FRENCH COURSE UNION



Introduction

Celebrate French language, linguistics, literature, and culture with the French Course Union (FCU)! FCU is a student-run organization that represents undergraduate students who take French courses at the University of Toronto. We hold academic seminars and social events during the academic year. If you would like to hear more about us, or would like to get involved, please contact us by **onaimefrancais@hotmail.com** or come to ASSU. A heartfelt thank you to the Staff and Faculty at the Department of French for all their assistance and support.

FCU Executive

FCS 195H1S French Culture from Napoleon to Asterix

Instructor(s): H. Koo

| Enr: 98 | Resp: 75 | | | | | Reta | ke: 78% | |
|--------------|----------|----|----|----|----|------|---------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 16 | 39 | 35 | 6.0 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 26 | 38 | 30 | 5.9 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 31 | 52 | 6.3 |
| Teaching | 2 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 16 | 41 | 29 | 5.8 |
| Workload | 5 | 15 | 13 | 59 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3.5 |
| Difficulty | 1 | 8 | 15 | 61 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 3.8 |
| Learn Exp | 1 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 25 | 35 | 13 | 5.2 |

Students' comments were glowing and very appreciative of Koo's interest in the course material, as well as her attention to individual concerns. Other students thought that the tests encouraged memorization rather than understanding, and would have liked to have a textbook rather than handouts.

FCS 298H1F French Culture and Asia

Instructor(s): M. O'Neill-Karch

| Enr: 67 | Resp: 53 | | | | | Reta | ke: 82% | |
|--------------|----------|---|----|----|----|------|---------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 28 | 30 | 26 | 5.6 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 33 | 41 | 18 | 5.7 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 20 | 26 | 41 | 6.0 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 21 | 31 | 27 | 5.6 |
| Workload | 1 | 9 | 21 | 53 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 3.7 |
| Difficulty | 3 | 5 | 25 | 51 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 3.7 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 5 | 0 | 35 | 15 | 17 | 27 | 5.2 |

Overall, students appreciated the approachability, enthusiasm, and knowledge of the instructor. Many found the material interesting, yet some felt that the evaluation method should have been based on individual rather than group assignments. The expectations for assessment could have been more clearly communicated. However, most enjoyed the intimate learning atmosphere of the class and the positive interaction between students and the instructor.

FCS 391H1S Special Topics in French Cultural Studies II

Instructor(s): K. Komisaruk

| Enr: 10 | Resp: 10 | | | | | Reta | ke: 90% | |
|--------------|----------|----|----|----|----|------|---------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 70 | 6.2 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 60 | 6.2 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 22 | 66 | 6.4 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 12 | 25 | 50 | 6.1 |
| Workload | 20 | 0 | 10 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.3 |
| Difficulty | 10 | 10 | 10 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.4 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 28 | 28 | 5.4 |

Students found the instructor's passion and sense of humour of great value in making this course a rich and rewarding learning experience. Some students noted the need for a text. Some felt there were too many quizzes.

FCS 395H1S Sensuality and the French

Instructor(s): D. Clandfield

| Enr: 112 | | Re | sp: 76 | ; | | Reta | ke: 61% | , D |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|----|------|---------|--------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 2 | 9 | 26 | 30 | 13 | 17 | 5.0 |
| Explains | 0 | 1 | 5 | 30 | 26 | 24 | 12 | 5.0 |
| Communicates | 0 | 1 | 4 | 16 | 25 | 27 | 25 | 5.5 |
| Teaching | 1 | 0 | 8 | 17 | 26 | 28 | 18 | 5.3 |
| Workload | 2 | 5 | 14 | 62 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 3.8 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 6 | 16 | 55 | 12 | 6 | 2 | 4.0 |
| Learn Exp | 1 | 3 | 12 | 43 | 10 | 17 | 12 | 4.6 |

Most students appreciated Clandfield's passion and enthusiasm for the course. Some students also commented on the harsh marking and unclear wording and expectations of the mini-assignments. Students also noted that lecture notes were not posted before the lecture.

