions on blackboard (his replies would take up a whole page). Recommended that you attend as there is a lot of stuff in the lecture notes that is not assessable, and he constantly gives out tips regarding the case studies.  

Overall: 7.5/10 – Once you get past the hell of the individual case studies, it’s all downhill and repetitive from there.
FINC3015: Financial Valuation: A Case Study Approach

Ease: (6/10) I found the case studies fairly simple managed to receive nearly full marks in the 2nd and 3rd one. overall people found them challenging however. the final isn't too hard too
Interest: (10/10) i found the valuation of companies very interesting.
Lecturer: joel fabre sucks, boring voice, thinks his funny when he isnt, didnt understand what he was talking about in lectures
Overall: (8.5/10) highly recommend it for anyone doing finance major

FINC 3017 - Investments and Portfolio Theory

Ease: 8.5/10
I initially made the mistake of this course thinking it was going to be mathsy, WRONG and hence i got owned in the mid-sem.

It's more like here is the situation explain why and maybe a quant question where u do it and explain why. Also do the readings as they will be examined in the final, though the lecturer kept telling us that over and over and over again.

If you listen to what Kerry says in the final review lecture there will be no surprises for the final. However i did find myself taking a moment to think as opposed to diving head first the question which I normally do. Lots of writing in the final including the reasoning for the quant questions. I was very unsure as to how i went seeing as i thought i did well in the mid-sem and didn't, but obviously what i did in the final was the BS that they were expecting. I was expecting at best 65 overall but got above 80.

Lecturers: 6.5/10
Kerry Pattenden is a nut case, who keeps telling us that we should never manager her super and that a passive investment strategy is the best. However, if you listen to what she says and ignore her smart ass remarks she does teach you the stuff and tell you what is in the final. Andrew Lepone aka the goofy uncle, not too bad just starting out, did improve his techniques from the two lectures he took for Trading and Dealing in Sem 2 last yr. Dr Mark Van DE Vyver shit boring lecturer.

My tutor was a lazy shit who didn't really teach us anything. Furthermore i was extremely ticked off as after the final i found out that apparently the tutors were meant to go through a question on last yrs paper which was very similar to the one we got.

Interest:7/10
I had done most of the stuff before through financial metrics, derivatives and corp 2. I hate to say it but i did find behavioural FINC interesting.

Overall:7/10
I needed one subject to finish my finc major and chose this thinking it would be quantity. It wasn't, i thought I was gonna do shit but somehow did a hell of a lot better than i expected.
FINC3017: Investments and Portfolio Management
With Robert Wixted

Ease: 10/10 – The two mid semester exams, worth 15 and 20% respectively, were piss easy (average being almost HD). Final exam (65%) was a bit harder, but still easy relative to FINC3011.

Interest: 6/10 – The material is dry and there is much revision of corporate finance I and II. However Robert’s real life stories from finance were very interesting.

Lecturer: 5/10 – There were some good laughs had and Robert provided interesting and practical insights to careers in finance. However there were some errors and gaping holes in the lecture notes which required you to carefully fill in by reading the text book (never a fun task). Also many lectures were based on 2 or even 3 textbook topics, yet only half of the lecture was dedicated to the lecture notes themselves.

Overall: 8.5/10 – It’s all worth it considering the ease of the subject. And Robert is actually a great guy.

FINC3017: Investments and Portfolio Management
Ease: (7/10) - easiest finance subject ive done
Interest: (7/10) yeah same as other finance subjects really capm, portfolio theory, bonds
Lecturer: (8/10) although he spoke about shit most of the time he was a top bloke. (Jiri)
Overall: 7.5/10

FINC3194: Finance 3 Honours (Securities Markets)
Ease - 5/10 Challenging...as to be expected by an Honours preparatory course.
Lecturers - 9/10 Not surprising given my favourite lecturer of all time was teaching the bulk of it.
Props to Johnstone.
Interest - 9/10 Some really really interesting papers and concepts were discussed.
Overall - 8/10 Hope I HD and have a hope of getting into Honours

FRNC - French

FRNC1631/FRNC 1632: Junior French 5 & 6
These two subjects are basically the same; 6 is just a continuation of 5.
Ease - 8/10
Lecturer - 7/10 (nothing special)
Interest - 5/10- The crap course made me lose interest in an otherwise interesting subject.
Overall - 7/10
GCST - Gender Studies

GCST2601: Introducing Media and Culture

Ease: 7/10 - The lectures and readings were fine. The assessments, however, were irritating. Instead of doing a nice and obvious essay, they make you do slightly offcentre tasks like annotated bibliographies and journal reviews which nobody knows how to do properly (including the tutors). You also have to do inclass writing exercises every lecture.

Lecturer: 5.5/10 - Kath Albury is a good speaker, but she tends to be quite patronising, and she isn't great at explaining the more technical aspects of the course (especially semiotics).

Interest: 4/10 - This might seem like a fun course, but it really isn't. Readings and lectures are dull and everything felt like a rehash of what had already been taught in 1st year sociology.

Overall: 5.5/10 Eh.

GCST3601: Gender, Race and Australian Identities

Ease: 6.5/10 - I always find GCST subjects a little bit difficult - a lot of waffling and painful navel gazing is required. The earlier readings looking at postcolonial theory, critical whiteness studies and writing whiteness are quite difficult, and the lectures did not always clarify the problems. Assessments were a 2500wd journal, a 2000wd essay and class participation.

Lecturers: 6/10 - We had two lecturers for this course, Ann Deslandes and Adam...Something. Both were OK - but tended to speak very quickly, making it difficult to make notes. Sometimes the lectures seemed a little haphazard, other times complex ideas were introduced and not explained clearly.

Interest: 6/10 - I was a little put off by the first half of the course, which is v. theoretical, navel gazing and boring. However, the latter weeks were orientated around more substantive subject matter - such as the War on Terror, the NT Intervention, the Stolen Generations and two fictional texts. Readings ranged from the boring to the fascinating.

Overall: 6/10 - I probably wouldn't have done this course if I had the chance to choose again
GOVT – Government and International Relations

GOVT1101: Australian Politics
Lecturer: Shelly Savage

Ease: 7.5/10.
Nothing in the course was particularly brain-bending, and a good knowledge of the textbook and lecture notes was generally sufficient for the exam. The assessments were pretty dodgy. They expected too much from the very short bibliographic assignment, and they did that hateful thing where they specify the type of sources they want you to use, so you had to use a web site, a government/NGO report, and so on even if there weren't any particularly relevant ones. It took me forever to find a report on my topic, and it wasn't even in Fisher or online, so I had to trek over to the State Library to get it. It wouldn't surprise me if people whose research was less thorough than mine never found a report. So that was pretty poorly thought through by Shelly. Also, most of the essay options relied on a recent case study, which was a problem because they were so recent (2006 stem cell debate, McKew for Bennelong, Brian Burke) that there was no academic literature on them. Again, poorly thought through. Also, some of the questions were quite unclear, a problem which carried over into the exam. But for all those complaints, if you got started early and researched thoroughly there was no real difficulty with the assessments. I got a high credit in the essay and assignment, and probably would've got a distinction if I'd addressed the case study more.

Lecturer: N/A.
I didn't go to the lectures because of a timetable clash. Props to Shelly for having comprehensive notes in the lecture powerpoints she put on Blackboard, though.

Interest: 8/10.
Most of the stuff in this course I found pretty interesting, but I've always been interested in government and civics so that was always going to be the case. Standouts for me were figuring out that elections and parliaments are about far more than simply selecting a government, most of the stuff about federalism/the constitution/the High Court, and some of the stuff about the public service and neoliberalism. But bear in mind that since I didn't go to the lectures these judgements are based on my own interest in the topics and the reading, not on how the material is presented.

Overall: 7.5/10.
This course felt pretty nothingy to me, probably because the only time I spent on it in a normal week was the tute and about an hour skimming the readings. However, I feel that doing the essay and preparing for the exam did give me an appreciation of the workings of democracy and Australian government which I didn't have before, which is a good thing, I suppose. It was reasonably interesting, so if you want to major in GOVT or just want a better understanding of the government then I'd recommend this subject.

GOVT 1101: Australian Politics

Ease: 6/10
It's not hard by any means, the subject matter is straight foward, the lectures are sufficient and the resource book/text book is full of extra information that's useful. On the other hand, it's quite tedious to have to remember a lot of stuff. It's not hard, but it's also not very exciting. The essay was a major furfy as well. The questions were a little vague, and the marking criteria not all that obvious. Perhaps the Economics faculty should take a page out of the Education faculties book and make criteria abundantly clear, and actually mark off the criteria so student knows what they're meant to be aiming for.
The bibliographic essay was a bit of a joke. It's incredibly hard to articulate an entire essay in one page, shortening it down so that it's short, but also appearing as if you know what you're talking about. I didn't do too well in my bibliographic essay, and I think that the poor structure of a preliminary essay which is marked as an actual essay is a bit contradictory, and dumb. Maybe that's just me though...

*Lecturer:* 6.5/10
I had the lecturer, Shelly Savage as the tutor too. I'm a little torn about Shelly. On the one hand, she articulated things quite well, organised the content in a good way and made things fairly straightforward. Her lectures were quite interesting at times. On the other hand, she didn't make much of an effort to make her lectures really interesting (something which is a pity, in this field), I dozed off a few times in her two hour lectures, and I found her personality to be one of being 'head and shoulders above the rest of the scum' type personality. She seems like a snob, and as such I can't really profess to like the lady. Her references to "political scientists", 'sif there is any such thing pissed me off to no end. Fortunately, she kept those references to a minimum (although the resource book was full of it).

*Interest:* 7/10
Interesting for sure...for the most part. The stuff about policy and interest groups was deathly boring, but the content about federation, the constitution and media was actually quite stimulating. Everyone knows what Australian Politics is about though, so it shouldn't come as a surprise that something so diverse would have parts that are interesting to some, and boring to others. It should also be said, that her lecturing style sometimes made the boring parts a little more boring, but also made the exciting parts (media/constitution) a lot more exciting.

*Overall:* 6.5/10
It's a decent course, let down by monotony, occasionally shabby lecturing and an overall personality clash of the subject with my own interests. There's a definite air, or what I perceived to be an air of this subject being a prestigious subject. The references to "political science", the lecturer, the subject matter didn't really bode well with me. I'll also say that it seemed to be, that the course and the content was a bit of a case of overcomplicating things, or so it seemed to me. The "policy cycle" is a great example. It's a case of taking something so simple, and creating something out of nothing. There was an aura of that around most matters in this course. It's extremely difficult to articulate how it sits with me. It just seemed a little snobby is all. I guess that's a personal preference though, and doesn't really speak for the subject...kinda. Still, a decent introduction to Australian Politics and fairly interesting all around. I'll be steering clear from this discipline from now on though (probably because I don't have much more space for electives. 😊)

**GOVT1101: Australian Politics**
Ease: 10/10
Lecturer: 5/10 (Ariadne - if its the other one you're better off)
Interest: 8/10
Overall: 7.5/10

**GOVT1101: Australian Politics**
Ease: 10/10. (If you already follow politics, most of the content will be familiar. Even so, most of the stuff is basic.)
Lecturer: 8/10. (She manages to sustain interest)
Interest: 9.5/10. (As quite a political person, i find the course to be quite stimulating.)
Overall: 8.5/10.
GOVT1105: Geopolitics
Lecturer: Dr Diarmuid Maguire

Ease: 7/10.
Most of the interesting stuff - on the rise of China, resource geopolitics and that sort of thing - was pretty easy, but the more abstract topics, mostly the cultural ones, were a bit more difficult to grasp, especially considering their apparent irrelevance to the course. (I also had a rambling replacement tutor for some of those topics, so that's probably part of it.) In terms of assessment, I thought that two 750-word assignments as well as a 2000-word essay was slightly (although only slightly) excessive for a junior unit. I would reduce it to just the bibliographic assignment and the essay, since the critical reading assignment was utterly pointless. It involved taking two articles, allegedly written from opposite sides of the same issue, and writing a comparison: but since most of the article pairs were only tangentially related, it was pretty difficult. The essay itself wasn't too bad as long as you stuck to the easy topics, although I felt they marked a bit harshly.

Lecturer: 7/10.
I'm finding it hard to come to a conclusion about Diarmuid. Some of the lectures were quite interesting, but he tended to ramble a bit or cover things in a very shallow manner (sometimes it seemed that his geopolitical analyses basically involved thinking of as many aspects of sovereignty, economics, culture and territory for a topic as he could, then listing them). His lectures need more detail to engage people a bit more, I think. I'd like to single out the lecture on protest for criticism: it was confusing, boring and apparently pointless, as it didn't have an attached tute or readings and didn't come up in the exam. Apparently he just talked about it because it happens to be his research topic. It was hell. But for all that criticism, I thought that Diarmuid was slightly OK. He gave just about enough of an overview - if you could strip back the rambling - to allow you to work out the bare bones of the topic, to which you could then add the readings and your own thoughts to get some idea of the topics. I'd also like to praise Betsi Beem's guest lecture, which was excellent, and refreshingly detailed and structured compared to Diarmuid.

As I've been saying, some of it was interesting. Much of it was appalling. Much of the reason for that appallingness was the difficulty in understanding what the topics we were studying had to do with the course. Sometimes they'd have a geopolitical topic - like migration and refugees, or the political aspects of sport - but then give us readings largely irrelevant to the geopolitical aspects of the topic, and/or fail to tie it back to the core of the course in the tute. The lectures didn't explain the links very well either.

Overall: 6.5/10.
Unfocused, unfocused, unfocused. Some weeks were really good - the ones about resources and geostrategy and generally what the course description suggested the course was about - but a significant number didn't really seem to have any relevance to anything. The lack of coherence in the course made it extremely difficult to study for in some cases, and left you with the feeling that you hadn't really learnt much at all. I'd find it hard to recommend this course to anyone who isn't forced to do it by their degree (poor fools), and I'd like to emphasise to people considering doing junior government and IR that GOVT1101 Australian Politics is probably the pick of a bad bunch. Do that instead.

GOVT1105: Geopolitics
Ease: 6/10
Lecturer: 2/10
Interest: 4/10
Overall: 4/10
I didn’t like this course at all. A few reasons existed for this
1) I didn’t like Diarmuid Maguire at all. I found that he trailed off at the end of sentences, making it hard to listen and to follow a train of thought. He tended to mumble and his information often didn’t really correlate to the subject matter at hand.
2) The course content is interesting, don’t get me wrong. But the way its presented in lectures makes it look like mould, the tutorials don’t really further the information at all, the readings tend to be a little off kilter to the subject matter and the assessment material were COMPLETELY off centre. Not to mention the final exam didn’t actually test what it said it would.
3) Geopolitics (as a school of thought) is largely defunct anyway, so studying it seemed to be a little pointless. Admittedly its making a comeback, but nonetheless, Diarmuid didn’t really point out the links or relevance at all.

I’ve found that people tend to fall into two categories with this course. They either love Diarmuid and hence, the course, or they hate him and the course.

Oh, he’s supposed to be a Neo-Marxist too – I didn’t really see much bias there, but then again, I slept through most of the lectures anyways so maybe there was, maybe there wasn’t, I have no idea.

The assessment for this unit was APPALLING. It was all over the shop. We were told that the exam content would come from the readings and tutorials – instead they were obscure facts here and there mishmashed from lectures or some readings. The major essays were also unrelated to course content.

**GOVT1105: Geopolitics**

*Lecturer: Diarmuid Maguire*

Ease: 8/10: Pretty straightforward, you just have to adapt your brain to think about everything in a geopolitical sense (which was kinda hard at the beginning of the course). The assignments weren’t overly hard, but the exam was pretty tough - you needed to have extensive knowledge of the readings; I actually found the essays to be easier than the short answers in the exam. Plus, for me, I had a tutor that was a really hard marker.

