

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, which include LIN, JAL, JLP, JFI, JLS, and JFL courses. 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 new website, www.uoftslugs.com, 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. Cuervo

Enr: 194	Resp: 110							Retake: 47%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	3	7	19	31	29	8	5.0
Explains	3	10	10	33	22	16	2	4.2
Communicates	0	0	6	28	29	19	13	5.0
Teaching	0	2	10	25	28	25	6	4.8
Workload	0	0	8	48	26	12	2	4.5
Difficulty	0	1	3	46	29	12	8	4.7
Learn Exp	2	5	17	34	19	19	2	4.3

The majority of students had complaints about the instructor's communication skills and her tendency to spend too much time on simple concepts. Most students found that they needed to go beyond the lectures to understand the difficult concepts, and that all the difficult material was what they were being tested on. A significant number mentioned that some material that was on tests was not covered even in tutorials. The overwhelming opinion was that tutorials were useless because they could only cover a small portion of the homework, and did nothing to help solve students' problems but only their past mistakes.

Many mentioned the uselessness of help-labs which were hopelessly over-crowded and ineffectively run.

Most thought the instructor was very kind and enthusiastic, and sev-

eral gave suggestions to post answer keys on the internet, to hold more tutorials and help labs, and to lower the number of, but not weight of, homework assignments.

Instructor(s): C. Cuervo

Enr: 126	Resp: 79							Retake: 55%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	1	3	11	23	28	22	7	4.7
Explains	1	9	17	25	18	25	3	4.4
Communicates	0	1	1	14	31	40	11	5.4
Teaching	0	2	11	20	29	28	6	4.9
Workload	0	2	5	52	15	17	6	4.6
Difficulty	0	1	2	33	26	25	10	5.0
Learn Exp	0	10	13	44	20	5	6	4.2

Although several students found the instructor very knowledgeable, enthusiastic and friendly, the vast majority were disappointed in her lectures. They felt that her handouts were poorly organized and edited. Also, Cuervo managed her time poorly as she didn't manage to finish lecturing each week's material. As a result, students mentioned that the assignments were difficult to complete. Often assignments didn't co-ordinate with lectures. Students felt lectures would be improved if Cuervo provided more concrete examples when explaining concepts.

Instructor(s): E. Gold

Enr: 155	Resp: 78							Retake: 60%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	9	32	38	20	5.7
Explains	0	0	1	3	28	39	26	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	6	30	42	20	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	2	31	50	15	5.8
Workload	0	1	6	67	17	5	1	4.2
Difficulty	0	1	6	59	24	6	1	4.3
Learn Exp	0	6	7	43	32	10	0	4.3

Gold was considered by most students to be a friendly, knowledgeable and organized instructor. She explained the material clearly, with relevant examples, and attended to the class' questions. A few students remarked that she devoted too much time to syntax, at the expense of other topics.

Instructor(s): E. Gold

Enr: 106	Resp: 52							Retake: 71%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	2	6	27	38	25	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	8	26	48	15	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	6	29	43	20	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	10	23	44	21	5.8
Workload	4	0	6	52	26	4	8	4.4
Difficulty	4	0	10	44	22	14	6	4.5
Learn Exp	2	2	0	39	34	13	7	4.7

Several students noted that Gold was a good instructor: well-organized, friendly and dynamic. Her enthusiasm extended to bringing in current newspaper clippings and articles, which made the experience more interesting.

Some felt that the tests did not reflect the material taught very well, and that assignment questions could have been worded better.

LIN 200H1F INTRODUCTION TO LANGUAGE

Instructor(s): A. Kahnemuyobour

Enr: 229	Resp: 105							Retake: 77%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	1	0	2	1	23	49	22	5.9
Explains	0	1	1	3	32	38	23	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	3	23	36	37	6.1
Teaching	1	0	2	9	14	45	27	5.8

Workload	2	4	17	53	14	5	3	4.0
Difficulty	2	2	14	42	17	5	6	4.2
Learn Exp	1	0	2	42	31	18	3	4.7

Students universally found the instructor to be interesting and humorous; his lectures were "organized" and "well-presented". Some felt that too much lecture time was spent answering and debating with students. There were also complaints about the usefulness of the tutorials and TAs. Some students also thought there was too much memorization involved in tests, and that tests did not always reflect the material taught.

In spite of these complaints, the majority of students enjoyed the course, and many felt they had learned a great deal.