FCS 497H1S Contemporary Feminisms in France and Quebec

Instructor(s): B. Havercroft

| Enr: 12 | | Re | sp: 9 | | | Reta | | |
|--------------|---|----|-------|----|----|------|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 77 | 6.8 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 77 | 6.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 66 | 6.7 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 77 | 6.8 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 4.2 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 4.2 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 20 | 40 | 5.6 |

Students found Havercroft's knowledge, enthusiasm, and approachable manner thoroughly enjoyable. The instructor encouraged students to develop their own ideas while providing intriguing material to discuss in class and on assignments. Havercroft showed great concern for the students.

FRE 140Y1Y The Pleasure of Reading

Instructor(s): A. Cozea

| Enr: 8 | Resp: 7 | | | | Retak | Retake: 100% | | |
|--------------|---------|---|----|----|-------|--------------|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 28 | 25 | 5.4 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 14 | 14 | 28 | 0 | 42 | 5.4 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 42 | 6.0 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 14 | 57 | 6.3 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 28 | 42 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 25 | 42 | 14 | 0 | 14 | 4.3 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 16 | 33 | 33 | 5.8 |

FRE 172H1S French Grammar, within Reason

Instructor(s): M. Troberg

| Enr: 40 | | Re | sp: 30 |) | Retake: 89% | | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|-------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 48 | 37 | 6.2 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 34 | 31 | 27 | 5.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 41 | 44 | 6.2 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 48 | 41 | 6.3 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 20 | 3 | 3 | 4.4 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 13 | 46 | 30 | 6 | 3 | 4.4 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 38 | 23 | 7 | 5.1 |

Students thoroughly enjoyed Troberg's enthusiastic and organized teaching style, noting her approachability and accessibility, both through email and during office hours. Students felt the course section should have met more than once a week, and recommended that the course be made a requirement of French programs. Some felt the tests were too long and required too much memorization.

FRE 240Y1Y Introduction to Literary Analysis

Instructor(s): A. Motsch

| Enr: 27 | Resp: 17 | | | | | Reta | ke: 41% | <u>Mean</u> 4.1 4.6 5.9 | |
|--------------|----------|----|----|----|----|------|---------|----------------------------------|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean | |
| Presents | 0 | 11 | 5 | 47 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 4.1 | |
| Explains | 0 | 5 | 17 | 17 | 29 | 23 | 5 | 4.6 | |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 23 | 29 | 35 | 5.9 | |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 52 | 29 | 5 | 5.2 | |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 12 | 31 | 12 | 31 | 12 | 5.0 | |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 37 | 25 | 12 | 5.2 | |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 46 | 13 | 0 | 4.7 | |

Many students felt that the course load was heavy and that clearer instructions for evaluations would have been helpful.

Instructor(s): C. Vercollier

| Enr: 33 | Resp: 26 | | | | | Reta | ke: 84% | |
|--------------|----------|---|---|----|----|------|---------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 23 | 61 | 6.5 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 26 | 61 | 6.5 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 19 | 15 | 57 | 6.2 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 46 | 38 | 6.2 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 7 | 53 | 26 | 7 | 3 | 4.5 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 3 | 7 | 42 | 23 | 23 | 0 | 4.5 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 4 | 54 | 8 | 5.4 |

Vercollier was a very good and organized instructor. Some felt that there was too much material to cover in one course, and that the tests were difficult.

FRE 272Y1Y The Structure of Modern French: An Introduction

Instructor(s): J. Steele

| Enr: 61 | Resp: 45 | | | | | Reta | Retake: 59% | | |
|--------------|----------|---|----|----|----|------|-------------|------|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 13 | 45 | 31 | 6.0 | |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 29 | 29 | 27 | 5.7 | |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 29 | 31 | 31 | 5.9 | |
| Teaching | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 22 | 47 | 22 | 5.8 | |
| Workload | 0 | 4 | 13 | 62 | 15 | 4 | 0 | 4.0 | |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 16 | 39 | 25 | 11 | 6 | 4.5 | |
| Learn Exp | 2 | 0 | 2 | 44 | 27 | 16 | 5 | 4.7 | |

Many students appreciated the enthusiasm of the instructor and his concise organization and effective communication of the material. However, some students felt that the instructor spoke too quickly and that it would have been helpful to have lecture notes before class.