Lecturer: 7.5/10: Diarmuid is a bit of a mixed bag; at times he was great, wasn’t ever boring, made some jokes that were pretty funny at times, and he kept lectures contemporary. Though he did have the tendency to trail off, mumble and whisper at the end of a sentence, which made things difficult sometimes.

Interest: 10/10 - I loved the content of this course, its exactly the kinda thing Im interested in.

Overall: 9/10 - Great course overall. The only negative thing I have to say about it, is about my tutor. He was a great guy and everything, but he just tended to treat as like children at times. And he was a very, let me say that again, VERY strict marker, which put a damper on things, especially when I thought that my essay deserved a higher mark than it got. Ah well. But yeh, definately recommended for anyone interested in govt and int relations.

**GOVT1105: Geopolitics**

Ease: 7/10
Lecturer: 4/10
Interest: 8.5/10
Overall: 7/10

**GOVT1105: Geopolitics**

Ease: 7/10 The content isn't hard but it is very boring - its difficult to concentrate on what your doing
Lecturer: 3/10 (Unorganised, doesn't explain things very well, and sometimes he trails off his sentences so that you dont know what he is saying. Also, lectures are 2 hrs long - and finish at 6pm)
Interest: 5/10 (Some weeks are interesting, some aren’t. The readings are deadly boring)
Overall: 4.5/10 (Not as interesting and fun as it sounds in the faculty handbook)

**GOVT1105: Geopolitics**

*Ease:* 8/10. The exam required you to discuss specific details from the readings but it was easy enough to remember. Tutorial content, especially from the reader, was more important than the generality of the lectures and text.
*Lecturer:* 9/10. Lectures were very interesting. Diarmuid Maguire speaks well, I don't get it when people say he's boring.
*Interest:* 10/10. I love govt+international relations.
*Overall:* 9/10. Geopolitics especially - examining how international relations are influenced by the economics etc of geography, is so cool.

-----

**GOVT1202: World Politics**

*Ease:* 7/10 - I found the assessment essays to be particularly difficult. It takes a long time to actually figure out what you're arguing, in relation to political theory. The exam was multiple choice based entirely on the concepts of the readings. If you actually have time to study the readings that much, you will do well in the exam. Because I didn't have time to do that.. my HD mark fell to a final mark of C. It was very difficult in this subject, more than any other for me, to balance the challenging assignments with the completion of course work.
*Lecturers:* 9/10 - I was one of the few people that liked Gil Merom. It's very difficult to follow what he's saying initially, not at all because of his accent, but just his style of speaking. Like out of nowhere he'll say something like "and secondly!" when there wasn't even a first point. But once you get it, he has alot to say and there's alot for you to write.
*Interest:* 10/10 - Such political theory is very important for senior govt units.
*Overall:* 9/10 - Though it was hard, I enjoyed it.

**GOVT1202: World Politics**

*Ease:* 3/10 - I hated it more than anything, readings were boring, essay was long and fucked and the exam was farcical. Too many readings, which are too hard to read due to their absolute blandness.
*Lecturer:* 0/10 - Worst ever, cannot be understood. Went to half the first lecture and that was the extent of my involvement with him. He was just so painful. Tutor was ok, but knew my hatred of the course so didn't like me.
*Interest:* 0/10 - Absolute pointless piece of shit. Why do you have to throw complex and confusing theory onto common sense concepts. I just hated it.
*Overall:* 1/10 - I can't believe I passed. Worst subject ever. DO NOT DO IT. I can happily say that will be the last connection I will ever have with the Economics faculty. Fuck you Govt and fuck you economics.

**GOVT1202: World Politics**

*Ease:* 6/10 - The content is dense and convoluted, and this is compounded by tedium. Despite clearly outlined criteria, the marking of essays remained contentious, unclear and questionable. Readings are too incoherent, too boring, and this translates into crap tute marks all around.
The exam however is a category unto itself. Questions are ambiguous and the topics examined are totally out of the blue - a clear trend over the years apparently. Hardly anyone gets a over 80% in this.

Lecturer: 5/10 - As incoherent as the readings. I had a clash, meaning I could never stay for a full 2 hour lecture, but at least I came out alive and kicking everytime. Gil Merom lovers are a weird species, but they exist.

Interest: 3/10 - Who cares if it's politically and academically relevant - not meaning to be cliched, its as boring as batshit.

Overall: 4.5/10 - Enough to put one off GOVT altogether, but older kids advise to keep the faith...

**GOVT1202: World Politics**

*Ease: 8/10* - The subject is quite easy overall, but the exam will pwn you hardcore. The average for this multiple choice exam is below 50%, so that's saying something. A lot of the questions will be very obscure. However, there were also waaaaay too many readings.

*Lecturer: 2/10* - I learnt the least from Gil, compared to any of my past lecturers. It's strange. No matter how hard I tried to concentrate and listen, I couldn't. There's something about his voice that does that to you.

*Interest: 5/10* - The concept of the course, world politics, interested me, but the execution of the course didn't. Some of the readings were rather interesting, but overall, I would avoid this subject.

*Overall: 3/10* - Very boring subject, which is compounded by a horrible lecturer. I wish that I enjoyed it a lot more, but sadly, it was crap. I'm also going to stay away from the discipline of govt in the future.

**GOVT 1202 – World Politics**

Ease: 6/10  
Lecturer: 3/10  
Interest: 4/10  
Overall: 5/10

This course was a theoretical introduction to the study of political science. The lecturer, Gil Merom, is very hard to understand, speaks very fast, with a very thick accent.

He is extremely knowledgeable and very smart – PhD from Cornell etc. It takes a lot of effort to maintain consciousness in his lectures so come prepared with strong coffee.

Seriously though, World Politics will put you in good steed for senior Government subjects, even if it is a labour of love. The theoretical foundations are handy to understand, although if you don’t fully get it I wouldn’t worry too much as they are covered again in the later years.

Like Geopol, World Politics should have been a great subject, but a combination of difficult lecturer, uninspiring tutor and bad time management on my part with the less than average assessment meant that the course as a whole was not enjoyable for me.

It seems though that all first year Government subjects are pretty bad. Please don’t let this deter you though. It gets better. Promise!
GOVT1202: World Politics
Ease - 4/10
Lecturer - 2/10
Interest - 2/10
Overall - 2/10

GOVT1202: World Politics
Ease - 10/10
Lecturer - 7/10 - if you can understand his wog accent
Interest - 0/10 - i've already studied pol sci
Overall - 6/10 - not hard to get a credit/ distinction, you won't get better if your tutor thinks (s)he is top shit.

GOVT1202: World Politics
Ease: 6/10
Lecturer: 8/10 once you get over the accent
Interest 9/10
Overall: 8/10

-----

GOVT1406: International Business and Politics
Ease: 5/10 (3 assessments in 5 weeks!!! - also marks very harshly)
Lecturer: 7/10
Interest: 5.5/10
Overall: 4/10

GOVT1406: International Business and Politics
Ease - 8/10
Lecturer - 5/10 (Darryl Dickhead Jarvis)
Interest - 8/10
Overall - 7/10

GOVT1406: International Business and Politics
Ease - 5/10 - lot of reading if you get an anal tutor, like 200 pages per week
Lecturer - 4/10 you either like his ego, or you don't. i did -penalised him for doing less than half of the lectures. guest lecturers suck.
Interest - 0/10
Overall - 2/10

GOVT 2119: Southeast Asia: Dilemmas of Development
Ease: 8/10, Lecturer: 8/10, Interest: 8/10, Overall: 8/10

If you like facts and figures and you're interested in South East Asia developmental issues then this is a really good course.

If you don’t mind a little raised voices either, then Dr. Lily Rahim is a pretty good lecturer as well. This is her area of expertise and she is good (she is the supervisor for the Honours students specialising in SE Asian Politics) with a comprehensive knowledge of the region, in particular, Singapore & Malaysia. She also has extensive knowledge about Islam and about the rise of militant Islam in South-East Asia in recent years.
The reason I say that a liking of facts and figures is needed is because the nature of the course, dealing with one country/topic per week, means that we speed along, cramming tonnes of information into a small pocket of time, without really analysing. It seems that a lot of facts are given without much analysis – although, as senior students, this is really our job I suppose.

Assessment was good. Tutorials are HEAVILY weighted in this UoS, with 25% on your presentation and paper alone. Assessment was all good, nothing nasty or scary and was heavily tied to the lecture material. Again, showing up to lectures and doing some readings is good enough to get you there.

**GOVT2119: Southeast Asia: Dilemmas of Development**

*Ease: 8/10* - The assessment is really spread out here in terms of value, so much so that if you do well enough during the semester, even if you just manage to pass the 25% worth final exam, you could still manage a Distinction. Again, 30% from tutorials alone.

*Lecturer: 7/10* - Some found Lily Rahim slightly intimidating, and a bit lacking in warmth maybe, I didn't think so, but most would agreed that she is quite helpful. Some found her a bit grating, wasn't an issue for me. She knows her stuff and is heavily involved in her research expertise (for instance, that morning when she announced that she just 'flew in from Southeast Asia', fresh from the region she was about to lecture us on. How very appropriate).

*Interest: 9/10* - One of the surviving remnants of the former Economic History Department, recast as GOVT unit. Fascinating topics - East Asian political economic development, democracy versus growth, regionalism, the politicisation of Islam. I might just major in Asian Studies because of it.

*Overall: 8/10* - I did have my expectations, and yeah, it was pretty much what I expected it to be. Great source for empirical evidence to use in essays for other units.

**GOVT2119: Southeast Asia: Dilemmas of Development**
Lecturer: Dr Lily Rahim

*Ease: 8/10.* basically no theoretical content so the material wasn't hard to learn. in terms of assessment, i thought there was a tad too much: 30 minute presentation with a partner, 4000 word report on your presentation done in your pair, 2000 word essay, mid-semester test and end of semester exam. the 4000 word report was epically pointless because it was basically a written version of the pres. final exam was heaps easy, she basically told us the questions in the final lecture.

*Lecturer: 7.5/10.* lily is a reasonably good speaker who gets through a lot of content in her lectures, but they're basically just listings of facts and figures without much analysis or theoretical insight to make the course about more than just getting a general knowledge of the region. she definitely has her own opinions, though, and it's worth researching stuff yourself to ensure that you're not taking her particular opinions as gospel. (the material on guanxi is a case in point - she presented it very postively, but people in my tute with experience of the guanxi system said that in some cases it's just systematised corruption.)

*Interest: 7.5/10.* varied. each week is on a different topic - which is either a country or a theme like islam or democracy - so it really depends on how much you're interested in each one. overall it's reasonably ok if you're interested in the region. i would have liked coverage of vietnam, the philippines, cambodia and so on - the focus was almost exclusively on the archipelagic states.
Overall: 7.5/10. I don't really have strong feelings about this course in either direction. I'd recommend it to govt majors because knowledge of the region could really come in handy, but it's nothing to write home about.

**GOVT2226: International Organisations**
Lecturer - 5/10  
Ease - 5/10  
Interest: 8/10  
Overall: 7/10 - very difficult exam, only one big assessment, quite a lot of readings, very hardlined on rules, definitely not for one wanting to take it easy

**GOVT 2445: American Politics and Foreign Policy**
Ease: 8/10, Lecturer: 9/10, Interest: 9/10, Overall: 9/10

By far the most useful unit of study I've undertaken at my time at University so far. Conducted by Dennis Phillips (no link!! Sorry!!), a lecturer from Macquarie University visiting USyd, he is a former Texan who has been living in Australia since the 1970's. More importantly though, as Dennis is actually American, his perspective is that which is perhaps more accurate and more whole than say, the opinion of an Australian who had gone to study American politics.

He is also not without bias, but Dennis freely acknowledges them and indeed, gives his background to explain why this may be the case. For example, whilst being against the Bush Administration and critical of the administrations foreign policy directives, he can also state that he understands the staunch, Southern Republican voter because his parents are of that stock.

The course is basically set in two parts: domestic American Politics and American Foreign Policy. The latter section is not as good, only because time constraints meant that we weren't able to study it in as much depth as required for such a vast topic. The topic is also, very contentious and ever-increasing so a comprehensive coverage was always going to be difficult.

The first section though is really really good. It explains a lot about America, the psyche of Americans and how and why their political system works. By studying the foundations of American politics, we can learn a lot about the current situation, the current Administration and, to a lesser degree the effect that is has on the world.

Lectures were excellent (although again, the lectures for the Foreign Policy component were virtually word for word the same as the text), tutes were great and the readings were useful. Assessment wasn't exactly easy but it was good it didn't really tie in with what we were learning but it built upon it well.

I would thoroughly recommend this course to ALL government students.

**GRMN - German**

**GRMN1631/GRMN1632: Junior German 5 & 6**
Ease - 8.5/10 - I like German. I loved it at school. It's not giving me much grief at uni at all.  
Lecturer(s) - 8/10 - Emilie, Kenny and Udo were/are great.  
Interest - 8/10  
Overall - 8/10
HPSC - History and Philosophy of Science

HPSC1000
Ease: 7/10 lots of essays marked fairly hardly, but no exam
Lecturer: 8/10 very solid
Interest: 7/10 they really start to scrape the barrel at the end
Overall: 7/10

HSTY - History

HSTY1022: Europe in the High Middle Ages

Ease: 7/10 - Not simple, nor is it overly hard. Solid in its workload, but you can easily not do any readings except the one your tute preso is on for the entire semester, and thats what I did and still sounded intellectual in tutorial discussions. Essays are short and straight foward, get some books from the libes and you are set.

Lecturer: 6/10 - It's hard for me to judge Pryor as I gave up on lectures after 2 weeks just cause I cbf, no other eason really. I spose if he was more engaging I would have rocked up.

Interest: 8/10- I love religious history, ESPECIALLY in the middle ages, which made this course extremely intriguing for me. The good part is I could just ignore all the other shit and concentrate on those aspects of the course that I enjoyed.

Overall: 6/10- Solid course, interesting and yeah shame it is being scrapped, which I had no idea about, probably because it was mentioned in a lecturer that I wasn't at.

HSTY 1022: Europe in the High Middle Ages
Ease - 9.5/10
Lecturers - 8/10
Interest - 8/10
Overall - 8.5/10 (If u can write essays u can win this subject)

HSTY1025: The Middle Ages 500-1500
Lecturers: Lynette Olson and Julie Smith

Ease: 6 (Oh man, did I get caned on my 'Historical Significance' piece of work; plus there's a lot of reading)
Lecturer: 10 (Lyn Olson is the bomb! I think Julie only took a couple because I missed two weeks of lectures due to union stuff, and they were the only weeks she was there. Seriously, though, I actually make time to go to the lectures, unlike just about everything else.)
Interest: 10 (I'm loving this subject, particularly its focus on church history, Islamic history and some of the things that happened just after the collapse of the Western Roman Empire)
Overall: 9 (I would have given it a 10 except for the difficulty)
HSTY1031: Renaissance and Reformation 1498-1648

Ease: 8/10.
The assessment for this was very straightforward. The final exam was a take-home and he basically gave us the questions in the last lecture so you knew what you were studying for. I haven't collected my essay yet so I'm not sure how I went on it, but I didn't have any trouble when writing it.

Lecturer: 8/10.
Dr Fitzmaurice is an awesome lecturer. He was very engaging and really knew his stuff. The two-hour lectures were difficult to concentrate in, however. I would have rathered two one-hour lectures. Furthermore, he didn't post his notes on WebCT, which would have made things much easier. He did post the audio, but I don't have the concentration to listen to it.

