SOCIETY OF LINGUISTICS UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Introduction

The Society of Linguistics Undergraduate Students (SLUGS) is a small but active group in the Department of Linguistics. We represent students taking courses offered by the Department of Linguistics. SLUGS is known for its interesting and informative academic seminars and talks, as well as some pretty fantastic social events and parties. We also aim to make the views of undergraduates count in departmental policy and regulations.

Our website, **http://www.chass.utoronto.ca/~slugs/**, is full of helpful information for Linguistics students, including news and events, career information, links to useful sites, a message board, and some Linguistics humour to boot. We encourage all students to stop by our website and find out what's happening.

All students taking a course in Linguistics are automatically members of SLUGS, and we welcome all members to participate in SLUGS's regular meetings and yearly elections. Please visit our website, or contact us at **slugs@chass.utoronto.ca** for more information or if you have any concerns about undergraduate Linguistics at U of T.

SLUGS Executive

LIN 200H1S Introduction to Language

Instructor(s): C. Pittman

Enr: 216		Resp: 108				Retake: 38%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	1	0	2	19	30	29	19	5.4
Explains	1	0	3	20	28	29	19	5.4
Communicates	1	0	5	6	28	32	28	5.7
Teaching	1	1	3	21	27	31	16	5.3
Workload	1	2	7	41	28	13	7	4.6
Difficulty	1	0	6	38	25	16	12	4.9
Learn Exp	6	6	7	37	23	13	6	4.3

Some students found the tests for this course tricky, but most were encouraged by the instructor's enthusiasm for the material. Several students felt that there was a lot of material to learn. Those students thought that more time could have been spent in the areas of the course such as the phonology section, which was apparently challenging for some students. Students also felt the weighting of marks was unfair, the midterm and final were worth too little. The grading of homework and tests were also "picky" or "strict". They were unsure of the level of detail they would be required to know.

LIN 201H1S Canadian English

Instructor(s): E. Gold

Enr: 40		Resp: 29				Retake: 75%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	17	60	21	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	0	17	58	24	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	10	44	44	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	0	20	51	27	6.1
Workload	0	3	20	68	6	0	0	3.8
Difficulty	0	3	31	62	3	0	0	3.7
Learn Exp	0	0	4	40	45	0	7	4.7

Gold received positive comments about her teaching style. She was well-organized, her handouts were clearly written and she illustrated her points with appropriate examples. The workload wasn't excessive.

LIN 203H1F English Words

Instructor(s): E. Dresher

Enr: 181		Resp: 88				Retake: 53%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	1	0	0	23	33	26	15	5.3
Explains	0	1	2	19	37	23	16	5.3
Communicates	1	1	4	10	30	31	20	5.5
Teaching	0	1	6	20	29	26	15	5.2
Workload	0	3	10	60	16	4	4	4.2
Difficulty	0	1	10	46	25	10	5	4.5
Learn Exp	2	4	8	44	22	8	7	4.4

Most of the comments for this course mentioned some dissatisfaction with the marking scheme: assignments were worth too little and mid-term/final worth too much. Some students complained about the amount of memorization required for this class. Obviously more than they were expecting. Some of the ideas and marking seemed to be arbitrary and abstract.

Dresher answered questions well and was enthusiastic about the material but those comments were overshadowed by dissatisfaction about the grades.

LIN 203H1S English Words

Instructor(s): M. Sherkina-Lieber

Enr: 177		Resp: 65				Retake: 30%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	16	13	16	21	20	9	1	3.5
Explains	25	14	23	23	9	4	0	2.9
Communicates	27	9	20	30	7	4	0	3.0
Teaching	25	23	15	25	6	4	0	2.8
Workload	0	7	24	49	12	3	3	3.9
Difficulty	0	1	16	58	13	7	1	4.1
Learn Exp	24	12	16	30	12	2	4	3.2

Most students were dissatisfied with the instructor and they way she taught the course. While the material was interesting, students found it difficult to understand the lectures. She seemed unprepared and unapproachable for questions. The quizzes and assignments did not accurately test the material, the marking scheme appeared arbitrary and unfair and she conveyed vague expectations.