Instructor(s): Y. Roberge

| Enr: 54 | | Re | sp: 39 |) | | Reta | ke: 70 | % |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|----|------|--------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 33 | 38 | 25 | 5.9 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 46 | 25 | 5.9 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 28 | 41 | 28 | 5.9 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 21 | 50 | 26 | 6.0 |
| Workload | 0 | 2 | 13 | 59 | 10 | 8 | 5 | 4.2 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 16 | 48 | 21 | 8 | 5 | 4.4 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 22 | 22 | 16 | 5.2 |

Students highly appreciated the instructor's effective presentation of the material, his approachability and enthusiasm. Many students also commented that they found tutorials helpful.

FRE 273Y1Y General History of the French Language

Instructor(s): H. Pagan

| Enr: 21 | Resp: 20 | | | | | Reta | ke: 73% | 6 |
|--------------|----------|---|---|----|----|------|---------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 6 | 6 | 18 | 50 | 12 | 6 | 4.8 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 6 | 33 | 20 | 33 | 6 | 5.0 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 37 | 31 | 12 | 5.3 |
| Teaching | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 42 | 35 | 7 | 5.1 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 6 | 81 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 4.1 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 5 | 64 | 17 | 11 | 0 | 4.4 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 26 | 33 | 0 | 4.9 |

Overall, Pagan was enthusiastic and funny, and her reviews at the beginning of the class very helpful. Some students, however, commented that she spoke too quickly and that the history section at the beginning of the term was very confusing.

FRE 277Y1Y Ortheopy

Instructor(s): J. Steele

| Enr: 17 | | Re | sp: 15 | ; | | | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|----|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 46 | 46 | 6.4 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 20 | 26 | 46 | 6.1 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 53 | 40 | 6.3 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 40 | 33 | 6.1 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 20 | 46 | 26 | 6 | 0 | 4.2 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 13 | 46 | 26 | 13 | 0 | 4.4 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 23 | 38 | 0 | 5.0 |

The majority found Steele very enthusiastic and knowledgeable. A few students complained about the limited and inadequate multimedia lab access, access which was integral to students' success in the course.

Instructor(s): S. Sonina

| Enr: 23 | | Re | sp: 19 |) | Retake: 87% | | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|-------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 68 | 6.5 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 26 | 68 | 6.6 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 78 | 6.7 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 26 | 63 | 6.5 |
| Workload | 0 | 5 | 0 | 88 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3.9 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 11 | 72 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 4.1 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 30 | 38 | 23 | 5.8 |

Students responded well to Sonina's teaching style, and many commented on her warmth and accessibility. Some students would have preferred a bound collection of course notes rather than handouts.

Instructor(s): S. Mastromonaco

| Enr: 20 | Res | sp: 19 | | | 6 | | | |
|----------|-----|--------|---|----|----|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 25 | 31 | 31 | 5.8 |

ASSU ANTI-CALENDAR 75

| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 56 | 18 | 5.9 |
|--------------|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|-----|
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 93 | 6.9 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 56 | 31 | 6.1 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 6 | 81 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 4.1 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 6 | 81 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 4.1 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 40 | 13 | 20 | 5.3 |

Students found Mastromonaco very helpful and approachable.

Instructor(s): S. Mastromonaco

| Enr: 15 | | Re | sp: 11 | | | | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|----|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 9 | 27 | 27 | 36 | 0 | 4.9 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 54 | 27 | 9 | 5.4 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 54 | 27 | 6.1 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 45 | 45 | 0 | 5.4 |
| Workload | 0 | 9 | 45 | 27 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 3.5 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 18 | 54 | 18 | 9 | 0 | 4.2 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 10 | 40 | 20 | 30 | 0 | 4.7 |

Students appreciated the instructor's approachability and the usefulness of the learned material; however, they would have appreciated more individual attention for labs and clearer organization of the materials.