Some of the topics were very fascinating, such as the Reformation and Milton's republicanism. Others were dull. It was very hit and miss. The course is structured in a way that places a lot of emphasis on the history of ideas and of philosophy, rather than an events-based narrative history. I prefer the narrative approach, but I still enjoyed this course on the whole because most of this period is interesting. Plus, learning about liberty and republicanism in one segment of the course appealed to me because a lot of these works were the forerunners of classical liberal ideology. There were a lot of readings which could be rather difficult - don't let the Middle English and the density of them sap your interest. Doing the readings would be useful, but you don't need to do all of them - if you do the ones that interest you, you'll cruise through. The tutorials were dull, and it wasn't the fault of our tutor - he really did try and spark us into discussion. It was a pity that one mature-aged student felt the need to dominate the entire tutorial every week, and interjected at every conceivable opportunity in order to ramble at length about whatever opinions she held. This made everyone else in the tutorials remain quiet for the most part, and so most of us lost interest. I fell asleep in quite a few tutorials, to be honest.

Overall: 6.5/10.
This was a good course with a good lecturer, but the fact that it was ideas and not events-based dragged the mark down a little. What really spoiled it, however, were the tutorials, which were absolutely painful. I still recommend this, because it's not really the fault of the lecturer or the topics or anything that really could have been prevented.

HSTY1044: Twentieth Century Politics and History
Lecturers: Judith Keene, Margaret Poulos

Ease: 7/10
Everything was pretty straight forward, there were no curve balls in any of the subjects or anything. But I guess, there was alot of info packed into one course. The first assignment was one of those historiography type questions; the actual question though was worded real wierd, and got a bit confusing sometimes, I found. There were a crap load of questions to choose fro for the major essay, so that was a plus. The exam was easy, but thats only because my tutor told us pretty much exactly what each question was beforehand; if not, I guess the exam would have been pretty hard.

Lecturers: Judith 7/10, Margaret 5/10
Judith was pretty goood, she had an enthusiasm for what she was doing. She was a bit too feminist, though, for my liking, and a bit leftist. Many of the subjects were explained in ways that you would think would be reserved for a senior, and more specialised unit.
Margaret... meh. She was boring. Also a bit leftist - she took a marxist view for explaining the Nazi state for crying out loud!
Interest: 6/10 - I was interested in it at the beginning, just because I hadn't much in modern history, but I was slightly disappointed overall.

Overall: 6.5/10 - The problem with this unit was that it was way too leftist... A lot of the readings were from a feminist perspective, and the lectures. Some of the views taken just seemed to be out of place with the subjects; sometimes it just made things confusing. I dunno, for a junior course, they just should have explored the basic points of the twentieth century, at least the basic ideas and facts for each subject; yet the course seemed to look at the more abstract ideas that (I would think) should be reserved for senior units.

**HSTY 1044: Twentieth Century Politics and Culture**
Ease 8/10
Lecturer: 3.5/10
Interest: 3.5/10
Overall: 5/10

Chris Hilliard took this course last year for whatever reason, as Dr. Judith Keene was mostly unavailable for most of the semester. In the end, the one lecture we had with Dr. Keene was so bad (dry, boring, condescending and dull) that it made us all feel very grateful to have Dr. Hilliard. His lectures were fairly interesting, certainly engaging enough to make you want to turn up.

In terms of content, the course was very similar to that of HSTY 1045, and certainly without as much emphasis on politics or culture as the unit of study title would lead you to believe.

Again, the assessment was fairly straightforward as well, with no kinks or unpleasant surprises. (I really should have wrote all my first year reviews when I could still remember everything!!)

**HSTY1044: Twentieth Century Politics and Culture**
Ease: 8/10 - The content covered isn't difficult to grasp, and the assessments were all fairly straightforward. The hardest part of the course were the tutorial readings, which were very dense, and sometimes seemed random and irrelevant to the course.

Lecturer: 6.5/10 - I thought Chris got better as the semester progressed. But it seemed like he was quite nervous when he spoke, and for some reason that made it difficult for me to listen to him. Sometimes he mumbles, and sometimes I didn't feel like he explained things very well.

Interest: 5.5/10 - I was really looking forwards to this course, but most of the content seemed to be either rehashing things that I already knew, or learning things that were random and not relevant. The lectures some weeks could be painfully dull, as could the tutorials.

Overall: 6.5/10
HSTY 1045: Modern European History 1750 -1914

Ease: 7/10
Lecturer: 7/10
Interest: 5/10
Overall: 7/10

Robert Aldrich specialises in French History and History of Sexuality – these are where the two biases in the course lie. This is not to say that without a grasp of these topics you won’t get anywhere – the bias is no where near as strong as it is in the Political Economy department. Rather, you’ll find that, particularly with France, this is where Dr. Aldrich takes most of his examples.

Course content was fairly engaging, if a little dry at times. My tutor was an “interesting” character to say the least – nothing much was learnt in his tute, and as most of us didn’t do the readings either, we spent a lot of time just looking at each other, or arguing about things mostly unrelated to the topic.

Assessment wasn’t difficult. Essay was fairly stock standard – read the question, read at least 2 of the books on the suggested reading list and answer the question directly and wholly. You should be fine.

HSTY 1045: Modern European History 1750 -1914

Ease - 2/10
Lecturer - 7/10 what he said was very informative, but he spoke way too quietly.
Interest - 7/10
Overall - 3/10 it was interesting, but i hated it. it was too political

HSTY 1045: Modern European History 1750 -1914

Ease: 6.5/10 Very obscure stuff but not much work
Lecturer: 5/10 Depressingly boring
Interest 2/10 the most boring subject ever
Overall: 4/10

HSTY 1045: Modern European History 1750 -1914

Lecturer: Robert Aldrich
Ease: 7.5/10 (It's not marked too harshly and the texts + lectures are understandable. There is quite a lot of reading however, and its a hell of a lot of content to remember)
Lecturer: 7/10 (Robert does a good job of making a v.broad topic logical and comprehensible - but the lectures can sometimes be a little dull and he talks too softly)
Interest: 6/10 (Some weeks are interesting, some are v.v. dull)
Overall: 7/10

HSTY1076: American History from Lincoln to Clinton

Lecturer: Clare Corbould
Ease: 6 (A fair amount of reading and it's quite harshly marked. I was told 10% failed, 70% passed and only 20% got higher marks for the last assessment.)
Lecturer: 9 (She's awesome and she's also my tute leader. She has a really dry sense of humour and covers the material in a coherent and easily-followed way.)
Interest: 7 (This is bumped much higher due to the lecturer. I'm not as into cultural history as other aspects, and this course has a lot of focus on it. Plus, there's too much focus on 'minority group history', at least in the tutes, for my liking.)
Overall: 7 (I love American history but I don't really like the focus of this course - based mostly on tutes, to be fair - as much as I should. Plus, too much cultural history.)
HSTY1088: Australian History: An Introduction
Lecturer: Dr James Curran

Ease: 8.5/10.
Content-wise, there was nothing that was much of a stretch, although some weeks there was a ton of reading. (The 'Debating the Bush' tute in particular: there was a massive article about Tom Roberts' painting Shearing the Rams as well as quite a lot of other stuff, and most people in my tute struggled to get through it all.) In terms of assessment, the load was pretty average. There was a 500-word source analysis type thing, which I thought asked us to do a bit too much given the word limit, but it wasn't really that much of a problem. Other than that, hand-in assessment consisted of a 2000-word essay, for which there were a lot of questions to choose from (17, to be precise) and handy reading lists. The exam also seemed fair to me, with a decent balance between broad sweeping themes and more specific topical areas. Overall, it was about average difficulty for a junior arts course.

Lecturer: 8.5/10.
James really knows his stuff, particularly about national identity and politics (which was his PhD topic). I felt his lectures were very strong on conceptual issues like identity, national legends, legacies of colonialism and so on which formed the basis of the course, although he was a bit weak on providing chronological/narrative background in some lectures. This was a problem because a lot of people (tons of American exchange students in this course, for some reason) hadn't studied Australian history before, and no one had studied Australian history before federation, which isn't covered in the School Certificate course. James also sometimes rushed through stuff - the lecture on Eureka was a standout in this regard - and there was no WebCT, which meant no recordings or slides to go back to if you missed it the first time. Those criticisms aside, James is an excellent lecturer and I'd fully recommend seeking out his other subjects.

Interest: 9/10.
The course focused on Australian identity and it how it was imagined and transformed over the period from the mid-eighteenth century to the present day. This sounds like typical arts wankery, and in a sense it is, but I found it really fascinating - my particular favourite, which came up again and again, was the bush legend, the idea that Lawson, Paterson and co.'s disaffection with city life led them to idealise the bush in their work, and that this led to the idealisation of so-called bush values like mateship, the fair go, contempt for authority and so on, which still form a key part of 'Australianness', as well as creating the idea that the 'bushman' is the archetypal Australian despite Australia being a primarily urban country. I think this sort of thing is fascinating, which is the primary reason I enjoyed the course so much. I can imagine that people who didn't find this as interesting as I did would rate the course lower. Other important areas in the course were the White Australia Policy (both immigration and Aboriginal aspects), the ANZAC legend, Australia as a 'workingman's paradise' and a 'social laboratory', and how Australian identity is constructed and imagined today. I found all of this stuff really interesting as well.

Overall: 9/10.
This course gave me a new perspective on Australian history and on modern Australia which has made me more appreciative of the country, which is probably a good thing. I'm now more interested in studying Australian history and am strongly considering changing my major from ANHS to HSTY in order to do it at honours level. Really good course, strongly recommended. (Shame they're cancelling it and replacing it with an entirely new course as of next year.)

HSTY1088: Australian History and Introduction
Ease: 7.5/10 - There isn't anything especially difficult about this course. Some of the readings are a little dense, but mostly the content is easy to understand. I thought the question they gave us for the essay was tricky though.
Lecturer: 6.5/10 - I like Penny - but in a lot of her lectures she planned to say too much, and so she'd have to fit the last half of the lecture into 10 minutes.
Interest: 6.5/10 - I was expecting this course to be v.v. dull, but it was actually fairly interesting. The topics and ideas covered in the lectures and tutorials were mostly entertaining, although there were some weeks that were just painful.
Overall: 7/10

HSTY1089: Australia: Colonies to Nation (1788-1970s)
Richard Waterhouse

Ease: 7/10 – Source analysis was a piece of cake after modern history in the HSC. Essay was extremely boring to research and boring to write. Exam was relatively painless, as we got given a choice of 3 out of 12 essay questions, all of which we were given word-for-word in the last lecture. Interest: 9/10 – I missed almost all the lectures, but I listened to them on Lectopia and they were clear, accessible and interesting. Yes, Australian history was actually INTERESTING, brought up some fascinating stuff. Many thanks to our lecturer, who by the way has an awesome Australian accent =)
Lecturer: 10/10 – I already said this, didn't I?
Overall: 7/10 – Adored the lectures on Lectopia. Unfortunately, did not enjoy the tutorials at all - too many people to make your voice heard. Also did not enjoy any of the assessments.

However, if you *have* to do Australian history, this one won't scare you off. MAYBE even the opposite.

HSTY2601: Religion and Society - Conversion and Culture

Ease: 6/10 - There's very little in the way of assessment for this course. The essay is worth 50%, the takehome is worth 40% and tute participation makes up the rest. The essay was okay, but choose your topic carefully - there are a lot of very obscure questions and not a whole lot of material/sources to study from. The takehome exam seemed to be easy until you actually picked it up. I didn't think it was possible for there to be so many obscure questions in one paper, but it is a really narrow field of study. In a word, difficult. I'll allow for slightly higher marks in this category simply because I missed half a semester out of illness, so undoubtedly it was more difficult for me because I couldn't attend a fair chunk of it.

Lecturers: Lyn Olson 9/10, Ahmad Shboul 5/10, Chris Hartney 3/10
This course is split into three sections. Lyn Olson takes the first section on Medieval Christianity, which was my favourite section of the course and the whole reason I persevered with it. As seen in both my previous reviews of Lyn's subjects, I love her lecturing style and find her to be rather fascinating. Ahmad did the next section, on Islam, and due to illness I missed most of these. The few I went to, I found him to be interesting if rather quiet, and he does have a rather heavy accent. The powerpoints he puts up are a big help. Chris Hartney does a section on Chinese Buddhism and I found this to be entirely dull. He rambles, puts up no powerpoints or anything, and strays from the topic quite a bit. I gave up on his lectures after the first couple.

Interest: 6/10 - I did this course for two reasons: I'm interested in church history and Lyn Olson was lecturing. That proved to be insufficient for this course to gain good marks. In fact, I'm giving it higher marks than it deserves simply because I enjoyed her section. I'm not interested in either Islamic or Buddhist history, to be honest. Islamic history I could deal with because Ahmad Shboul was concise and got to the point, but the Buddhist section was intolerable. Aside from the fact that Chris Hartney waffles, I could barely keep up with the stream of Chinese religious figures, and what was said in lectures had very little relevance to anything at all. I found that part of the course entirely devoid of anything interesting, though I tried. The closest thing I got to something that piqued my
curiosity was seeing the word 'Draco' nestled somewhere in the notes a friend passed onto me for this section of the course.

*Overall: 4/10* - If you like thematic courses with a lot of obscure content, this will be wonderful for you. I advise most sane people to steer clear. Veridis got it right when he called it a 'wanky thematic course' in another thread. I wanted so much to like it but I just couldn't. The course is piecemeal and has no clear thread running through it; there are very few resources and it really just overall wasn't what I expected it to be. Also - WEBCT, people! That would make things so much easier!

**HSTY2601: Religion and Society - Conversion and Culture**

*Ease: 6/10* - There's very little in the way of assessment for this course. The essay is worth 50%, the takehome is worth 40% and tute participation makes up the rest. The essay was okay, but choose your topic carefully - there are a lot of very obscure questions and not a whole lot of material/sources to study from. The takehome exam seemed to be easy until you actually picked it up. I didn't think it was possible for there to be so many obscure questions in one paper, but it is a really narrow field of study. In a word, difficult. I'll allow for slightly higher marks in this category simply because I missed half a semester out of illness, so undoubtedly it was more difficult for me because I couldn't attend a fair chunk of it.

*Lecturers:* Lyn Olson 9/10, Ahmad Shboul 5/10, Chris Hartney 3/10

This course is split into three sections. Lyn Olson takes the first section on Medieval Christianity, which was my favourite section of the course and the whole reason I persevered with it. As seen in both my previous reviews of Lyn's subjects, I love her lecturing style and find her to be rather fascinating. Ahmad did the next section, on Islam, and due to illness I missed most of these. The few I went to, I found him to be interesting if rather quiet, and he does have a rather heavy accent. The powerpoints he puts up are a big help. Chris Hartney does a section on Chinese Buddhism and I found this to be entirely dull. He rambles, puts up no powerpoints or anything, and strays from the topic quite a bit. I gave up on his lectures after the first couple.

*Interest: 6/10* - I did this course for two reasons: I'm interested in church history and Lyn Olson was lecturing. That proved to be insufficient for this course to gain good marks. In fact, I'm giving it higher marks than it deserves simply because I enjoyed her section. I'm not interested in either Islamic or Buddhist history, to be honest. Islamic history I could deal with because Ahmad Shboul was concise and got to the point, but the Buddhist section was intolerable. Aside from the fact that Chris Hartney waffles, I could barely keep up with the stream of Chinese religious figures, and what was said in lectures had very little relevance to anything at all. I found that part of the course entirely devoid of anything interesting, though I tried. The closest thing I got to something that piqued my curiosity was seeing the word 'Draco' nestled somewhere in the notes a friend passed onto me for this section of the course.