LIN 201H1S CANADIAN ENGLISH

Instructor(s): J. Chambers

	Resp: 18							Retake: 93%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	27	55	16	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	0	27	55	16	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	0	17	17	64	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	0	16	44	38	6.2
Workload	0	0	5	61	22	11	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	5	77	16	0	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	23	30	7	38	5.6

Comments about the course were almost uniformly positive. Students liked Chambers. He was commended for being interesting, approachable and extremely knowledgeable in the subject area.

LIN 203H1F ENGLISH WORDS

Instructor(s): E. Gold

	Resp: 101							Retake: 80%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	3	16	25	37	19	5.5
Explains	0	1	0	12	26	42	19	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	9	18	41	31	5.9
Teaching	0	0	2	9	17	52	20	5.8
Workload	0	2	16	62	12	5	2	4.1
Difficulty	0	3	14	61	16	4	2	4.1
Learn Exp	0	1	2	39	29	13	14	4.9

Overall, students found it highly enjoyable and the subject matter very interesting. This was due in great part to the instructor. Students expressed highly positive remarks about Gold, noting that she was very nice and approachable. She conveyed a high level of enthusiasm for the course and tried to make the material interesting. She also showed a great knowledge of the material. Many students noted that Gold was one of the better teachers in the department, as well as UoF.

Students felt that assignment solutions, as well as marks, should have been posted on the course website. They also noted that the large amount of material would have been better covered in a year-long course. The textbook could also have been more relevant to the subject matter.

LIN 203H1S ENGLISH WORDS

Instructor(s): K. Phan

	Resp: 81							Retake: 80%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	1	0	1	11	22	34	29	5.8
Explains	0	1	2	11	27	32	35	5.6
Communicates	0	1	1	6	38	29	23	5.6
Teaching	1	1	0	7	32	35	22	5.6
Workload	3	5	24	60	2	2	1	3.7
Difficulty	1	10	31	42	6	6	2	3.7
Learn Exp	1	0	5	42	18	25	6	4.8

Most students commended the instructor on her level of enthusiasm and appreciated her approachability. Many students commented on the shortness of her lectures, some enjoyed this while others felt it was inappropriate. Many students appreciated the instructor for her online notes.

They also said she was very quick to respond to questions via email. One criticism that came up was the lack of new information in the lectures. Students felt that the lectures were simply a review of the text.

LIN 228H1F PHONETICS

Instructor(s): L. Colantoni

	Resp: 80							Retake: 91%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	2	10	25	61	6.5
Explains	0	0	0	1	20	32	46	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	1	11	33	53	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	1	10	29	59	6.5
Workload	2	2	11	56	11	11	3	4.2
Difficulty	0	3	7	57	20	7	3	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	31	31	26	9	5.1

This course was evaluated as interesting, but with a heavy workload. There were many homework assignments and quizzes - they did however, reflect the final perfectly. Good examples were given and notes were posted on the website. Insufficient tutorial time was a complaint though. Colantoni always addressed questions during lectures.

Overall, Colantoni was an excellent instructor who lectured well, was understanding, available and approachable. No complaints about here were written, only praise.

LIN 220H1S SOUND PATTERNS IN LANGUAGE

Instructor(s): B.E. Dresher

	Resp: 44							Retake: 67%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	2	9	31	34	22	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	6	20	40	31	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	4	15	29	50	6.2
Teaching	0	0	2	7	16	45	28	5.9
Workload	0	2	4	65	23	2	2	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	6	53	25	4	9	4.6
Learn Exp	2	0	7	51	25	10	2	4.4

Students commented that Dresher was a good instructor who was deeply knowledgeable of phonology, had an entertaining and witty sense of humour, and prepared handouts of the highest calibre. Students complained however, that both the textbook and tutorial meetings were not useful, and that the midterm test did not reflect what they had learned.