FRE 304H1F Women Writers

| | Instructor | s): B. | . Havercroft |
|--|------------|--------|--------------|
|--|------------|--------|--------------|

| Enr: 14 | Resp: 11 | | | | | | | |
|--------------|----------|---|---|-----|----|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 45 | 45 | 6.3 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 36 | 54 | 6.5 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 27 | 63 | 6.5 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 36 | 6.4 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 4.1 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 44 | 22 | 5.9 |

All the students found the instructor enthusiastic, organized and helpful. They also enjoyed the selection of novels.

FRE 317H1S Explorations of Self in Contemporary Quebec Theatre Instructor(s): A. Watanabe

instructor(s). A. watanab

| Enr: 13 | Resp: 11 | | | | Retake: 90% | | | | |
|--------------|----------|---|---|----|-------------|----|----|------|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 45 | 36 | 6.1 | |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 45 | 36 | 6.1 | |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 36 | 54 | 6.5 | |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 18 | 63 | 6.5 | |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 9 | 72 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 4.2 | |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 4.3 | |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 25 | 37 | 12 | 5.4 | |

Students found the Watanabe engaging and enthusiastic, encouraging independent thinking and sharing of ideas. Students thoroughly appreciated his feedback on assignments.

FRE 320Y1Y The 17th Century: The Rise of Classicism

Instructor(s): B. Bolduc

| Enr: 18 | | Re | sp: 18 | 3 | Retake: 76% | | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|-------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 23 | 41 | 29 | 5.9 |
| Explains | 0 | 5 | 0 | 16 | 16 | 33 | 27 | 5.6 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 33 | 61 | 6.6 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 17 | 47 | 23 | 5.8 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 5 | 50 | 38 | 0 | 5 | 4.5 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 55 | 5 | 0 | 4.7 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 35 | 35 | 7 | 5.3 |

Students responded enthusiastically to Bolduc's fascinating, well-

organized lecturing style. Many commented that Bolduc was able to make somewhat advanced material interesting and relevant.

FRE 324Y1Y The 19th Century: The Age of Revolutions

Instructor(s): A. Oliver

| Enr: 19 | | Resp: 15 | | | | Retake: 76% | | | |
|--------------|---|----------|---|----|----|-------------|----|------|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 35 | 21 | 35 | 5.9 | |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 38 | 38 | 6.2 | |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 21 | 64 | 6.5 | |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 28 | 42 | 6.1 | |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 4.4 | |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 35 | 7 | 0 | 4.5 | |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 58 | 0 | 25 | 5.3 | |

Students referred to the instructor as brilliant and superb, even going so far as to say that he revitalized their views of the 19th century. Students thoroughly enjoyed the readings and enjoyed the in-depth analysis of romantic literature.

FRE 367H1F Studies in the 20th Century French Novel I

Instructor(s): A. Cozea

| Enr: 16 | Resp: 15 | | | | Retake: 93% | | | |
|--------------|----------|---|---|----|-------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 6 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 40 | 26 | 0 | 4.7 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 20 | 46 | 20 | 5.7 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 20 | 66 | 6.5 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 50 | 35 | 6.2 |
| Workload | 7 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 3.9 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 40 | 20 | 6 | 5.0 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 5.3 |

Students thoroughly enjoyed Cozea's philosophical approach to literature and her engaging, fascinating personality.

FRE 375Y1Y Comparative Stylistics

Instructor(s): F. Collins

| Enr: 44 | Resp: 32 | | | | Retake: 76% | | | |
|--------------|----------|---|----|----|-------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 3 | 25 | 31 | 21 | 18 | 5.3 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 18 | 40 | 25 | 5.7 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 50 | 37 | 6.2 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 60 | 30 | 6.2 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 21 | 68 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 3.9 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 3 | 56 | 28 | 12 | 0 | 4.5 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 10 | 24 | 24 | 31 | 10 | 5.1 |

Students loved the instructor's approachability, humour and enthusiasm. They also appreciated that he truly cared about the students. Many however, thought that a textbook would have been helpful.