*Overall: 4/10* - If you like thematic courses with a lot of obscure content, this will be wonderful for you. I advise most sane people to steer clear. Veridis got it right when he called it a 'wanky thematic course' in another thread. I wanted so much to like it but I just couldn't. The course is piecemeal and has no clear thread running through it; there are very few resources and it really just overall wasn't what I expected it to be. Also - WEBCT, people! That would make things so much easier!

**HSTY 2614: Australian Social History**

*Lecturer:* 7/10

*Ease:* 7/10

*Interest:* 1/10

*Overall:* 3/10
HSTY2655: Race Relations and Australian Frontiers

Ease: 7/10. Being a person who is not historically minded, I didn't find the material in this unit too challenging. Maybe this is because we're only looking at one aspect of Australian history, rather than Aussie history as a whole. The focussed nature of this unit gave it a common theme (duh) with which to link all of the lectures, tutes and readings. The assessment was pretty straightforward, with the standard essay and tute paper, with no nasty surprises in the take-home exam.

Lecturer: 7/10. Kirsten was pretty cool. She is one of those lecturers who gets annoyed with people who show up late, but to make up for this she showed a bit of CNNNN in one of the lectures, and the information is presented in a straightforward manner.

Interest: 5/10. I'm not particularly interested in Australian history, but I skipped surprisingly few lectures for this one because it was presented in a comprehensible manner, and was made interesting and relevant. The only reason I didn't score this higher is because of my general lack of interest in history, Australian or otherwise.

Overall: 7/10. Can't complain. Was easy enough, and there weren't any nasty surprises.

HSTY2670: New York, New York

Ease: (9/10)
10% for tutorial participation, the other 90% from three 1500 word essays, which were delivered evenly across the semester, this has been by far the most organized and accommodating unit I've been in, they history faculty really knows what they're doing. Lectures more or less followed the history of the city chronologically, while tutorials covered specific places (e.g. Five Points, Greenwich Village) or features (Subways, Skyscrapers, Pools), together providing an extremely clear vision of the city.
The first essay concerned an event in the city, and the second a place, so each allowed you to combine aspects of lectures and tutorials in a very simple way. Although lectures were recorded, those for the first half of the semester were so soft as to be inaudible on my laptop, the early ones especially cutting in and out a lot, though the problem was eventually fixed. The reader was a bit too large though, particularly factoring in online components, that we were always expected to have read.

Lecturer: (8/10)
Stephen Robertson was a great, intelligent and entertaining lecturer, really demonstrating his experience with and love for the city, packing in a huge amount of information but always with clarity. Sometimes it was held back a bit by the impersonal, huge classes. The number of students also meant that tutorial times filled up quickly, class numbers were huge, and accessing resources, even in Fisher Reserve, could be difficult.

Interest: (7/10)
Really provided a good sense of the history of New York from its founding to the present, and always seamlessly connecting the greater economic and political changes to the changing experiences of ordinary people, with a good emphasis on cultural trends.

Overall: (9/10)
Very easy to recommend this course. Provided everything it offered in an entertaining way, everything you could want from a history unit. The assessment structure has been perfected, with options allowing you to pursue the aspects of the unit you found most appealing.
HSTY 2670: New York, New York
Lecturer - 9/10
Ease - 7/10
Interest: 8/10
Overall: 5/10

HSTY2678: Race Around the World
Ease: 8/10 - This course is fairly straightforward. The subject matter revolves around placing Australian race relations in an international context - which might sound a bit strange and obscure, but its fine. The main difficulty I had with the course was that some of the readings were quite dull and long - creating some concentration problems. Assessments were a 2500w draft essay, and then a major assignment that was based upon your draft. For this, you could chose to do a 10min speech, a 3000w essay, an opinion piece, a documentary or a website. The last assessment was a 1500w reflection on the course, as well as a tute participation mark.

Lecturers: 7/10 - We had two lecturers for this course. Kirsten McKenzie is definitely a high quality history lecturer. She structures her presentations well, chooses interesting subject matter and communicates clearly. Penny Russell is not quite as good. She tends to ramble a fair bit, and tries to put too much content into her lectures so that she races in the last 10minutes and makes it difficult to concentrate.

Interest: 6/10 - There were some really interesting weeks at the start of the course - esp. looking at performing savages, early intercultural encounters and the history of race science. But I found the last half of the course - which focuses more on Indigenous political activism - to be fairly uninteresting.

As mentioned above, readings could be a little bit dull.

Overall: 7/10 A pretty good course.

HSTY2765: A House Divided: The American Civil War
Ease: (8/10) Clear, well-structured course. 10% on essay preparation and 40% on the actual 2000 word essay, 35% on a take-home essay and the rest on tutorial participation. There were a lot of options for essay topics on each assessment, though still some competition for non-Reserve resources. Marking was also quite generous, but tutorial readings were a bit heavy.

Lecturer: (8/10) Frances Clarke was a great lecturer, with real enthusiasm for the subject, effectively simplifying and bringing together all of the social, technological and political aspects of the conflict. Lectures were also recorded, which was helpful.

Interest: (7/10) The unit was evenly divided between the antebellum, war, and Reconstruction periods, really seeming to provided the big-picture. Rather than memorizing battle-dates and military figures the unit focused much more on social and political changes, and illustrating the different kinds of war being fought by the different actors, whether politicians, soldiers, blacks, women and those on the home-front, providing a lot of variety. The Reconstruction section was particularly interesting, leaving the narrative on a much more negative note than expected. There was also a revealing discussion on Civil War memory, and the way the event has been manipulated and re-imagined for different purposes in the popular imagination.

Overall: (8/10) A very good course. Well organized, great lectures, with assessments evenly spaced throughout the semester. Perfectly fine choice even if you have no background in American history.
IBUS – International Business

IBUS2101: International Business Strategy
Ease: 8/10. There weren’t many readings, and nothing was very challenging.
Lecturer: 6/10. Whilst his material was fantastic, it was virtually impossible to concentrate on what he was saying, as he had a mechanical voice. Plus I had brogan distracting me.
Interest: 6.5/10. I’ve covered a lot of the stuff in other subs, and nothing really tickled my penis. I mean fancy.
Overall: 7/10. Not the best unit, but I suppose it’s necessary for the major.

IBUS2101: International Business Strategy
Overall: 7/10
Fuck this subject, I still don’t know what my mark was for any of the course whereas some people know up to 60% of there possible marks.

IBUS3101: International Business Alliances
Lecturer - 8/10
Ease - 8.5/10
Interest: 8/10
Overall: 7/10 - fun assessments, but they don’t really test course content. The bulk is an online strategy game, however, if you don’t do well in week 1, you’re pretty much screwed.

IBUS3102: International Risk Management
Lecturer: Sandra
Ease: 7.5/10 – No exams, but there is quite a bit due. The online game takes up a lot of time, but is only worth 10%. Which is teh lame. Whilst nothing is really difficult about the subject, she marks quite harshly and based on a marking criteria that we weren’t told to refer to: I.e. it turns out we weren’t meant to answer the questions, but answer the same generic marking criteria for each assignment :s

Interest: 8/10 – She teaches interestingly, but the problem is that she targets it at a high school level: i.e. content is oversimplified. The assignments were fun.

Lecturer: 9/10 – She’s a great person, and very responsive to student feedback, but she did, again, make content too simple

Overall: 7/10 - it left me feeling a bit empty, as I didn’t learn very much, but did have fun.

IBUS3103: Global Entrepreneurship and Enterprise
Ease: 9/10 Easy as pie. Get a good team for the group assignment. Make sure you have someone with 1337 Finance skillz like me, and you’re laughing. You can bullshit your way through the rest.

Lecturer: 8.5/10 Seymour’s a good kid, guest lecturer’s were fucking interesting. still didn’t go regularly to lectures cos the content was just a rehash of all the base commerce courses i’d done.

Interest: 7/10 Fair interesting in parts. Fair boring in other parts. Private equity stuff was cool.
Overall: 8.5/10 I worked with a cool team, made awesome friends and got a nice mark. Recommend the course as something different in the Eco+Bus faculty since you actually develop a real business proposal and pitch it to industry experts.
INFO - Information Technology

INFO2820: Databases 1 (adv)

Ease - 9/10
Mostly straightforward database stuff. A few arts students that had to do the course had trouble with grasping syntax and stuff, but if you've done any sort of databases or programming before you shouldn't have too much trouble. Advanced stuff was easier than the standard stuff imo, plus you don't have to do quizzes, so if you can get into advanced, go for it.

Lecturer - Alan Fekete (9/10), Sanjay Chawla (6/10)
We had alan for the majority of the course. He was very quick to answer to emails and was equally helpful (replied emails within 5-10 minutes prior to an assignment submission, i think that guy lives in the school of IT or something). Sanjay's lectures were a bit tangential and the advanced stream kinda fell behind the material for the first couple of assignments. No tutors for the standard stream of this course (but i heard they assigned some about halfway through the semester).

Interest - 8/10
SQL, JDBC/database apps etc, analysis of transactions, storage and relational algebra...advanced stream dabbled into datalog. Not that hard to fall out of interest with really.

Overall - 9/10
I liked this course, might do 3rd year databases if my degree can accomodate it. Course outcomes, marking schemes and exam layouts were very concise, kinda makes me miss 2nd year subjects (3rd year ones i did didn't seem to have much clarity this year).

INFS - Business Information Systems

INFS1000: Business Information Systems

Ease 4/10 - I lived in fear before every assesment because i literally had no idea what could be asked or the topics. For a long while though i could easily fail the course but i might even end up with a credit so wtf.
Lecturer 0/10 - She was fucking shit. thought her subject was the best in the world and did things very crappily.
Interest 0/10 - If i wanted to do databases i would have done an IT course
Overall 0/10 - Should not be core. Was painful and i didnt even go to a lot of lectures.

INFS1000: Business Information Systems Foundations
Ease - 9/10
Lecturer - 6.5/10 (Paul - 7, other guy 6)
Interest - 5/10 (lectures were BORING, computer stuff was alright though)
Overall - 6/10
INFS1000: Business Information Systems Foundations
Ease: 9
Lecturer: 6
Interest: 2
Overall: 6

INFS1000: Business Information Systems Foundations
Ease - 8.5/10
Lecturers - 6/10
Interest - 0/10
Overall - 0.5/10

INFS1000: Business Information Systems Foundations
Ease - 9/10
Lecturers - 3/10 (Lectures were useless, <50% attend lectures)
Interest - 5/10 (The programming stuff was interesting... kinda)
Overall - 5/10

INFS1000: Business Information Systems Foundations
Ease 2/10 very un good stuff
Lecturer 3/10 sorry, though they try to lecture well, the stuff being taught are just too abstract to be understood by human
Interest 4/10 - ok, it's useful... that's about it
Overall 2/10 - if you understand what's being said the first time around, i'd buy you a cookie

INFS1000: Business Information Systems Foundations
Ease - 9.5/10
Lecturers - 5/10
Interest - 3/10
Overall - 6/10 (Absurdly useless but amazingly easy to bullshit the final exam)

INFS1000: Business Information Systems Foundations
Ease: 9.5/10
Lecturers 9/10 - don't need to go to these
Interest: 5/10
Overall: 9/10

INFS1000: Business Information Systems Foundations
Overall: 8/10 - though course structure is a mess, lecturers are crap, assessments =WTFOMGBBQ, still, very useful in real life

INFS2001: Business Information Systems

Ease: People with an IT background - 10/10 and People with a non-IT background 6/10.
If you have done any form of IT or are an INFS major, this course is basically an easy way to boost your WAM.

For those commerce students doing this as part of the of their CPA the modelling is going to be the most difficult skill to pick up i.e. given a problem constructing a suitable ERD, DFD etc. My stream was also fortunate enough to have that Huy guy who disappeared than re-appeared then disappeared again on BOS literally living on the forums and making the lecturers seem stupid 😁. The lecturer even noted his aim was to try and answer the students queries before Huy could. My suggestion if you
feel lost, find out who does B.IT. B.Eng or B.CST and get them in your group 'cause they will be able
to gun the course. The rest of it is really easy and just BS.

*Lecturer: 7.5/10* - The lecturers Mark and Sam did an alright job in both lecturing and tutoring. They
bother to answer questions on BB as well, which is nice. In terms of how the explained modelling to
new students i am not too sure of since i already knew how to do all those things. Based on student
feedback though the students wanted more examples on modelling, which they said they will
incorporate into the course.

*Interest: 4/10* - I already knew everything that was taught, though i did get a half day for work so that
at least made me happy. Though i think some students might find the modelling an interesting change
from all the BS theory.

*Overall: 6.5/10* - For me an easy elective for Engo where i could walk away with a god mark with no
effort. I read the lecture notes the night before the exam, did the group assignment 2 days before it
was due and walked into the quiz with no study. All the non-IT students need to do is just practice the
different modelling techniques and you will be right.

**ISYS - Information Systems**

**ISYS2140: Information Systems**

*Ease - 8/10*

Easy enough, couple of fairly tedious assignments, but you work in groups. Final exam is rote
learning.

*Lecturer - 6/10 Byoungu Choi*

Strange accent and weird analogies of e-commerce terms aside, Byoungu was a decent lecturer.
Granted i didn't go to most of the lectures (9am start fml), but the content and assignments were
straightforward in what was expected. Marking was quick for the first assignment, but we never got
the second assignment back.

*Interest - 5/10*

Tutes consisted of a presentation and 'debate' (you did 1 of each for the entire semester). Only about
half the topics sparked my interest so i guess 5/10 reflects that.

*Overall - 7/10*

Well you have to do this one if you want to do anything related to information systems. I'd say easy
brownie points, but on retrospect, the group assignments could get pretty hardcore if you wanted good
marks. I'd say this subject would be easy to pass but you'd have to do quite a bit of work to get 80+.
JPNS - Japanese

JPNS1611: Japanese 1.

Ease: 7/10. It's an introductory course so the content covered is not particularly complicated at least at first, but it does move quickly and if you don't keep up you might find yourself in the uncomfortable position of hardly understanding a word that is said to you in tutes, as i did a couple of times. I would say that if you have a background in some variety of Asian language you will find it easier to grasp than i did (you know, being used to a normal 26 letter all-purpose alphabet and all). Grammar, particles, sentence structure and speaking were all okay for me although i had a few issues with structure at first what with all the backward-ness compared to English. Script was my downfall...hiragana and katakana were okay to learn, but fuck me sideways i sucked at kanji characters. Other people might be different though.

Lecturer/s: 8/10. Yasumoto-sensei was good at covering content quickly without it feeling too rushed; she had a nice clear way of explaining things and she was just a nice lady overall. Matthew Stavros who did the culture lectures was awesome, really nice, laid back, and funny; he made the most interesting component of the course even more so with his delivery and humour. Top guy.

Interest: 7/10. I really liked the culture component and found it the most interesting even though the focus was meant to be on learning the language. As for the actual language learning, communication tutorials were the most fun/interesting, script tutes were fucking boring though. Grammar lectures fell somewhere in the middle.

Overall: 7/10. It was good, not great, but okay. If you're into languages and don't mind a bit of rote memorisation, you should find it enjoyable. Tip: you have to study and keep up to date or you will fail, the end. I just found this out the hard way. 😞

LAWS - Law

LAWS1006: Foundations of Law

Lecturer: 8/10 - Friendly, knowledgeable, approachable - pretty much the tri-factor. Was a bit inconsistent with the marking, though.

Ease: 6/10 - Not easy, but not necessarily hard either. Difficulty is inversely proportional to the amount of reading you do each week - some weeks you'll be lost, others you'll be in your element.