LIN 231H1F MORPHOLOGICAL PATTERNS IN LANGUAGE

Instructor(s): A. Johns

	Resp: 54							Retake: 15%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	9	15	28	33	9	3	0	3.3
Explains	7	16	37	24	11	1	0	3.2
Communicates	9	7	16	27	22	11	5	4.0
Teaching	7	11	28	28	16	5	1	3.6
Workload	0	0	7	59	24	7	1	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	4	38	36	16	6	4.8
Learn Exp	19	7	26	40	2	2	2	3.2

This course was considered generally to be based on a very challenging subject. The instructor was seen as a nice, approachable person who conveyed a reasonable amount of enthusiasm for the course, reflected in her examples during lectures. However, students generally agreed that Johns lacked confidence in the subject, and clarity in describing the finer points of morphology. She often appeared confused about her lecture material. This left the class feeling nervous, anxious and unprepared for tests. The tests were therefore considered very difficult and lacking a tangible connection to the lecture material. The textbook was felt to be difficult and hard to understand. Overall, students considered this course disappointing, confusing and insufficient as a core linguistic course.

124 LINGUISTICS

LIN 232H1S SYNTACTIC PATTERNS IN LANGUAGE

Instructor(s): M. Barrie

	Resp: 43							Retake: 54%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	Mean							
Presents	0	0	0	13	20	30	34	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	9	38	30	21	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	4	18	46	30	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	11	16	38	33	5.9
Workload	0	0	0	30	25	32	11	5.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	16	27	44	11	5.5
Learn Exp	0	0	5	51	18	16	8	4.7

Students found Barrie's handouts and frequently updated website to be very helpful, and many appreciated his ability to clearly explain complex, and often dry, material.

On the other hand, some students found Barrie's lectures too packed with information, and felt that he often spoke too quickly making it hard to keep up with the ideas and concepts. Assignments were judged as being too difficult. Additionally, students complained about the pacing of the course - too much reading before the midterm, and not enough afterwards.

Overall, Barrie was considered a good instructor who demanded a lot from his students.

LIN 305H1S QUANTITATIVE METHODS IN LINGUISTICS

Instructor(s): R. Smyth

	Resp: 10							Retake: 66%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	Mean							
Presents	0	0	10	0	60	20	10	5.2
Explains	0	0	0	20	20	40	20	5.6
Communicates	0	0	10	0	30	30	30	5.7
Teaching	0	0	0	10	30	40	20	5.7
Workload	0	0	0	60	20	0	20	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	30	40	10	20	5.2
Learn Exp	0	0	33	11	11	33	11	4.8

Students found Smyth to be a good instructor, and especially appreciated the lecture notes that were posted on the web. Some students wished they could have gotten more practical experience with the statistics software.

LIN 306H1S LANGUAGE DIVERSITY AND LANGUAGE UNIVERSALS

Instructor(s): A. Johns

	Resp: 10							Retake: 80%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	Mean							
Presents	0	0	10	10	60	20	0	4.9
Explains	0	0	0	10	35	50	10	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	10	20	40	30	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	10	30	50	10	5.6
Workload	0	0	10	70	20	0	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	10	80	10	0	0	4.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	40	40	0	20	5.0

Students found Johns very enthusiastic and knowledgeable. They credited her for her approachability. Most students found the course very interesting and especially enjoyed the in-class presentation. The only complaints regarded the usefulness of the textbook.

LIN 322H1S PHONOLOGICAL THEORY

Instructor(s): K. Rice

	Resp: 18							Retake: 93%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	Mean							
Presents	0	0	0	0	0	38	61	6.6
Explains	0	0	0	0	0	38	61	6.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	55	11	83	6.8
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	27	72	6.7
Workload	0	0	0	61	27	11	0	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	61	22	16	0	4.6

Learn Exp	0	0	0	7	28	28	35	5.9
-----------	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	-----

Several students commented that Rice's enthusiasm for the course and material was infectious. A knowledgeable teacher, she was committed to her student and easily available for consultation. Rice was an excellent instructor who was open to discussion and pushed her students to achieve their best.

LIN 323H1F ACOUSTICS PHONETICS

Instructor(s): M. Chasin

	Resp: 23							Retake: 82%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	Mean							
Presents	0	0	4	8	21	39	26	5.7
Explains	0	4	4	13	26	26	26	5.4
Communicates	0	0	4	4	8	21	60	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	8	17	30	43	6.1
Workload	0	0	34	60	4	0	0	3.7
Difficulty	0	0	13	43	43	0	0	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	35	29	29	5	5.1

Chasin was considered to be a "knowledgeable" and "enthusiastic" instructor. Students reported that he made difficult concepts interesting and easy to understand. However, some found the pace of the course to be too quick and wished that Chasin would have slowed down at some points. Many felt that the (optional) textbook was not helpful. Overall, though, students enjoyed the course and the instructor. The field trip was especially enjoyed.