FRE 376H1F French Phonology and Phonetics

Instructor(s): P. Bhatt

| Enr: 31 | | Res | sp: 22 | | | Retake: 80% | | | |
|--------------|---|-----|--------|----|----|-------------|----|------|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 27 | 68 | 6.6 | |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 59 | 36 | 6.3 | |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 22 | 54 | 6.3 | |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 45 | 50 | 6.5 | |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 18 | 4 | 0 | 4.3 | |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 31 | 4 | 4 | 4.5 | |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 33 | 23 | 9 | 5.1 | |

Students appreciated how the instructor was organized, helpful and knowledgeable, as well as humorous. They also found lecture notes enhanced their learning. Some felt, however, that the evaluation method should have included smaller and several assignments rather than a few big ones.

FRE 378H1F French Syntax

Instructor(s): Y. Roberge

| Enr: 33 | | Re | sp: 27 | , | Retake: 70% | | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|-------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 29 | 25 | 37 | 5.9 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 18 | 33 | 29 | 5.7 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 30 | 42 | 6.2 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 33 | 51 | 6.4 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 14 | 70 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 4.0 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 33 | 7 | 7 | 4.7 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 15 | 35 | 10 | 5.2 |

Students found the instructor very enthusiastic and helpful. A few felt that he moved too fast through difficult material and that the textbook was insufficient in explaining concepts. Above all, students appreciated the passion of the instructor and greatly enjoyed the classroom experience.

FRE 387H1S French Morphology

Instructor(s): A-M. Brousseau

| Enr: 28 | | Re | sp: 17 | , | | Reta | ke: 29% | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|----|------|---------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 11 | 23 | 23 | 35 | 5 | 5.0 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 41 | 23 | 11 | 5.2 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 5 | 17 | 23 | 29 | 23 | 5.5 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 35 | 35 | 17 | 5.6 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 17 | 58 | 17 | 5 | 0 | 4.1 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 58 | 5 | 0 | 4.7 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 25 | 50 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 4.2 |

Although some students felt the course material was dry and uninteresting, they liked Brousseau and found her to be very approachable.

FRE 420H1S Ardour and Armour in Medieval France

Instructor(s): F. Collins

| Enr: 13 | Resp: 11 | | | | Retake: 60% | | | |
|--------------|----------|---|----|----|-------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 36 | 18 | 27 | 5.9 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 27 | 36 | 27 | 5.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 36 | 27 | 5.9 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 30 | 40 | 20 | 5.7 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 10 | 80 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 10 | 70 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 4.9 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 14 | 42 | 28 | 0 | 14 | 4.6 |

Many students thought the instructor was a good lecturer and very approachable. Some commented that they appreciated his selection of short excerpts rather than entire texts. Others mentioned they might have benefitted from a more thorough introduction to the works studied.

FRE 438H1F Advanced Topics in French Studies I

Instructor(s): B. Bolduc

| Enr: 16 | | Resp: 15 | | | | Retake: 69% | | | |
|--------------|----|----------|----|----|----|-------------|----|------|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 13 | 20 | 53 | 6.1 | |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 20 | 13 | 53 | 5.9 | |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 20 | 66 | 6.5 | |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 26 | 20 | 40 | 5.8 | |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 26 | 33 | 6 | 5.1 | |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 26 | 26 | 13 | 5.2 | |
| Learn Exp | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 50 | 10 | 5.2 | |

Most students found this instructor enthusiastic and well-organized. Some students however, felt there should have been more opportunity for class participation.

FRE 449H1S French Poetry

Instructor(s): A. Cozea

| Enr: 16 | Re | sp: 10 |) | | Reta | ike: 80% | | |
|--------------|----|--------|----|----|------|----------|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 20 | 5.5 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 50 | 6.1 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 60 | 6.3 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 22 | 66 | 6.6 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 10 | 60 | 20 | 10 | 0 | 4.3 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 40 | 30 | 0 | 5.0 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 57 | 6.1 |

Many students greatly enjoyed the works studied and Cozea's philosophical approach to the subject. A few found the readings challenging.