LIN 204H1S English Grammar

Instructor(s): C. MacDonald

Enr: 179		Resp: 52				Retake: 44%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	1	0	5	26	25	23	17	5.1
Explains	0	7	1	29	31	17	11	4.8
Communicates	1	0	3	21	36	17	19	5.2
Teaching	1	1	7	28	36	9	13	4.8
Workload	0	1	7	41	27	15	5	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	4	38	24	22	12	5.0
Learn Exp	11	2	18	38	11	13	4	4.0

Overall, students found this course challenging, both in terms of the difficulty and quantity of the material. Students felt that the tests were too long and required too much memorization, using questions not found in the textbook. Some complained that her lecture notes should have been posted earlier. However, many found the instructor to be enthusiastic and knowledgeable and quick to answer students' questions.

LIN 228H1F Phonetics

Instructor(s): S. Mackenzie

Enr: 135		Resp: 79				Retake: 76%		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	4	17	50	28	6.0
Explains	0	1	0	9	25	35	28	5.8
Communicates	1	0	1	12	20	43	21	5.7
Teaching	0	0	1	3	19	47	27	6.0
Workload	0	1	8	79	8	2	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	0	6	68	18	5	1	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	3	28	38	21	8	5.0

Students felt that Mackenzie was patient, attentive and knowledgeable. Many felt that class expectations were too vague. Tests and quizzes were considered quite difficult, unfairly marked and not reflective of material covered in class. Some thought the second half of the course was much more difficult.

LIN 231H1S Morphological Patterns in Language

Instructor(s): A. Johns

Enr: 96		Resp: 39				Retake: 25%		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	2	5	10	33	28	17	2	4.4
Explains	0	7	12	33	30	10	5	4.4
Communicates	0	2	7	12	30	28	17	5.3
Teaching	0	0	10	25	41	17	5	4.8
Workload	0	0	0	58	33	5	2	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	5	35	41	12	5	4.8
Learn Exp	0	3	6	46	26	13	3	4.5

Many students felt that the instructor was very nice and approachable but had a rather monotonous lecturing style. Some felt the material was interesting but not enthusiastically presented. A few felt that the assignments and tests were inappropriate and the marking scheme rather arbitrary and unfair.

LIN 232H1F Syntactic Patterns in Language

Instructor(s): M.C. Cuervo

Enr: 87		Resp: 66				Retake: 41%		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	6	24	23	36	9	5.2
Explains	1	0	7	26	32	26	4	4.9
Communicates	0	0	0	9	27	38	24	5.8
Teaching	1	0	8	14	30	32	12	5.2
Workload	0	0	1	15	36	26	19	5.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	12	23	35	29	5.8
Learn Exp	7	1	3	38	23	21	3	4.5

Cuervo received positive comments about her enthusiasm and knowledge in the area of syntax. Most of the students seemed to feel that the workload and scope of the class was very broad and challenging, discouragingly so. Students expressed a wish for more time, either longer classes or longer tutorials. The material was complex and the assignments were challenging, more so than was expected of a 200-level course.

LIN 305H1S Quantitative Methods in Linguistics

Instructor(s): R. Smyth

Enr: 13		Resp: 10				Retake: 37%		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	20	0	60	10	10	0	3.9
Explains	0	10	30	10	40	10	0	4.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	30	60	10	5.8
Teaching	10	0	30	10	30	20	0	4.1
Workload	0	0	0	77	11	11	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	11	33	44	0	11	4.7
Learn Exp	12	12	12	37	25	0	0	3.5

Some students felt that although the instructor was really knowledgeable about the material, he was not an effective teacher. Students lacked practice in using the computer program required to complete the assignments. Homework assignments were not spread out well throughout the semester. Students thought that tutorials would have been beneficial.

LIN 322H1S Phonological Theory

Instructor(s): S. Mackenzie

Enr: 25		Resp: 15				Retake: 84%		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	26	60	13	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	6	33	46	13	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	0	26	60	13	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	0	26	60	13	5.9
Workload	0	0	14	71	14	0	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	0	7	78	14	0	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	30	30	38	0	5.1

Students were very satisfied with the course and liked the instructor. They found her lecturing style easy to understand and very helpful in understanding difficult material. A few commented that she would sometimes speed through the material but all felt she was approachable and friendly and always willing to help students after class.

