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 100Y1Y Introduction to General Linguistics

Instructor(s): C. Frigeni

Enr: 191 — Resp: 87 — Retake: 65%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	1	1	2	13	20	41	19	5.5
Explains	1	0	5	17	29	34	11	5.2
Communicates	0	0	5	13	28	31	20	5.5
Teaching	1	1	1	13	26	45	11	5.5
Workload	1	2	6	54	24	6	3	4.3
Difficulty	2	0	5	34	30	16	10	4.8
Learn Exp	2	2	4	42	24	17	5	4.6

Students found Frigeni to be helpful and enthusiastic. However, some felt that there was a large disconnect between the methods of evaluation and the material covered in class.

Instructor(s): C. Frigeni

Enr: 195 — Resp: 69 — Retake: 67%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	1	10	34	37	15	5.6
Explains	0	0	4	15	36	33	10	5.3
Communicates	0	0	1	17	25	33	22	5.6
Teaching	0	0	4	7	30	47	10	5.7
Workload	0	5	5	56	23	8	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	2	11	36	22	23	2	4.6
Learn Exp	0	1	5	36	32	15	8	4.8

Students generally found Frigeni to be engaging and enthusiastic about the course material. They said the labs and office hours were very helpful,

though some students felt the quizzes were too difficult and the homework exercises were confusing at times.

Instructor(s): E. Gold

Enr: 135 — Resp: 70 — Retake: 74%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	7	21	46	24	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	4	22	38	35	6.0
Communicates	0	0	1	5	20	37	34	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	5	20	46	27	6.0
Workload	0	1	10	54	28	3	1	4.3
Difficulty	0	1	4	47	35	5	4	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	1	46	36	8	6	4.7

Overall, students thought the instructor explained concepts clearly and was well organized. The one bone of contention was that a number of students thought that the exam was much more difficult than the midterm.

Instructor(s): E. Gold

Enr: 143 — Resp: 63 — Retake: 65%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	1	11	23	44	19	5.7
Explains	0	0	1	9	28	38	22	5.7
Communicates	0	1	0	9	28	36	23	5.7
Teaching	0	0	3	11	22	46	17	5.6
Workload	0	3	7	44	30	11	3	4.5
Difficulty	0	3	8	35	35	16	1	4.6
Learn Exp	1	0	3	48	26	7	11	4.7

Students felt Gold was very enthusiastic, knowledgeable and explained concepts well, with good use of examples. Students also appreciated Gold's teaching style. The handouts were very helpful and well-organized - a nice approach. Some felt tests were somewhat vague.

LIN 200H1S Introduction to Language

Instructor(s): B. Jankowski

Enr: 193 — Resp: 59 — Retake: 42%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	18	5	27	27	15	3	1	3.3
Explains	8	5	23	30	18	10	3	3.9
Communicates	5	5	3	27	30	20	8	4.7
Teaching	7	8	21	22	29	8	1	3.9
Workload	0	3	15	64	10	5	1	4.0
Difficulty	1	3	16	50	18	6	1	4.1
Learn Exp	2	8	13	44	20	8	2	4.1

Students felt that this course could have been more organized. Jankowski did not prepare the lectures in a well-planned manner. Many felt there was not enough time given to complete the midterm exam. Students felt the class may have been better conducted providing there were visual aids.

LIN 203H1F English Words

Instructor(s): S. Herdan

Enr: 205 — Resp: 129 — Retake: 46%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	11	11	12	21	24	14	3	4.0
Explains	17	14	15	11	24	11	5	3.7
Communicates	18	15	18	19	15	7	4	3.4
Teaching	30	8	17	21	11	5	5	3.1
Workload	8	4	21	51	8	0	4	3.7
Difficulty	7	8	21	46	7	3	3	3.3
Learn Exp	12	13	14	37	14	2	4	3.5

Comments were generally negative. Students described Herdan as "rude", "disrespectful", and "unprofessional". She insulted the class, calling them a "bad class" and "kindergartners". Further, she was sar-

castic, unapproachable and often lectures were a regurgitation of the text. Quizzes were handed back in class, which wasted time. Further, quizzes were inconsistent and most felt that it was inappropriate to make them too easy and then bell curve them down at the end.

The class was too big, no access to TAs or tutorials, which would have helped. Lectures were disorganized and the instructor did not post her notes. However, some felt she was knowledgeable.

LIN 204H1S English Grammar

Instructor(s): M. Hirayama

Enr: 220   Resp: 77   Retake: 56%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	5	5	7	33	24	18	5	4.4
Explains	9	11	19	28	19	9	2	3.8
Communicates	12	10	18	32	19	3	2	3.6
Teaching	10	7	14	30	23	10	2	3.9
Workload	4	2	13	63	9	6	0	3.9
Difficulty	2	1	19	61	9	5	0	3.9
Learn Exp	8	6	18	41	13	8	1	3.8

Some students felt the instructor was helpful and enthusiastic, while a few thought the instructor didn't explain concepts well.

Many felt that the grades were unfairly lowered, and didn't reflect effort and understanding. Many complained that the instructor merely read off the power point, making the lectures very boring. Some suggested a tutorial or help lab while others thought there should be a prerequisite as a linguistic background was assumed.