Interest: 7/10 - The history is mostly crap. The philosophy behind law is an acquired taste (I liked it, personally, but most of the class didn't). It gets more interesting as the course culminates in international law/politics and issues such as Guantanamo Bay, which sparked some very engaging discussion. If you're not opinionated you will find this course not only hard, but intimidating.

Overall - 7/10

LAWS1006: Foundations of Law

Ease: 8, Lecturer: 9.5, Interest: 7, Overall: 8

LAWS1006: Foundations of Law

Ease - 9/10
Lecturers - 9/10 (Some interesting guest lecturers (Kirby); some not so interesting)
Interest - 8/10 (Interpretation and history stuff boring, but otherwise assessments and stuff interested me)
Overall - 8/10
**LAWS1008: Legal Research**
Ease: 10, Lecturer: 6, Interest: 5, Overall: 7

**LAWS1018: International Law**
With Kate Miles
Ease: 6/10 – Assignment (20%) was decent (similar to past law subjects), 5% participation also easy, final exam (75%); killer, clearly too much weighting, very hard to answer 3 questions in 2 hours (1 essay and 2 problems).
Interest: 8/10 – Very interesting.
Lecturer: 9/10 – Great tutor, all tutorial materials were up on WebCT (by Steven). If the tute materials are put up, don’t bother writing down anything other than what the tutor says about the essential readings as that is what is usually missing from the online notes.
Overall: 6.5/10 – Interesting. HEAPS of readings. The final exam was a killer.

**LAWS1020: Torts**
Ease: 7/10 (Advice: Keep well-organised notes and annotate wisely.)
Lecturers - n/a (Tutors - 9/10, knowledgable, well-organised, friendly and approachable)
Interest: 9/10
Overall: 9/10

**LAWS1020: Torts**
Ease: 7.5
Lecturer: 9.5
Interest: 9.5
Overall: 9

**LNGS - Linguistics**

**LNGS1005: Structure of English**
Ease: (6/10) I felt the concepts in this unit were easier to grasp than the similar ones in ENGL1007, but my marks weren't as good. Go figure. The assessment in this unit is non-stop: there's no single high-pressure tasks, but the continual work is a pain.
Lecturer: (2/10) 10 minutes into the first lecture, I realised that Dr. Ahmar Mahboob's lecturing style would make for a long, long semester. He moves terribly slowly through simple concepts, and expects you to immediately understand the higher-end theories to which he's dedicated mere seconds of a lecture. Several lectures went by without him mentioning anything that seemed relevant to the unit at all. And his communication skills are terrible - often, related material for assessment tasks would be placed in some teeny nook or cranny of WebCT, a couple of days before the task was due... never mind the week that had already passed since the assessment was handed out. I may be a nerd, but these are the only lectures I walked out of this semester - on repeated occasions.
Interest: (5/10) The mark I'm giving here for 'Interest' is partially saved from the lowly clutches of the lecturer by the contributions of Peter and Namali, the seminar leader and tutor respectively. The tutes were sometimes irrelevant and basic, but the seminars were generally enlightening. Shame about the lectures.
Overall: (5/10) You could take this unit and achieve reasonable marks, but don't expect an exciting semester. In fact, you could miss most of the lectures, just attend the seminars and tutes, and get the same results you would have done anyway. But a better idea? Do something else.
NB: I understand this subject isn't being offered for the next couple of years. I can't say I'm surprised. But for those of you who are offered this subject when it returns - if Dr. Mahboob is still the coordinator, steer clear!
MATH - Mathematics

MATH1001: Differential Calculus
Ease - 5/10
Lecturer - 2/10 (worst lecturer in history. refused to use a microphone)
Interest - 4/10
Overall - 4/10

MATH1001: Differential Calculus
Ease: 5/10 - Starts off as an easy subject but turns really random after the first quiz when you start learning about the Extreme Value Theorem, Mean Value Theorem and so forth.
Lecturer: 10/10 - Ben Wilson was such a gun. He made the course interesting and explained content in simple real life examples. He also wrote on the blackboard instead of using overheads or powerpoint presentations which meant there were breaks every 20 minutes or so.
Interest: 7/10 - Sometimes it's boring, sometimes it's interesting.
Overall: 7/10 - Not bad but not spectacular.

MATH1002: Linear Algebra
Ease: 8/10 - Unlike MATH1001, the first half of the course was much harder than the second half.
Lecturer: 6/10 - Adrian Nelson was ok. He used overheads and had some errors in them which he corrected during the lecture. Not the best but wasn't the worst either.
Interest: 7/10 - Gets pretty boring sometimes (Vectors) but the matrices part isn't too bad.
Overall: 7/10 - It was ok. Questions from past papers usually equals 5-10 marks in the final exam (there's always the parallelogram question in the final exam...)

MATH1002: Linear Algebra
Ease - 6/10 (vectors are dodgy, but matrices are easy)
Lecturer - 6/10 (if you talk in lecturers, you will be in big trouble)
Interest 5/10
Overall - 5.7/10

MATH1004: Discrete Mathematics
Ease - 8/10
Lecturer - 11/10 (Dr Choo or uncle choo as he prefers to be called, is a legend)
Interest 7/10
Overall 8.7/10

MATH1005: Statistics
Ease - 7/10 (starts out really easy, then gets hard in week 6)
Lecturer - 7/10
Interest - ???? depends on how interesting you find statistics
Overall 7/10
MATH 1011: Life Sciences Calculus

Ease: 4/10
I know that I'm going to either fail, or pass my an incredibly small margin, but regardless of that the course wasn't really all that hard. Reading through the resource book is probably enough to get anyone through the course, provided that they have a bit of a clue about HSC Mathematics. The examples exams are essentially identical to the one that's you're assessed on, so there's no lateral direction - study the manual and look at the exams and you'll do fine (and by that, I mean learn the questions in the past exams off by heart). Still, the shoddy lecture format, uninspiring content and the fact that it's a uni maths course means it's not that easy (then again, I'm no math whiz).

Lecturers: 1/10
Godawful lecturers, Godawful lecturing format, Godawful lecturing style. There's nothing that can be learned from some waffling old man by the name of Palmer (funny as he was) at 8am in the morning writing on endless powerpoints, nor is there anything that can be learned from two Asian men (Lai, Zhang) who've barely mastered phonics, droning on about some garbage that I couldn't care less about. No effort was made to make things interesting, none at all. I can respect that they don't give their best lecturers to the life science students, but God, give us something. Breaking it down:

Palmer: Funny, quirky old man but he was unfortunate enough to occupy the 8am slots, which I gave up on attending after week 2.
Lai: Funny, kinda cute guy (in a totally heterosexual way) but incredibly hard to understand.
Zhang: Hopeless, unintelligible lecturer. His lectures consistent of re-writing the resource book (which the other two mostly avoided, as best they could), pacing back and forth, laughing at the most incoherently unfunny things and yelling at people for talking. I cannot fault them, as Zhang is the most mindless, hopeless and awful lecturer I've encountered at USyd.

Interest: 0.5/10
It's maths. I liked it in the HSC because it was new. This was advanced HSC work, presented in an awful format. Kudos to Palmer for making things practical and interesting in his lectures, but as I said, there was no way I could keep going to them.

Overall: 2/10
It's a maths course, it's compulsory, it's shit.

MATH 1011: Life Sciences Calculus

Ease: 5/10 - It is almost like HSC Calculus, but taught it a much harder way. Bascially wasn't as difficult as I thought considering I only went to 4 weeks of lectures. If you enjoy maths then this is easy for you, if you are like me and really do not like maths, then this is gonna be hard. Passing isn't as easy, but as long as you go to the tutes and attempt to do some and study, then it should be no prob. I only studied the night before, so I guess getting a pass is something I deserve. It is almost all differentiating. 3D though, I don't like 3D personally, and never learnt it, only figured we did 3D 2 weeks before exams. So, yes... not that easy!!

Lecturers: 2/10 - I got Palmer at 8am, and no way was I to make my way out in the cold mornings of Thurs and Fri to go to a MATHS lecture. Stopped going in week 4 and never bothered again. He really tried, but he thought it in a format I didn't enjoy (use to my HSC teachers and tutors) so yes, he over-complicated EVERYTHING. And sometimes refused to use a Mic. For 8am lectures, where u are half asleep, and overdosing on coffee, microphones WILL be appreciated.

Interest: 2/10 - The is harder HSC Maths, if you are like me and used the Cambridge 2U book, then it
is like the Challenge Q but harder. If you enjoyed maths, then this might be ok. But I really enjoyed HSC maths, and this wasn't that enjoyable. But still, it is not too bad if you don't bother turning up and use what they teach you back in HS with just a bit more new knowledge. You can pass with that.

Overall: 3/10 - It is compulsory. I really hate maths thanks to the Life Science maths... Such a pity for someone who really enjoyed maths....

MATH 1015: Life Sciences Statistics

Ease: 1/10 - This is HARD. I never liked Stats so it made my life hell. Plus you have crap lecturer (I Did) so it was totally off putting. I managed a Pass with 50 (say I am lucky) I really didn't get more than half the paper. I didn't bother going to lectures coz I didn't get the lecturer anyway. And I didn't understand the textbook. I resorted to getting my HSC private Maths tutor back in to tutor me for 4 hrs and finally got something. So it is HARD. Unless they change the bloody lecturer and tutors. I never knew so many tests for stupid stats, T-test, Z-test, Sign-test, P-test. etc.

Lecturers: -10/10 - I got Professor Jennifer Chan with a PhD in Maths who really didn't know how to speak ENGLISH! It was SO HARD trying to get her Canto accent. I am really use to the Chinese accents since I know so many overseas students and everything, so I can usually understand everything, but this is an EXCEPTION. She is terrible. Took me 2 lectures to know Pond = Plot, Err... rah = Error and Owl = R. So yes... her teachings I didn't get either, try asking her a question and she doesn't answer it properly. Hope she is never back again. She is terrible.....

Interest: 0.5/10 - Terrible. I gave it 0.5 coz I got the Median, Mode, Mean and Box Plot, those easy crap we did back in HS. Anything harder than that got me headaches. It is NOT interesting. It is hard, it is hard to understand. Everything about it sucks. I hate maths thanks to this...!!

Overall: 1/10 - It is compulsory. I hate it with a passion. I always had something against stat... so this was terrible to the limits.

MATH1901: Differential Calculus (Adv)
2005 Lecturer: Mrs Jenny Henderson

Ease: 8
Lecturer: 9
Interest: 7
Overall: 8 - The first few weeks are mostly revision work with a few new topics, such as the complex exponential function. The course is led on to more interesting topics later on, all presented by an excellent lecturer.

MATH1902: Linear Algebra (Adv)
2005 Lecturer: A/Prof Bob Howlett

Ease: 7
Lecturer: 7
Interest: 6
Overall: 7 - Personally I did not find Howlett's lecturing style very interesting, although I have been assured by the postgrad maths community that he is very good. The material isn't too hard, just algebraically messy, with multiplication of matrices.
MATH1903: Integral Calculus and Modelling Advanced

Ease: 9/10. - If you liked Mathematics Extension 2 and did well in it, then this course may seem too easy. About 80% of it covers material already learnt in the HSC course. The only new stuff was solving linear differential equations and second order differential equations. However, looking at the proposed new Mathematics Extension 2 syllabus it appears that this ENTIRE uni course will soon be incorporated in the HSC. (i.e. making it even easier for future students)

The quizzes were a bit of a joke since we did the same quizzes as the normal level. Just to give an idea around half of the total candidature were on full marks before the final exam in 2007. The only reason I stopped short of 10/10 for ease, was because the final exam was difficult (understandably).

Lecturer: 8/10. - David Galloway explains things very clearly. However, sometimes when he does a worked example, he diverges into irrelevant contexts of the example rather than the maths. Also, he does not know how to be assertive in the lecture room which results in everyone talking and him losing his temper at times.

Interest: 10/10. - Only because I like Maths, especially this type of calculus...

Overall: 10/10. - Easy stuff...possibly the easiest uni course for my entire degree.

MATH1903: Integral Calculus and Modelling (Adv)
2005 Lecturer: Dr David Easdown

Ease: 9
Lecturer: 10
Interest: 10
Overall: 10+ Easdown is a highly commended lecturer, and many who have been taught by him regard him as one of the best. The material is largely irrelevant as he has an amazing ability to make everything interesting and appealing, as well as simplifying the most complex problems. A level above the other 10s.

MATH1904: Discrete Mathematics (Adv)
2005 Lecturer: Dr Bill Palmer

Ease: 10
Lecturer: 9
Interest: 10
Overall: 10 - Ridiculously simple concepts of the course. Personally every mark lost was due to silly calculation errors rather than any unknowns. While not a step above the rest like Easdown, Palmer is up there with some of the best lecturers.

MATH1905: Statistics (Adv)
2005 Lecturer: Dr Marc Raimondo

Ease: 7
Lecturer: 4
Interest: 5
Overall: 5
While the concepts and methods in stats is relatively easy, the way it is presented could be much improved upon. Raimondo's voice aids sleep rather than study, not to mention the lecturing material is copied in verbatim from Primer. The book, however, is just as boring as the lecturer, and anyone who can venture beyond a page or two without feeling sleepy or lost will be appreciated for their efforts.
MATH1905: Statistics Advanced

Ease: 8/10. The only difficult part is understanding the concepts in the first place. Once you've done that, the rest is just easy routine applications.

Lecturer: 6/10. Marc Raimondo is monotonous and his accent doesn't help either. Even if you can get past that, the explanations themselves are just slightly better than mediocre.

Interest: 8/10. It's actually interesting in a mathematical way as well as its relevance to many contexts. The central limit theorem is quite an interesting theorem. Unfortunately, the lecturer doesn't portray it that way.

Overall: 7.5/10. It's alright I guess and it is useful in real life situations.

MATH1907: Maths SSP B
2005 Topics: Vibrations and Waves, Ancestral Trees, Bernoulli Numbers and the Euler Maclaurin Formular
2005 Lecturers: Dr Sanjeeva Balasuriya, Prof John Robinson, Dr Donald Cartwright

Ease: 8/9/7
Lecturer: 7/8/8
Interest: 8/7/8
Overall: 8

Vibrations and Waves is an extension on use of calculus to solve differential equations, without much difficulty. Once past the stereotypical view on stats being boring, Ancestral Trees contains harder Markov chain but the assignment is straight forward and easy. While Bernoulli Numbers is an interesting topic, most people would find the algebra involved intimidating, where Mathematica would come in handy.

MATH2961: Vector Calculus and Linear Algebra
Ease: 6/10 (easy stuff)
Lecturer: 5/10 (not the best, but alryte... have to say, alot are having difficulty understanding dr ruibin zhang's accent... =p)
Interest: 9/10 (interesting stuff)
Overall: 7/10

MATH2965: Real Complex Analysis
Ease: 0/10 (definitely the hardest sub in first sem)
Lecturer: 10/10 (u can't argue with daners)
Interest: 10/10 (very intersting stuff)
Overall: well i guess it makes it 10/10...

MATH2965: Partial Differential Equations
Ease: 1/10 (dind't think PDE was gonna be so hard)
Lecturer: 4/10 (didn't really liked the lecturer... not as much as the first sem one's any way)
Interest: 9/10 (esp for those doing phys, u need it... even some economist need it)
Overall:7/10 (good call...)
MATH2968: Algebra
Ease: -1/10 definitely the hardest subject i have done yet... i believe the extra one pt above the 10 is worthwhile
Lecturer: 2/10 (poor... very poor, tho his wkly review session is a good practice... at the end, didn't even bother to turn up to tutes... maybe that explains my poor grades)
Interest: 8/10 (not as an interestin subject as analysis... but still quite fun to do)
Overall: 6/10 (didn't enjoy it as much... after final exam i felt like shit)

MATH2970: Financial Maths
Ease: 10/10 then 0/10, and the change is not a smooth limited growth funtion... it's more like a step fn... all of a sudden it gets impossibilty hard
Lecturer: 4/10 (he's nto bad... just he's not good either... overall doesn't have too good of a good impression of him... ivers i think his name was... he tries hard alot already, but i jsut feel not loved in financial maths)
Overall: 8/10 (important subject for finance students/those who want to progress into risk assessment etc...)