LIN 323H1F Acoustic Phonetics

Instructor(s): M. Chasin

Enr: 38		Resp: 32				Retake: 71%		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	9	37	37	15	5.6
Explains	0	0	6	9	28	46	9	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	0	16	41	41	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	9	16	54	19	5.8
Workload	0	3	6	84	3	3	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	0	6	50	34	6	3	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	35	35	25	3	5.0

Even though this course was very technical, people without a physics background were still able to participate and understand the material. Chasin was knowledgeable and enthusiastic. Some students felt that maybe the textbook would have been helpful to understand the more difficult aspects.

All students seemed to especially enjoy the fieldtrip to the Canadian Hearing Society.

LIN 331H1F Syntactic Theory

Instructor(s): E. Cowper

Enr: 32		Resp: 25				Retake: 87%		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	16	20	48	16	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	16	20	40	24	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	0	12	28	60	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	12	21	56	20	5.8
Workload	0	0	0	20	32	48	0	5.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	36	44	20	0	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	28	42	23	4	5.0

Students generally enjoyed the instructor - they found her to be very knowledgeable and professional. The homework assignments were challenging but fair and relevant. Many felt that the instructor made a boring topic interesting.

LIN 356H1S Language Variation and Change: Theory and Analysis

Instructor(s): S. Tagliamonte

Enr: 10		Resp: 9				Retake: 77%		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	11	33	33	22	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	11	44	22	22	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	11	33	55	6.4

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Teaching	0	0	0	0	33	55	11	5.8
Workload	0	0	0	22	33	22	22	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	33	44	22	0	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	0	16	33	33	16	5.5

Most students enjoyed the course and felt the instructor was extremely enthusiastic and knowledgeable. The main complaint was with the workload: students felt the workload was at a 400-level course standard and many were overwhelmed by it. Some felt that they were not fairly prepared for the difficult assignments and would have welcomed more instruction. However, students liked the course.

LIN 362H1F Historical Linguistics

Instructor(s): E. Gold

Enr: 24   Resp: 19   Retake: 63%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	10	36	26	26	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	15	26	42	15	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	10	26	31	31	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	5	31	47	15	5.7
Workload	0	10	15	63	0	10	0	3.8
Difficulty	5	5	5	36	36	10	0	4.3
Learn Exp	0	6	6	50	25	12	0	4.3

LIN 451H1F Urban Dialectology

Instructor(s): S. Tagliamonte

Enr: 6   Resp: 5   Retake: 100%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	20	40	40	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	0	0	60	40	6.4
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	20	80	6.8
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	80	20	6.2
Workload	0	0	50	25	25	0	0	3.8
Difficulty	0	0	25	50	0	25	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	50	50	0	5.5

LIN 479H1S Current Issues in Linguistics

Instructor(s): R. Roeder

Enr: 10   Resp: 10   Retake: 90%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	20	30	50	6.3
Explains	0	0	0	0	20	40	40	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	40	60	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	30	70	6.7
Workload	0	0	0	50	40	10	0	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	60	30	10	0	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	10	20	40	30	5.9

All of the students who took this course left very positive comments about Roeder and her teaching style. She made herself available outside of class time for students who had more questions. The evaluation methods were fair and provided a good way for students to think critically about what they were learning. The topics were engaging and the lectures were well-planned.

LIN 481H1S Introduction to Analysis and Argumentation

Instructor(s): E. Dresher

Enr: 5   Resp: 4   Retake: 100%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	0	75	25	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	0	0	75	25	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	7.0
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	25	75	6.8
Workload	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	33	66	0	0	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	33	0	66	6.3

Students were overwhelmingly enthusiastic about their love for this course. One mentioned that it was her favourite course this year. Another recommended the course for all LIN students.

IT'S A CIVIL WAR. A CIVIL WAR IT'S NOT. IT'S A CIVIL WAR. A CIVIL WAR IT'S NOT. IT'S A CIVIL WAR...

M.e. Cohen