LIN 228H1F Phonetics

Instructor(s): A. Kochetov

Enr: 110   Resp: 59   Retake: 81%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	12	30	30	26	5.7
Explains	0	0	3	14	33	22	26	5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	5	10	36	47	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	10	21	32	34	5.9
Workload	0	0	3	63	28	3	1	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	1	59	22	14	1	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	4	34	28	19	13	5.0

Kochetov was enthusiastic and made the material fun. He used relevant and interesting phonetic clips and examples. Online notes were a huge asset. Attending the tutorials was crucial.

LIN 229H1S Sound Patterns in Language

Instructor(s): C. Frigeni

Enr: 72   Resp: 47   Retake: 58%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	8	26	36	28	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	12	31	44	10	5.5
Communicates	0	0	4	14	34	21	25	5.5
Teaching	0	2	2	4	17	47	26	5.8
Workload	0	0	6	70	19	4	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	4	47	36	6	4	4.6
Learn Exp	0	2	7	46	24	14	4	4.6

Students saw Frigeni as an enthusiastic instructor who was well-organized and provided good handouts. She was friendly and answered questions well.

One complaint voiced by many was the communication between the instructor and grader, especially the awkward structure of having a grader and a TA. Most students found it very frustrating that the grader was not knowledgeable enough to award part marks on assignments. Another issue was that the textbook was not helpful.

Donate your old term tests to the ASSU Test Library!

LIN 232H1F Syntactic Patterns in Language

Instructor(s): M.C. Cuervo

Enr: 81   Resp: 51   Retake: 66%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	4	24	14	36	20	5.4
Explains	0	2	8	24	28	28	10	5.0
Communicates	0	0	2	24	16	38	18	5.5
Teaching	0	0	0	18	36	28	18	5.5
Workload	0	0	0	43	37	7	11	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	37	31	25	5	5.0
Learn Exp	0	0	11	38	26	21	2	4.6

Students found Cuervo to be very enthusiastic and good humoured, however, many felt that she went through the material too quickly and didn't always answer student questions.

The course was difficult for many students, who felt that the workload was too heavy and there was too much material to cover for a one semester course. The lectures repeated the textbook, but this helped to clarify concepts. Tutorials were not useful and were rushed. Overall, students felt that this was a challenging but enjoyable course.

LIN 241H1S Introduction to Semantics

Instructor(s): S. Herdan

Enr: 90   Resp: 36   Retake: 18%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	2	0	8	37	22	20	8	4.7
Explains	2	2	25	25	25	11	5	4.3
Communicates	0	5	17	28	31	11	5	4.4
Teaching	2	2	8	40	28	8	8	4.5
Workload	0	2	2	71	17	5	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	28	45	22	2	5.0
Learn Exp	16	0	23	43	10	6	0	3.5

Herdan was described as using clear examples during her lectures, though many students found the fact that she used the same examples as the textbook very unhelpful. The students found the course work difficult and the assessments were not very fair.

LIN 306H1S Language Diversity and Language

Instructor(s): S. Herdan

Enr: 35   Resp: 19   Retake: 31%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	5	10	26	31	26	0	4.6
Explains	0	0	26	26	15	31	0	4.5
Communicates	5	10	10	26	26	21	0	4.2
Teaching	0	5	31	21	10	26	5	4.4
Workload	0	0	0	36	52	5	5	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	26	36	26	10	5.2
Learn Exp	6	6	25	37	25	0	0	3.7

While most students found the instructor knowledgeable, a few complained that she was abrasive at times towards students. Many also would have liked more constructive criticism and practice exercises.

LIN 322H1S Phonological Theory

Instructor(s): K. Rice

Enr: 28   Resp: 20   Retake: 85%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	10	40	50	6.4
Explains	0	0	0	0	5	50	45	6.4
Communicates	0	0	0	0	5	30	65	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	50	50	6.5
Workload	0	0	5	68	21	5	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	10	70	20	0	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	15	57	26	0	5.1

Students thoroughly enjoyed this course. Rice was described by the majority of students as very enthusiastic, knowledgeable, and good at

explaining concepts and making the material interesting.

A number of students said that Rice was a caring instructor who was always there to help. Students also appreciated the structure of the course - having homework assignments in lieu of tests.

Overall, an excellent course and learning experience.

LIN 323H1F Acoustic Phonetics

Instructor(s): M. Chasin

Enr: 43   Resp: 36   Retake: 75%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	2	11	16	52	16	5.7
Explains	0	2	2	11	11	52	19	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	0	19	36	44	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	11	16	41	30	5.9
Workload	0	2	13	66	13	2	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	66	16	13	2	4.5
Learn Exp	0	3	7	40	14	25	7	4.7

Students found Chasin to be enthusiastic and very knowledgeable. However, many found they needed more detail - on the slides and readings.

There was also frustration with the tests. Students found the questions too difficult and surprising. Many commented that they loved the field trip to the Canadian Hearing Society.