MBLG - Molecular Biology

MBLG1001: Molecular Biology and Genetics (Intro)
Ease- 6/10 (the exam was quite hard)
Lecturer- 8/10 (gets bad towards the end, though)
Interest- 8/10
Overall- 7/10

MBLG2071: Molecular Biology and Genetics A
I enjoyed everything except Iain Campbell's lectures. No matter how many times I read over them, I couldn't understand anything. The lectures are fairly detailed, but the practicals are very enjoyable, especially the DNA Fingerprinting prac where you analyse your own DNA sample.
MECO - Media and Communications

MECO1001: Australian Media Studies
Ease - 3/10
Lecturer - 9/10 (Worst tutor ever)
Interest - 3/10
Overall - 5/10

MECO1003: Principles of Media Writing
Ease - 7/10
Lecturer - varies, approx 7.5/10 (Catherine Lumby is an arrogant pain in the ass)
Interest - 9/10
Overall - 8/10

MECO1003: Principles of Media Writing
Ease 8/10 - If you are genuinely interested and actually put a bit of work in you will breeze through this subject.

Lecturer: Lumby 9/10, Dunn 5/10
I rate lecturers purely on how they conduct a class, and whether or not they can interest me. Lumby made it easy for me to go to everyone of her lectures by having a whole range of material we could discuss in different formats and shit which was cool. Whereas Dunn ensured I didn't rock up after her first lecture, because her monotone is too much for me to handle, she is the most perfect speaker ever, NEVER and I mean NEVER makes any linguistic mistakes whatsoever, she's a machine, but a boring one at that. However, We only had her for like 3 or 4 lectures so it was all good.

Interest: 10/10 - I love it, I’m passionate about it, and the practical tutorial system was the best idea ever.

Overall: 9/10 - Just a fuckin awesome subject.

MECO 1003: Principles of Media Writing
Lecturers: Catharine Lumby / Anne Dunn

Ease: 8/10 - the lecture material was fairly tedious, but interesting nonetheless and a good background to the stuff that will be studied in later years. assessments are relatively easy for those skilled enough, and are rather fun to do [go get interviews, read up articles, then write your own] except for the final exam, which consists of two essays based on lecture material. Easy and doable nonetheless.

Lecturer: 8/10 - Lumby, 5/10 - Dunn. Catharine Lumby did a great job and made things exciting with her involvement of the group. So it was cool, but she's leaving for UNSW and thus she sucks a bit. Anne Dunn is very knowledgable and her expertise invaluable, but when it comes to the lectures she just read off the readings [which she wrote], so there wasn't much point to her lectures in this subject.

Interest: 8/10 - the theoretical aspects which you learn during the lectures and readings are probably worth 3/10, but the tutorials are so much fun due to their practicality and it really works your mind having to write a news story in 20 minutes or so. Interesting.

Overall: 8/10 - all round generally awesome. The set up is great [lectures - theory, tutes - pracs] and most of it is fun. Plus, seeing as only MECO students can do it, the people are great fun to be around too. And pretty hot.
MKTG - Marketing

MKTG1001: Marketing Principles
Ease 9/10 - Already passed course before final exam which is worth 33%. Assesments and tests are easy as long as you have a decent group and the concepts aren't to different from HSC business studies if you did that.
Lecturer 9/10 - Geoff Fripp i think it was. Lecture slides were a bit general, but he was a good speaker and gave very good examples to emphasis his points. Would be happy to ever have him again.
Interest 8/10 - Found lectures and the marketing sind rather interesting, the textbook made it fucking dull though. But pretty interesting overall compared to most subjects.
Overall 8/10 - Core subject so comm students have to do it anyway but it's a pretty good course.

MKTG1001: Marketing Principles
Ease: 8/10
Lecturer: 6/10 (if you're not that interested in the advertising and psychological components of marketing) 7/10 if you are.
Interest (ambiguous, as some people like maths others dont. some like hot chocolate. others like rape.): 7.5/10
Overall: 6.5/10

MKTG1001: Marketing Principles
Overall: 10/10 - though got crap results, robyn martin + paul henry made this subject do'able

MKTG1001: Marketing Principles
Ease: 8.5/10. all theory no maths
Lecturers: 9/10. Don’t need to go to lectures
Interest: 7.5/10
Overall: 8/10

MKTG1001: Marketing Principles
Ease: 5/10 - rather hard i think
Lecturer: 9/10 - paul henry is good, robyn is a LEGEND!!!!
Interest: 10/10 definitely fun
Overall: 9/10 despite the shitty result...

MKTG1002: Marketing Research
Ease: 8/10 - but you’ll have to do a harder course combining 1002 and 3001
Lecturer: 7/10 - a bit quiet but a top bloke
Interest: 6/10
Overall: 6.5/10

MKTG2002: Consumer Behaviour
Ease: 8.5/10
Lecturer: Same as for mktg1001
Interest: 8.5/10
Overall: 8/10
MKTG2010: Marketing Channels and Logistics

Ease: 8/10 - Don't ask me why but I did this module in my first semester in first year (which was 1 year ago). Got a distinction so I think the grading is rather lenient. Textbook is rather dry but the midsem and exam only covered basic knowledge and basic marketing concepts. If you have a strong marketing background you will surely score for this.

Lecturer: 7/10 - Lecturer was Charles Areni who was rather I felt was rather good at presenting the lecture. However I stopped attending lectures half way cos the timings were just inconvenient for me. Charles does give obvious hints about his pet topics to be tested in his exams though, might be worthwhile to attend.

Interest: 7/10 - Interesting marketing module considering I haven't been in any before. Text was rather boring and content taught in too theoretical in nature but may useful if applied in real situations.

Overall: 7.5/10 - Group projects once again kinda luck of the draw sometimes. Made new friends and we worked together to putting up a decent presentation. Overall, there was only 1 tutor for all the classes and he kinda just facilitated discussion rather than provided real answers, so everything is up to the you or the quality of the tutorial group. I took this module cos it was a core for my B.Com till they changed it to MKTG1000 this year 😊

MKTG3112: New Products Marketing

Lecturer: Michael Paton

Ease: 9/10. You can get 25/25 for tute participation just by handing in homework each week. Then you get another 2 bonus marks for participating in a research study. The final exam was also quite simple and 1/5th multiple choice. I am currently on 58/60, and should have about 90% overall.

Lecturer: 3/10. Really nice guy. That's about all the positives of his lecturing style. I have no idea why, but for some reason he insisted on summarising the textbook chapters himself, making his own powerpoints from these summaries, and then reading them during the lecture. So, what we got was a summarised version of the text.

Interest: 3/10 - The above made it very uninteresting, especially as the text was the most boring and dry marketing text I have ever read. A course on new product marketing can be very interesting: i've taken one in the US on exchange, however, this was horribly boring. The only redeeming feature was some of the tutorial homework exercises.

Overall: 3/10 - The sad thing is that this course is very useful, as badly as it was taught. I think this is mostly owing to the fact that Michael Paton has no real interest in the subject area (he is teaching as a replacement for the regular lecturer). The good news is that there will be a new lecturer taking this course next sem.

MKTG3116: International Marketing

Ease: 8/10 - no final exam, 35% video assessment, 20% participation (with bonus quiz if you don't have 20/20 at the end)

Lecturer: 3/10 - Catherine Sutton-Brady wrote the text and seems to prepare the lectures exclusively from it. Quite dry in terms of content delivery.

Interest: 6/10 - Not an interesting course as I knew a lot of the content already. However, the assessments were brilliant fun to prepare (such as the video)

Overall: 7/10 - Assessments were fun, tutorials were great, but the course itself wasn't that good. Still worth taking, though.
MKTG3117: Services Marketing
Lecturer: Iain Black

Ease: 9/10 Nothing was particularly difficult. All the assessments were quite simple and were very interesting to produce. I would recommend going to all lectures, though, as Iain will give you hints about the final exam to reward those who come. Note that the workload is high, though, with loads of readings to do.

Lecturer: 7.5/10 It's hard to assess Iain. He has a lot of knowledge and he teaches well, although he is a bit too quiet, and his accent serves as a bit of a barrier until you learn to understand it. He also adds a bit of a political and environmental spin to some things, which is very welcome.

Interest: 7/10 - probably my least interesting marketing subject, as it was a bit dry, although very applicable to the real world, and I'm sure I'll use a lot of the things discussed in my future jobs.

Overall: 7.5/10 - I quite enjoyed the course, however, it was just less interesting than what marketing usually is. I craved a bit more creativity and unfortunately I wasn't able to demonstrate it in the course.

MKTG3120: Building and Managing Brands
with Paul Priday

Ease: 8/10 - there isn't much to do, as there's no textbook. I didn't study at all until the final exam, and even then I didn't do much. Content isn't challenging, but there are a lot of assignments.

Lecturer: 9/10 - I love the lecturer (I've rated him before). He tells a story, rather than delivers a lecture. However, if you're not interested in the subject matter, you won't like his delivery style. However, he's the worst administrator ever known.

Interest: 8/10 - as I said, the lecturer makes lectures fascinating, but at the same time, marks have to be deducted, as the subject wasn't an accurate reflection of brand management (he was never a brand manager, himself)

Overall: 8/10 - a cruisy, highly enjoyable subject. Important to do if you want to work in brand management

MKTG3121: Advertising: Creative Principles

Ease: 8/10 - There is nothing too difficult in this unit of study. However, we never received any marks back for ANYTHING. The final exam was very simple to do.

Lecturer: 7/10 - Paul Priday is brilliant. He's had a lot of industry experience and this will show. However, he doesn't really stick to his lecture outlines. He likes to drift off and prefers to show off various ads he likes, rather than teach the things in the syllabus. He also sucks at computers and has trouble putting up most things on blackboard. Nonetheless, he's a fascinating lecturer that kept me enthralled.

Interest: 9/10 - Whilst some people may not like Paul's style, I loved it. It led to some interesting course content that has even inspired me to research some of his concepts and theories further. His exploration of advertising historically is especially of interest, as he tries to explain how people's perceptions of the world shaped marketing and advertising. You also get to see some boobs in this course 😍 sexy time!

Overall: 9/10 - I loved this subject. I was enthralled during lectures, and the assignments were practical. The tutor was also fantastic, although she said she won't teach again, as she earns 50 times as much doing consultancy work. poo. However, ask Paul what day Karem teaches, and avoid it. I had Karem for 1001, and feel that he would be horrible for this subject (I mean, the man is an accounting major).
MUSC – Music (Foundations)

MUSC1507: Sounds, Screens & Speakers - Music & Media
Ease: (7/10) The assessments are pretty straightforward and the marking is fair, once you get used to the lecturer's expectations.
Lecturer: (9/10) Dr. Fairchild was engaging, humourous and intelligent. Not once did he present boring subject material, and his analyses are enlightening. Possibly a little too much reliance on DVDs for some tastes - but really, who's going to complain about watching DVDs when they're related to the topic.
Interest: (9/10) This subject was never boring. Towards the end, it may have got a smidgeon repetitive, but overall it's a great overview of the last century in recording technology and music media.
Overall: (9/10) I couldn't recommend this subject enough. It's given a tiny little paragraph in the Arts handbook, and no publicity otherwise, but it's most definitely worth it. You don't even need the most basic of backgrounds in musical theory.

IMMU - Immunology

IMMU2101: Introductory Immunology
Very interesting course, learn all about the body's biological defence system against foreign bacteria. 2 hours of lab work every 2nd week (that usually don't even go for 2 hours), but are on friday's only. 1 hour of tut every 2nd week, extremely easy, only have to do one presentation with 2-3 ppl in the last few weeks of semester on any medical topic that involves the immune system i.e. Diabetes.
One essay that you can start preparing and completing from week 1 and is due in week 10.
Although the lecture material tends to be all over the place... if you like the content then you'll love to study it.

Overall: 9.5/10 - an immensely bludgy and carefree subject... but fascinating to ready about.
PHIL - Philosophy

PHIL 1010: Society, Knowledge and Reason
Ease: 8/10
Lecturer: Tim Rayner 8/10, Nick Smith 3/10, Stu!! 9/10
Interest: 5/10 (taking into account Knowledge, otherwise, 9/10)
Overall: 6/10 (again, taking into account Knowledge, otherwise it’s a 9/10)

So again, this course is another cheese plate of philosophy, essentially covering Political Philosophy, Epistemology and basic Logic. For myself, personally, Epistemology was about as interesting as watching grass grow, so if you factor in MY own personal bias (which is that I love politics and everything about it) you can see that my opinion of the course may be just slightly screwed.

Tim Rayner was not exactly the most fabulous lecturer I ever had, but he was good enough to keep me doing the subject into second year. He was a clear, concise and informative speaker and for someone like myself, doing a government degree, this section of this UOS was EXTREMELY helpful in providing a solid foundation for a deeper understanding of my area of expertise. The essay for this topic is again, worth 40% (including the plan) so paying a little attention is advisable.

Nick Smith was BORING. I mean, really boring. He wasn’t engaging and, as a typical academic, laughed at his own jokes, which left the rest of the lecture hall going “huh??!” Unfortunately, unlike Aesthetics, this section was harder to bullshit in the exam so it’s a choice between two evils – sitting through boring as all buggery lectures or doing boring as all buggery reading. The choice is yours.

Stu and the Reason section was great. Stu was funny and engaging and the humour he tried to inject into lectures (no matter how cheap/cheesy) made an otherwise dry topic rather enjoyable. The section deals primarily with the structure of an argument, fallacies etc. so it is very very useful, especially when trying to deal with people like waf or Phanatical on these forums 😃

PHIL1010: Society, Knowledge and Reason (though there was no ‘Reason’).

Ease:
Society: 8/10 (becomes so when the readings are done, and one learns how to write a Philosophy paper, which I never realised, but thankfully discovered, was a cinch compared what I was used in the social sciences - complete bullshitting, but with close reference to the text, and only to the text. It's all about rhetoric rather than research).
Knowledge: 4/10

Lecturer:
Duncan Ivison (Society): 7/10
Sometimes went around in circles, but only to hammer the content into our heads.
Anne Newstead (Knowledge): 6/10
Like Ivison, another Canadian (what is it with Canadians and philosophy?). Rarely covered all the slides in lectures, constantly 'ums', but gets the job done I suppose (meh). Then again, she didn't have a lot to work with.
Important - For tutes, make sure you get Patrick Yong. Avoid Simon Duffy like the plague.

Interest:
Society: 9/10 - Couldn't get enough of it. Introduces ideas used heaps elsewhere.
Knowledge: 2/10 - Enough to induce self-harm during StuVac, since going through the readings is self-harm in itself.

Overall: 6/10 - Would be heaps higher if it was Society alone.
PHIL 1011: Reality, Ethics and Beauty

Ease: 8/10
Lecturer: DBM – 10/10 West – 8/10 MacArthur 3/10 (but I didn’t like his subject)
Interest: 6/10 (offset by Beauty, which I didn’t like, otherwise an 8/10)
Overall: 7/10 (again, offset by the yeuky bits)

This course is essentially your sampler plate for the wonderful world that is philosophy. As an introductory, first year course, the delights to sample are: metaphysics (which deals with what is real and what isn’t), ethics (which deals with what is right and wrong) and aesthetics (which deals with what art is…..)