LIN 331H1F SYNTACTIC THEORY

Instructor(s): D. Massam

	Resp: 23							Retake: 72%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	Mean							
Presents	0	0	9	13	36	27	13	5.2
Explains	0	0	0	9	31	31	27	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	13	30	56	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	0	21	43	34	6.1
Workload	0	0	0	34	39	17	8	5.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	37	43	8	8	4.9
Learn Exp	0	0	5	5	35	25	30	5.7

Massam was an excellent instructor who was knowledgeable about syntax, and could explain things so it could be easily understood. She was also very enthusiastic about the course material. Massam was usually available to answer any questions, was very approachable and listened to any problems students had with the course or homework.

LIN 362H1F HISTORICAL LINGUISTICS

Instructor(s): E. Drescher

	Resp: 25							Retake: 66%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	Mean							
Presents	0	0	4	4	32	40	20	5.7
Explains	4	0	0	8	20	41	25	5.7
Communicates	0	4	0	4	16	36	40	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	12	20	37	29	5.8
Workload	0	0	4	64	20	12	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	16	32	20	20	12	4.8
Learn Exp	5	0	5	40	5	35	10	4.8

Drescher was a very good instructor who was very enthusiastic and approachable. There was a large emphasis put on phonology, and not as much on the historical aspect of linguistics.

The bi-weekly homework assignments did not always reflect the lectures, which made them a little difficult. The grade was composed of homework assignments, and a final, which meant that going into the final exam, there was no way to know what to expect.

LIN 372H1S INTRODUCTION TO COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS

Instructor(s): P. Reich

Enr: 53	Resp: 31							Retake: 56%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	6	6	32	35	19	0	4.5
Explains	0	0	19	22	38	3	16	4.7
Communicates	0	0	6	6	29	32	25	5.6
Teaching	0	0	6	16	36	26	13	5.2
Workload	0	6	3	74	12	3	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	0	9	51	19	16	3	4.5
Learn Exp	8	4	0	32	28	24	4	4.6

Students commented that Reich was a friendly, approachable instructor who was "always available", be it in person, by phone or by email. Several students enjoyed being exposed to a different point of view and theory from what was studied in other linguistics courses. Many students also complained, however, that their unpreparedness for this theoretical shift hindered their understanding of the material, especially at the beginning.

LIN 432H1S ADVANCED MORPHOLOGY: MORPHOSYNTAX

Instructor(s): A. Johns

Enr: 12	Resp: 14							Retake: 66%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	7	7	17	21	28	21	0	4.2
Explains	0	7	14	14	21	28	14	4.9
Communicates	0	0	7	15	15	30	30	5.6
Teaching	0	0	14	14	21	28	21	5.3
Workload	0	0	7	71	14	7	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	57	21	14	7	4.7
Learn Exp	8	0	0	25	25	25	16	5.0

Students thought Johns was a friendly, approachable instructor who had a solid understanding of the material. Many students complained, however, that lectures were disorganized. Most students felt, however, that the value of the assigned reading and overall learning experience was good.

LIN 451H1F DIALECTOLOGY

Instructor(s): J. Chambers

Enr: 6	Resp: 5							Retake: 80%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	0	60	40	6.4
Explains	0	0	0	20	0	40	40	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	0	20	0	80	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	40	60	6.6
Workload	0	0	0	0	40	40	20	5.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	20	20	40	20	5.6
Learn Exp	0	33	0	0	33	33	0	4.3

Chambers was enthusiastic and interesting. He brought excitement to the course and tried to teach to all levels of understanding. The course was difficult, with the bulk of the grade coming from one paper. The enrollment was small, which made the class more intimate and exciting.

Overall, the course and the instructor were great.

LIN 456H1S GRAMMATICAL VARIATION

Instructor(s): S. Tagliamonte

Enr: 7	Resp: 6							Retake: 66%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	66	16	16	5.5
Explains	0	0	0	16	50	0	33	5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	0	16	33	50	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	0	40	20	40	6.0
Workload	0	0	0	0	16	66	16	6.0
Difficulty	0	0	0	16	16	16	50	6.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	50	25	25	5.8

Almost all students considered this to be a good course. However, it was generally felt that more help was required in order to use the GoldVarb program properly - students would have liked a manual or an introductory session.



"My albert has this tremendous thirst for knowledge..."