LIN 331H1F Syntactic Theory

Instructor(s): E. Cowper

Enr: 23   Resp: 20   Retake: 57%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	10	5	5	45	25	5.7
Explains	0	0	10	10	0	35	45	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	5	5	10	80	6.7
Teaching	0	0	0	15	5	20	60	6.2
Workload	0	0	0	10	40	30	20	5.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	15	5	50	30	5.9
Learn Exp	0	0	10	21	36	10	21	5.1

Students found themselves balancing an interesting and enjoyable class with rigorous and demanding assignments. Part of the reason students enjoyed the course was the instructor's skill at explaining abstract concepts (clearly linking new concepts to older ones already covered in the course) and her enthusiasm for the material.

LIN 341H1F Semantic Theory

Instructor(s): S. Herdan

Enr: 6   Resp: 6   Retake: 66%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	16	50	16	16	5.3
Explains	0	0	0	16	33	16	33	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	0	33	0	66	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	0	33	0	66	6.3
Workload	0	0	0	33	33	33	0	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	0	50	33	16	5.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	20	20	60	0	5.4

Herdan did well explaining advanced concepts and was willing to give extra help.

The course was fast-paced with advanced and challenging material. However, the instructor was good at making the material clearer.

LING 362H1F Historical Linguistics

Instructor(s): A. Kochetov

Enr: 24   Resp: 20   Retake: 63%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	5	25	50	20	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	0	57	21	21	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	5	30	50	15	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	0	2	65	15	5.9

Workload	0	0	10	75	10	5	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	10	52	26	10	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	58	29	11	0	4.5

The textbook was inconsistent at times and spelling and typos made analysis and homework confusing.

The instructor was engaging and interesting, but sometimes Kochetov relied too heavily on technology. Some students were frustrated with technological delays.

LIN 423H1S Phonetic Analysis

Instructor(s): M. Hirayama

Enr: 11   Resp: 9   Retake: 100%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	11	22	33	33	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	0	22	44	33	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	11	22	44	22	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	44	55	6.6
Workload	0	0	0	22	77	0	0	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	11	44	44	0	0	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	33	3	33	6.0

Students thought the instructor was "great" and had an enjoyable, interactive class. She was attentive to questions and easy to contact through email.

LIN 451H1S Urban Dialectology

Instructor(s): J. Chambers

Enr: 16   Resp: 14   Retake: 100%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	0	50	50	6.5
Explains	0	0	0	0	0	28	71	6.7
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	7	92	6.9
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	21	78	6.8
Workload	0	0	14	71	7	7	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	0	69	23	7	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	0	58	41	6.4

Students loved their humorous, knowledgeable and interesting instructor. They enjoyed the course and thought it was an important learning experience.

LIN 456H1F Language Variation and Change: Theory and Analysis

Instructor(s): S. Tagliamonte

Enr: 7   Resp: 6   Retake: 83%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	16	16	50	16	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	0	50	0	50	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	16	83	6.8
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	33	66	6.7
Workload	0	0	0	16	33	16	33	5.7
Difficulty	0	0	0	33	0	66	0	5.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	0	60	40	6.4

Students enjoyed the course and doing an individual research project, although it was a great deal of work. It seemed to be an overall good learning experience with an excellent instructor.

LIN 458H1F Revitalizing Language

Instructor(s): A. Johns

Enr: 16   Resp: 14   Retake: 91%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	14	0	21	21	21	21	5.0
Explains	0	0	0	7	14	35	35	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	7	7	14	71	6.5
Teaching	0	0	7	7	14	21	50	6.0
Workload	0	0	7	76	15	0	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	15	76	7	0	0	3.9

Learn Exp	0	0	10	0	10	40	40	6.0

Students found the material very interesting, and the course was a good learning experience. Johns was enthusiastic about the material.

LIN 479H1S Current Issues in Linguistics

Instructor(s): A. Perez-Leroux

Enr: 18   Resp: 15   Retake: 71%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	6	40	40	13	0	4.6
Explains	0	0	0	26	26	46	0	5.2
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	20	80	6.8
Teaching	0	0	0	0	13	73	13	6.0
Workload	0	0	0	13	13	46	26	5.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	20	20	46	13	5.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	18	27	45	9	5.5

Students said this course was very intense and that perhaps there was too much work. The instructor was considered to be brilliant. Students felt that the instructor would occasionally talk over their heads.

LIN 481H1S Introduction to Analysis and Argumentation

Instructor(s): E. Dresher

Enr: 9   Resp: 9   Retake: 100%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	33	44	22	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	0	0	44	55	6.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	44	55	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	11	55	33	6.2
Workload	0	0	0	88	0	11	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	55	44	0	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	25	37	37	6.1

Students found Dresher to be extremely enthusiastic and knowledgeable about the subject matter. The only negative comment about the course was that sometimes the lectures from week to week were not well-connected. Overall, students found the course to be very beneficial.

NEW: A new limited policy on Late Withdrawal (LWD)
is available for students in difficulty.
See the Calendar, page 537 for details.

NEW: Students may now take one credit in their
degree as Credit/NoCredit (CR/NCR).
See the Calendar, page 537 for details.