Metaphysics (Reality)
David Braddon-Mitchell comes and equal first to Frank Stilwell in best lecturer stakes. He is a brilliant speaker, engaging, entertaining and making the information which needs to be divulged a pleasure to learn. However, for those of you who like details which you can sink your teeth into, Metaphysics is not the kind of subject for you. It deals primarily in hypotheticals, often asking “what if”’s to give possible scenarios many different situations.

The major essay in this course is derived from the metaphysics section so a good idea of what metaphysics is all about (which shouldn’t be hard if you go to lectures) is advisable, as the essay makes up 30% of the course. (although the essay plan which precedes it is worth 10% so really, Metaphysics has a 40% weighting)

Ethics (well…. Ethics)
Caroline West (who is not the same Caroline West from Sex Life) was, for me anyway, a fairly good lecturer. Some people think that she was crap, or rather, that her subject matter was crap. Either way, she was no where near as bad as what was to come.

This section of the course is worth 2 essays and 30% of the course, assessment of which occurs in the final exam.

From an educational perspective, the ethics section is useful because it brings up words and themes that you will, inevitably encounter in other areas of study – phrases like cultural relativism which may arise in other, social science type subjects, are philosophically explained here. If you got impatient with the wishy-washyness of Metaphysics, Ethics only gets worse.

Aesthetics (Beauty)
What is beautiful and what isn’t? How does one define beautiful? How does one ascertain the true meaning behind art itself?

If you like that kind of thing, good on you. For the vast majority of us though, we hated this section. Jhakka and I went to the first of this lecture series and didn’t attend another lecture the whole semester. The lecturer, David Macarthur managed to make dry subject matter unbearable, and made airy-fairy subject matter stratospheric.

Luckily, cramming as much information from scant readings 2 hours before the exam can scrape you through find. Its so vague that it doesn’t really matter anyway. This section also accounts for 30%, so if you don’t like Beauty, but like the idea of the other two, work really hard in the others to offset this.
PHIL1011: Reality, Ethics & Beauty

Ease: (9/10) Course material is pretty simple to grasp and even if you don't understand the basic ideas for the essay/exam, so long as you explain why they're confusing you'll get good marks. There's nothing too difficult about understanding how to write an argument, or anything from the ethics and beauty section. Hardest part are some of the bamboozling things about God and Mind/Body from the reality part of the course, but that's expected.

Lecturer: (7/10) David Braddon-Mitchell who you'll have for about 5 weeks was a pretty fantastic lecturer. Funny and interesting. Caroline West for the ethics part was also fairly interesting, and in addition did great lecture slides. Bit boring though and sometimes engaged a bit too much with philosophical wankery which pissed me off to no end. Davis Macarthur wasn't as bad as everyone has said, but he wasn't great either. I found his material boring, not so much as his style boring, so I didn't attend those lectures.

Interest: (6/10) Reality was fairly interesting, but far too much of it was too wanky to be really interested in. Ethics was practical and intriguing, so I liked that. The beauty part was awful – fap fap

Overall: (7/10) Well structured course, interesting overall, competent lecturers but a little too wanky and/or dull in some places. I'd recommend it though.

PHIL1011: Reality, Ethics & Beauty

Lecturer: 6/10 - It's really a mixed bag here. Stewart Saunders (reality) was brilliant and hilarious, John Hadley (ethics) was dry and disorganised and MacArthur (beauty) sort of fell between the two in terms of competence.

Ease: 7/10 - It's easier than it initially appears. Once you get your head around the leading theorists and concepts, the rest falls into place. The exam is a bitch, especially since it's worth 60% of the final mark, although to be fair we got the pool of questions well in advance.

Interest: 9/10 - This is where it's at for your interest points. Questions regarding the existence of God, anyone? What acts are moral/ethical and who, if anyone, deems them so? Are there populist standards of morality or is it all just a culturally relativistic quagmire? Is beauty really in the eye of the beholder, or are some things universally beautiful? What is art? There are important philosophical questions in this course which will suit pretty much everyone.

Overall: 7/10

PHIL1011: Reality, Ethics & Beauty

Ease - 9/10. Easy to talk about, mostly easy to explain, sorta easy to write argumentative essays on. Lecturers - Reality guy 10/10, Ethics lady 8/10 (got boring after a while), Beauty guy 7/10 (very boring, but covered everything we needed to know very well).

Interest - 8/10, maybe 9/10. Great stuff.

Overall - 9/10. Tutorials were great fun - easy to make friends, easy to discuss. Exam wasn't too bad either. =)
PHIL2620: Probability and Decision Theory

Ease - 9/10 - It really strikes me how easy Art subjects are in comparison to say my Commerce subjects (not being a wanker...just my experience). Maybe they have lower standards and expectations for the students.

Lecturers - 9/10 - All really really good. Especially enjoyed the last guy. Really knew his stuff and posed some fascinating philosophical questions.

Interest - 10/10 - Arguably the most interesting subject I've done at university. Really made me regret not doing more arts subjects.

Overall - 9/10 - Really really hope to HD, will be disappointed with anything less. Cannot fault the subject on anything. The contrast between the type of thinking required in such philosophy and arts subjects vs commerce subjects is also a welcome and worthwhile change.

PHIL2634: Democratic Theory.

Ease: 8/10
Lecturer: 8/10
Interest: 9/10 (because I like Politics but you should do if you're going to do this unit anyway.)
Overall: 8/10

This subject was a deeper exploration into the “Society” section of PHIL1010 and was fantastic in the investigation of social contract theory, majoritarianism, utilitarianism etc. It does, focus primarily on democracy, its origins and the aspects of it and not so much on anything else (hence, the name of the unit) Its second semester counterpart, Contemporary Political Philosophy is more focused on a broader range of ideology if that is more your thing.

Duncan Ivison is a good lecturer. Because the class size is relatively small, he’s able to interact with the class using a combination of slides and the black board. He is Canadian and is actually a visiting fellow from the University of Toronto, which means that many of his empirical examples are, naturally, drawn from Canadian examples.

I felt that assessments in this topic didn’t really allow for you to do much research – Ivison preferred to merely test us on the content of the reader, which is fine if you are a lazy sort of person, but not so good if you enjoy the research aspect of essays.

There is no final exam for this unit, but just a take-home exam worth 40% which literally can be done with just your reader and a word-processor.

Another disadvantage to this unit was the lack of WebCT, meaning that slides are e-mailed to the class on a weekly basis as well as the tutorial papers from that week. Just means more e-mail really, but its still a little annoying nonetheless.

I strongly advise only taking this topic if you have an interest (academic or otherwise) into politics, because if not, it’s a real snore. This is the same with most Senior Units though, unless you possess an interest, there isn’t any real reason to do it as the units are very much more specialised.

PHIL2644: Critical Theory: From Marx to Foucault

Ease: 6/10 - Readings from this course were very difficult. The reader is wholly composed of primary texts from Hegel, Marx, Horkheimer, Habermas, Foucault - and, as insightful as these philosophers may or may not be, they are not clear writers. Having said that, the lecturers discussion of the texts and philosophers were generally more accessible. Assessments were a 2000wd essay, a 2000wd take home exam and a 5-10 minute tutorial speech.
Lecturer: 8/10 - I liked John Grumley for a number of reasons. His lectures were clear and organised, he speaks slowly to allow me to write notes, he puts his lectures online and he gives back helpful comments re: assessments. He is a little boring as a lecturer, but he does a very thorough and clear job.

Interest: 7.5/10 - Looking back at this course, I'm quite glad I took it. It looked at several thinkers who I've encountered before, and examined them in more detail (Marx, Frankfurt School, Habermas and Foucault). The readings are quite difficult, and the lectures are not exactly "fun", but I feel I got quite a lot from this course.

Overall: 7/10 - Solid

**PHIL2647: Philosophy of Happiness**

Ease: 7/10 - This was the first PHIL course I've ever done and I didn't find it too difficult. Mostly the content was very clearly explained in the lectures, and the readings were well chosen. Some weeks the amount we had to read was excessive. Assessments were a 2500w essay and a 2500w take home exam.

Lecturers: - 9/10 We had two main lecturers for this course - Caroline West and David Braddon-Mitchell. Both were very informative and entertaining to listen to. Lectures were generally well structured, and were actually worth turning up to. Almost up to Frank Stilwell standard. We also had quite a few guest lecturers, who were all good as well.

Interest: 8/10 - There were a lot of interesting issues/questions covered by this course. The first half of the course is devoted to the philosophy of happiness - and basically involves running through the various theories that different philosophers have provided. This does get a little dull after a while, but by the middle of the course you turn to more interesting questions like the psychological research about subjective well-being and the social correlates of happiness etc.

Overall: 8.5/10 Highly recommended. As an aside, there are no prerequisites for this course, so you can enrol in it without having done any philosophy before.

**PHIL 2649: The Classical Mind**

w/ Rick Benitez (ANHS1600 students got an offer to attend this class without the prerequisites)

Ease: 8/10 – The course depended entirely on primary sources, which were fascinating. However, I had *major* panic attacks with the assessments, especially as it was 50% essay and 50% exam. Lots of pressure. Luckily we were encouraged to have our own interpretations of the source texts, so it was doable.

Interest: 10/10 – Primary material was great. ~$70 for the textbook, a bit annoying but turned out to be worth it. Tutorials were fun.

Lecturer: 9/10 – I enjoyed the lectures and the smaller lecture class. Great stuff. He really seemed to care whether we turned up or not, which is rare sometimes.

Overall: 9/10 – I'm sure the second and third year students had a great time, but it was a bit of a shock for me. >_<
PHY - Physics

PHY1901: Physics 1A (Advanced)
Ease - 5/10 (I found it quite hard)
Lecturer - 7/10
Interest - 7/10
Overall - 6/10 (I found it too stressful)

PHY1500: Astronomy
Ease - 9/10 (but there's a lot to remember)
Lecturer - 8/10
Interest - 7/10 (I did astrophysics in year 12, so not many things new to me)
Overall - 8/10

PHY 2911: Physics 2A (Adv)
Lecturer - 9/10, 7/10
Ease - 9/10
Interest - 9/10
Overall: 9/10 - Good, although the Nuclear and Particle Physics (only three weeks) gives minimal new information.

PRFM - Performance Studies

PRFM2601: Being There: Theories of Performance
Ease: 7/10. Like the above, it's not hard if you keep up with the reading. Some of the concepts take a few goes to fully wrap your mind around but it's not impossible. Assessments are frequent but not worth much. Hand in exam. Word limit for assignments tends to be too low (1000 words for an essay) so if you like to waffle on you'll have to curb the habit.

Lecturers: 9/10. We had a few. Amanda Card took most of the ones I went to, she's great. Nice casual lecturing style, clear. Tim Fitzpatrick was particularly engaging as was Glen McGillivray (sp?) who was incidentally also my tutor and did a great job. There were a couple of guest lecturers but I think I missed/skipped those lectures so I have no opinion.

Interest: 7/10. Despite the subject title I wasn't expecting it to be quite so theoretical. We did a few practical activities but they were pretty much just demonstrations of a theory we were looking at. However despite this it is actually pretty interesting especially the Embodiment paradigm which I found most interesting.

Overall: 8/10

PRFM 2602: An Audience Prepares
Ease: 7/10. It's by no means hard, but settling into the way of thinking you're supposed to use in this subject was a bit hard at first. You do a lot of practical stuff in tutes, just theatre games and stuff, nothing scary or hard. And more fun than sitting down talking about theories (which you will do but towards the end when they're like omfg exam time). Exam is an essay, and if you've done well in the
previous assignments you should do okay here as all assignments for the course are a lead up to this essay.

Lecturers: I wouldn't know, I had a clash and only went to about 2 or 3. Those ones were ok though.

Interest: 6/10. The theoretical side of it was a bit dry but not tragically boring. The practical side was lots of fun.

Overall: 7/10. I'm not a big fan of how this uni does performance studies to be honest but compared to last semester's unit it's not at all bad.

**PSYC - Psychology**

**PSYC1001: Psychology 1A**

*Ease: 6/10* - Let no one make you believe 100 Multiple Choice exam is an easy one. It isn't, but it isn't bad either. But try not to cram in the last minute as you end up falling asleep in the exam. Try your best in the Essay, it is one of the 1st essays you do in Psychology so get the book which tells you how to write one. You will get the marks if you follow it. Make sure you do the work in the semester, try NOT to forget the tutorial quizzes, or if you do, remember to do experiments. Then it can it up for some silly mistakes.

*Lecturers: 7/10* - Lisa Zadro - 10/10 lecturer. Ok, I am also biased coz I went to her High School but that is a different story. She is a BRILLIANT lecturer who really gets you interested in Psychology. The most claps and the one lecture which is FULL and isn't attended by 20 or 30 people like Conceptual Issues in Psychology.

Caleb Owens - 9/10 lecturer. Brilliant one. But too much in the the Stats got me bored, but still. He is good, just not as good as Zadro.

Neuroscience dude (John?) - 7/10. I never remembered his name, but he was good. He really tried to be funny but lost to Caleb and Lisa. But neuroscience was interesting. It gets better as the lectures go on.

Applied Psychology woman (Szabo?) - 8/10. Brilliant lecturer. I loved the way she spoke about things and everything was really interesting.

Personality - 6/10. Not bad, he was funny, but he made the exams really hard. But yes, the issues about Freud was the only good thing he made.

Conceptual Issues - 3/10 (Fiona). She was. I didn't get her lectures. And never bothered to go. Explained why I did so bad in her section, but surprised that my guessings still got me the mark I got. She should stay sober in her lectures. Might help us understand.

*Interest: 8/10* - Zadro made it all worth it, so did Caleb. All the others were quite good Minus Fiona's Conceptual issues. It is a good course to do, but don't think it is too easy. But it is enjoyable, and you really learn so much about Psychology from a different aspect. The boredom did happen, and sleeping wasn't un-usual. But since Zadro and Caleb really made it so good, the 8/10 is worth it. Without them it might be dropping to a mere 5/10.

*Overall: 7.5/10* - Good and enjoyable. Minus the crappy bits and you will learn to love Psychology
PSYC1001: Psychology 1A  
Ease - 6/10  
Lecturer(s) - 8/10 (most were really good, some not so good)  
Interest - 10/10  
Overall - 8.5/10

PSYC1001: Psychology 1A  
Ease - 5/10  
Lecturer - 7/10 I liked some and hated others. The "better" lecturers made their topic 10 times more interesting. Kudos to Lisa Zadro. I did the best in her topic  
Interest - 8/10  
Overall - 7/10 too much science and maths for my liking

PSYC1001: Psychology 1A  
Ease: 7.5/10 - I found it relatively straightforward, so long as you made sure you did work throughout the term, with the tutorial quizzes etc. I'm also a big fan of multiple choice exams, so I liked the final.  
Lecturer: 7/10- Some were absolutely amazing (Caleb Owens, Lisa Zadro), some were really solid and interesting (Szabo), some were a tad repetitive, and some drove me insane with boredom and annoyance. But the good lecturers made up for the bad ones.  
Interest: 8.5/10- I love psych, and I found basically all of it really interesting (except for conceptual issues- die!)  
Overall: 8/10- Very enjoyable.

PSYC1002: Psychology 2  
Ease - 8/10  
Lecturer(s) - 8.5/10 (better than last semester)  
Interest - 8/10  
Overall - 8/10

PSYC1002: Psychology 2  
Ease - 7/10  
Lecturer - 7/10 majority of lecturers were better this time round  
Interest - 9/10  
Overall - 8/10

SCLG - Sociology

SCLG1001: Introduction to Sociology  
Lecturer: Fiona Gill

Ease: 8.5/10 (Lectures and texts are clear and not difficult to understand. A fair amount of content - but it is definitely possible to waffle through the course.  
Lecturer: 9/10 (Love Fiona)  
Interest: 9/10 (v. interesting, also good for getting into arguments with people. There is a lot to read, but it isn't boring.)  
Overall: 9/10 (Love this course.)
SCLG1001: Introduction to Sociology

Ease: 7/10 - I found it kind of tricky, but I got a distinction, so obviously it wasn't too hard. The essay at the beginning of the semester was a bit daunting because it was early days and I didn't know what was expected, and the topics were on issues that we had to research independently, i.e. they weren't discussed in lectures. The final exam was a take home which involved writing 4 mini-essays in 24 hours. It was full on and draining, but I got it done by like 5pm the first day, and I did well.

Lecturer: 7.5/10 - I quite enjoyed Catriona Elder's lecture style, and most of the guest lecturers (there were quite a few) were quite good. One point to mention, however, is that there was a bit of disorganisation with the publishing of lecture notes on WebCT, so even if they say the lecture notes will be put on WebCT, write the stuff down anyway, because often they aren't put up.

Interest: 7/10 - I thought all the topics were very interesting, but they tried to cram too many into one semester, which meant you were unable to go into much depth at all. This also made it feel a little frantic and rushed. Also, you have to keep up with your readings!

Overall: 7/10 - A solid subject. I didn't like it at first, but I settled into it as the semester progressed and I did well.

SCLG1002: Introduction to Sociology 2

Ease: 7.5/10 - The lectures were well explained and easy to understand, but some of the readings were horrible. Many sociologists take the stance that "the more people who can't understand what I write, the smarter I am", and as a result, there were many articles in the reading brick that were really dense and badly explained. The assessments were fairly easy though.

Lecturer: 8/10 - I really liked Catriona - she made things from the readings that were difficult to understand more sensical. A couple of guest lecturers appeared throughout the semester, and they were not as good (the lectures on subculture were really amazingly awful).

Interest: 8/10 - I thought most of the material covered was interesting. The most boring module was the one on risk, but I liked the ones on celebrity, consumption and community.

Overall: 8/10

SCLG2601: Sociological Theory

Ease: 6/10 - The actual content isn't that difficult, but all sources of information in this course are vague and incoherent. The readings are texts that are written by Durkheim, Weber, Marx etc. and these sociology gods are generally not great at communicating clearly. Lecturer (see below) is also annoying. The assessments are fairly straightforward (2500w essay, 5-10 min speech, 2000w take home exam, participation).

Lecturer: 4/10 - Craig Browne is very rambling and difficult to follow. He doesn't use powerpoint, and his speeches seem to move around in circles so that, when you look at your lecture notes, you've written the same thing over and over again for two hours. He did get better towards the end - he does another course in contemporary soc. theory, so he seemed more at ease in the later weeks. The guest lecturers were always a relief - Alec Pemberton is solid, if dull, and Amanda Elliot's feminism lecturer was nice.
Interest: 6.5/10 - I doubt anybody would ever love this course, and pushing yourself through the readings/lectures is tough, but I think that the course is quite valuable. Knowing all the theoretical arguments that underpins sociology makes it easier to tackle any sociology course you do at uni.

Overall: 6/10 - Not awful, and fairly useful. Don't do it if you don't have to do, but if you do have to, it isn't that bad.

SCLG2602: Social Inquiry

Interest: 7.5/10 - This course was surprisingly interesting. The weeks on ethnography, interviewing, and ethics were excellent - and even the weeks on quantitative methods were OK. There isn't too much reading to do for this course - and the readings that are chosen are good.

Lecturer: 7/10 - Fiona is mostly fantastic - funny, informative and engaging. She also did a good job giving us information about the assessments and is very responsive to questions and emails. She does have a tendency to rush the final quarter of the lecture - especially when she was discussing quantitative methods.

Ease: 7.5/10 - Some non-maths people found the quant section of the course confusing - but truthfully, if you could manage year 9 maths you won't have a problem. Assessments were 5 online exams, a participant observation exercise and a research proposal. The exams are straightforward, but I found the participant observation exercise and the research proposal difficult.

Overall: 7.5/10 - Surprisingly good course

SCLG2604: Social Inequality in Australia

Ease: 7/10 - This course is pretty average in terms of difficulty. There are a few weeks where you will be going through stuff you've already learnt, so these rehash weeks are pretty easy. There was one week in particular that was very difficult, when we were learning about the political theory of Ranciere. But mostly its fairly standard difficultywise. Assignments were a 2000wd essay, two short 750wd essays and tutorial participation.

Lecturer: 8/10 - Melinda Cooper is a very good lecturer. She actually puts a fair amount of effort into coming up with the course content. She doesn't just summarise the readings for the week, or recite some sociology textbook, but actually gets some interesting/new content that she's been looking at and talks us through it. She isn't the most engaging speaker in the world, but I didn't find her difficult to listen to at all. My main gripe with her is that she takes _forever_ to get assignments back to you.

Interest: 7/10 I was expecting this course to be much less interesting than it was. There were really interesting issues covered regarding the history of racial science, clashes between cultural and human rights and the move towards recognition as a political goal. However, as I said earlier, there was bit of repeated material, which wasn't the most interesting.

Overall: 7.5/10 Solid course, better than I expected.

SCLG2605: Social Justice, Law and Society
Ease: 6.5/10 - This course requires a lot of reading and the first half is v. theory heavy. A lot of people found themselves completely lost after two weeks of lectures, and many seemed to think the course was about "inequality". Having said that, I found the readings/lectures fairly clear and not too difficult.

Lecturer: 7/10 - Danielle Celemajer is a good lecturer who really know her stuff and explains ideas clearly. She's engaging most of the time, and fairly easy to listen to. My only criticism of her is that sometimes she puts too much content into her lectures, and to compensate for this she has to race through the slides - which can be annoying.

Interest: 8/10 - This course is v. interesting - it isn't so much a course in sociology as one in political philosophy. Lots of interesting debates are covered. If you're not scared of the theory, and you put the effort in, you can get quite a lot out of this course. Assessments are straightforward again (1500w take home exam, 2500w essay and participation)

Overall: 7.5/10 - Definitely a valuable course.

SCLG2606: Media in Contemporary Society

Ease: 9/10 - relatively easy, even though they gave me a crap mark for my essay. Don't need to do any readings.
Lecturer: 1/10 - I hate her. She invented her own referencing system. She has only ever published one academic work. She believes the Redfern Riots didn't happen: how it was all some conspiracy. She randomly wouldn't come in for her own lectures and tutes. She didn't respond to emails because she broke her arm (even though it wasn't even her writing arm). She included the bibliography in the word count.
Interest: 4/10 - would have been much more interesting if I didn't have her as my lecturer
Overall: 3/10 - my first arts subject and I hated it.

SCLG2607: Social Movements and Policy Making

Ease: 7/10 - We covered so little substantive content in this course that, as long as you turned up to the first few lectures, you will know everything you need to know. The ideas were really shallowly developed. On the flipside, the marking criteria that Annette uses is a mystery, so it can be difficult to get good marks because you don't know what you are meant to be doing.

Lecturer: 2/10 - Annette Falahey is by far and away the worst lecturer I have ever had. Her lecturers were rambling, she would spend 5 seconds talking about a theory and then spend the next 20 mins talking about a tangentially related example, she included the bibliography in the wordcount for one of our assessments and gives 5 seconds notice when she cancels a class. She spelt embassy "embassey" on the chalkboard at the front of the lecture theatre. The comments she gives on assessment tasks were v. unhelpful, and left me wondering where I had gone wrong. I would thoroughly recommend that people avoid any course run by Annette.

Interest: 4/10 - I don't know why I chose to do this course. It really wasn't interesting at all. Readings were long and repetitive, lectures were poorly structured and rambling, tutorials involved listening to classmates and no group discussion at all. The content was really not engaging.

Overall: 3/10 Really useless course. Do not do it.

SCLG2611: Comparative Sociology of Welfare States
Interest: 6/10 - Interest level was quite volatile from week to week. The readings were generally ok, although sometimes in social policy it can seem like you're reading the same article over and over again. There is quite a lot to be gained from doing this course - but I wouldn't say its 'interesting'.

Lecturer: Gyu-Jin Hwang: 6/10 - I ended up with a slight crush on Jin - he was my tutor as well, and he's quite funny and sweet. However, his lectures can feel very long - he doesn't structure them very coherently, and sometimes he can fall completely off topic (esp. the week on labour markets).

Ease: 6.5/10 - There wasn't anything especially hard. Some of the weeks on quantitative comparison shook the non-maths people, but if you're competent with maths/numbers, you should be fine. The assessments tasks were a tutorial facilitation, a 1000w country case study and a 3000w comparative essay.

Overall: 6/10 - Solid - if you're interested in social policy its fine. But I wouldn't really recommend this that much either.

SCLG3601: Contemporary Sociological Theory

Ease: 7/10 - This is probably one of the harder SCLG units (which for most people probably isn't that hard). The readings we did on the sociology of space and affect were v. abstract, although other readings were fine. Assessments were a 4000wd essay, a 1500wd literature review and class participation.

Lecturer: 8/10 - I like Melinda Cooper. She's not the most amazingly entertaining lecturer in the world, but she definitely knows her stuff, and she usually manages to make her courses interesting. The seminars for this course are timetabled as being 3 hrs long, however most went for about 2 hrs.

Interest: 8.5/10 - The course was structured around a sociological approach to neoliberalism. We spent early weeks looking at the neoliberal subjectivity, the sociology of labour, religious revival and the sociology of migration. The latter part of the course moved away from the focus on political economy - looking at the intersection between race and gender and the sociology of space and affect. I found this course v. interesting - both readings and lectures were thought provoking and well structured.

Overall: 8/10 - Well worth doing

SCLG3602: Empirical Sociological Methods

Ease: 5.5/10 - Apparently the marks that have been given back have been quite low c/f other SCLG subjects. There is a fair bit of emphasis upon the philosophy of research in this course (epistemology, ontology, methodology), which some people found quite challenging. Assessments are a groupwork interview exercise, a research proposal speech and essay, and class participation.

Lecturer: 7/10 - Fran Collyer has a good grasp of the methods literature in SCLG. She has a slightly vague and confused aura, but she is generally well read and capable of explaining complicated ideas clearly. She was, however, not the best at the organisational side of things - a WebCT site would have made the groupwork task a lot easier.

Interest: 6/10 - For a research methods course, this wasn't too bad. This subject had two primary aims - to give students experience at qualitative interviewing and writing research proposals. These were quite useful in terms of giving us an idea of what real live sociologists actually do. However, the lectures and the readings were not particularly inspiring.

Overall: 6/10 - Not too bad. Compulsory for SCLG honours students
SCPL - Social Policy

SCPL2601: Australian Social Policy

Ease: 9/10 - This course is quite easy. Apart from the week on new public management, everybody I talked to thought the content was straightforward. Lectures and readings are clear + well chosen. Especially easy if you have done the first year ECOP courses.

Lecturer: 8/10 - Amanda Elliot is definitely an engaging lecturer. She manages to walk the fine line between putting too much information into her lectures vs. putting too little into them. We had a couple of guest lecturers who were also good.

Interest: 7/10 - It isn't as uninteresting as it sounds, however I felt like I knew most of the content from this course already. The readings can feel a bit repetitive, and the tutorial discussions were a little dull due to the lack of right wingers who are willing to come near the sociology faculty.

Overall: 8/10 - Solid, but not fantastic

SCPL2602: Contesting Social Policies

Interest: 6.5/10 - This course is fairly interesting. The content is a theoretical approach to social policy - so a lot of political philosophy type stuff is looked at. Quite a bit of the content will already have been covered in SCPL2601 - so it is a little repetitive. The readings are mostly good.

Lecturer: Gyu-Jin Hwang 5.5/10 - I had him for two subjects this semester. Again, he isn’t a very engaging lecturer, he tends to drone a lot, his lectures seem to take a v. long time and they aren’t v. well structured. Also, the lecture room for this subject (I think its the Quad History room) is AMAZINGLY uncomfortable.

Ease: 8/10 - Assessments are great (one 1500w essay and one 2000w take home exam). The content covered in lectures and readings are clearly communicated - apart from the week on policy implementation. From what I’ve heard, the marking for this course was fairly generous as well - because the number of people taking it was so low, the markers were under no obligation to follow the bell curve.

Overall: 6.5/10 - Not bad, not great
SLSS - Social Sciences

SLSS 1002: Law as a language, culture and performance

Ease 9/10: It's easy...don't need to attend lectures...tutorials are a complete waste of time cause the assessments and tutorials don't even overlap. There's no exam just two HUGE essays. Which are also easy, just got to do the reading.

Lecture/ers 3/10: Omg...just crap! Lectures and Rebecca are just boring; with nothing you don't already know. Only thing interesting/weird is when she mentions her beloved Buffy and how she's a huge fan...other than that don't bother with lectures.

Interest 3/10: Its boring. Tutorials 'can' make the subject interesting when/if ppl debate.

Overall 4/10: Only did the subject because it was mandatory...otherwise would never do it or recommend doing it.

SOFT - Information Technology

SOFT1001: Software Development 1
Ease - 9/10 (though only if you actually pay attention. if you don't, especially at the start, obviously you will struggle. duh. do it only if u actually want to)
Lecturer - 7/10
Interest - 7/10
Overall - 7.5/10

SOFT1902: Software Development 2 (Advanced)
Ease - 4/10 (workload = immense)
Lecturer - 7/10
Interest - 6/10 (began to wane, maybe because of the workload)
Overall - 7/10

STAT - Statistics

STAT2011: Statistical Models
Quite a difficult course. Didn't enjoy it that much, especially when the lecturer is a deadshit.

STAT2911: Probability and Statistical Models
Ease: 1/10 (quite hard stuff...)
Lecturer: 8/10 (robinson's not bad)
Interest: 9/10 (interesting nonetheless)
Overall: 8.5 - hey, u can't argue that stat's useful
WORK - Work and Organisational Studies

WORK1001: Foundations of Industrial Relations
Ease: 8/10
Lecturer: 10/10
Interest: 7.5/10
Overall: 8.5/10 (Great lecturer. Hillarious)

WORK1002: Foundations of HRM
Ease: 8/10
Lecturer: 7.5/10
Interest: 6/10
Overall: 7/10

WORK 1003: Work and Organisational Studies
Ease: 7/10 - It's pretty good...a lot of it is today’s work and employment situation. Assessments are pretty dodgy but, they don’t look at the practical side more theoretical. Exam is only worth 30% and to me seemed like the easiest part of the course.

Lecture/ers: 6/10 - Marian is alright, her lectures are more reading off her lecture slide note things which she posted up anyway. Tutorials are good, better than lectures, you learn more and if you get ppl who actually talk in ur tute you will have some decent debates. There is way tooooo much reading for this subject and a lot of it is just irrelevant. U have to be selective with the reading and not read the huge chunks of the text book. Even just reading the summary is good enough lol.

Interest: 5/10 - You learn about current issues so it’s kinda interesting.
Overall: 5/10 - its not that hard to get a good mark for this subject, just need to attend tutorials. Good for learning the fundamentals of employment and industrial relations

WORK1003: Foundations of Work and Employment Relations
Ease: 8/10 - not too hard to get a credit even if you don't try
Lecturer: 9/10 - really hilarious
Interest: 6/10 - there where times where i really enjoyed it and there where times where i was so close to falling asleep so mixed emotions
Overall: 8/10