FRE 450H1S The Sable Centre Seminar in 19th Century French Studies

Instructor(s): D. Speirs

| Enr: 17 | Resp: 16 | | | | Retake: 100% | | | |
|--------------|----------|---|----|----|--------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 43 | 43 | 6.3 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 62 | 6.6 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 87 | 6.9 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 81 | 6.8 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 12 | 81 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 4.0 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 6 | 0 | 87 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 4.0 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 45 | 5.9 |

Students had nothing but praise for Speirs, described by many as "passionate", "wonderful" and "exceptional". One student gave her an "A+".

FRE 479H1S Sociolinguistics of French

Instructor(s): Y. Roberge

| Enr: 28 | | Re | sp: 23 | | | Reta | ike: 90 | % |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|----|------|---------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 21 | 43 | 21 | 5.7 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 65 | 21 | 6.0 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 43 | 47 | 6.4 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 60 | 30 | 6.2 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 13 | 78 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 4.1 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 25 | 5 | 15 | 4.8 |

Most students commented that Roberge was a very good instructor. However, students would have found it helpful had material regarding assignments been presented before the assignment was due.

FRE 480Y1Y Translation: French to English

Instructor(s): F. Collins

| Enr: 19 | | Res | sp: 12 | | | % | | |
|--------------|---|-----|--------|----|----|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 50 | 6.5 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 83 | 6.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 94 | 6.9 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 91 | 6.9 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 8 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.9 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 16 | 8 | 0 | 4.3 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 11 | 55 | 6.2 |

FRE 489H1S Special Topics in Advanced Linguistics II

Instructor(s): Y. Roberge

| Enr: 8 | Resp: 6 | | | | Retake: 16% | | | |
|----------------------|---------|--------|--------|----------|-------------|----------|----------|------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents Explains | 0 | 0 0 | 0 0 | 33 16 | 33 16 | 16 50 | 16 16 | 5.2 5.7 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 16 | 50 | 6.2 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 33 | 50 | 6.3 |

|--|

| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 16 | 66 | 0 | 5.5 |
|------------|---|---|---|----|----|-----|----|-----|
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 33 | 50 | 6.3 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 6.0 |

Although students felt that the course material was advanced and challenging, they appreciated the instructor's excellent presentation.

FSL 100H1S French for Beginners I

Instructor(s): P. Berney

| Enr: 57 | Resp: 43 | | | | | Reta | ke: 82% | |
|--------------|----------|---|---|----|----|------|---------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 29 | 53 | 6.2 |
| Explains | 2 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 10 | 45 | 30 | 5.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 15 | 30 | 47 | 6.1 |
| Teaching | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 42 | 45 | 6.2 |
| Workload | 0 | 2 | 0 | 39 | 17 | 29 | 12 | 5.1 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 2 | 0 | 52 | 25 | 15 | 5 | 4.7 |
| Learn Exp | 2 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 32 | 32 | 18 | 5.4 |

Most students had very positive comments regarding Berney and said that she was organized, helpful and understanding. Some students complained that the oral classes were not effective and did not improve their French. Students did appreciate the extra grammar handouts provided by the instructor and commented that she was very prompt in handing back tests.

FSL 101H1F French for Beginners II

Instructor(s): L. Morra

| Enr: 23 | | Re | sp: 17 | , | | Retak | e: 100 | 7 Mean 1 6.2 1 6.1 | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|----|-------|--------|------------------------|--|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean | | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 56 | 31 | 6.2 | | |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 50 | 31 | 6.1 | | |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 31 | 56 | 6.4 | | |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 66 | 6.7 | | |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 6 | 37 | 31 | 25 | 0 | 4.8 | | |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 23 | 41 | 17 | 11 | 5 | 4.4 | | |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 13 | 40 | 26 | 5.7 | | |

Morra was very enthusiastic and pleasant. She went to extra lengths to ensure her students understand the material.

FSL 101H1S French for Beginners II

Instructor(s): N. Daou

| Enr: 20 | Resp: 15 | | | | | Reta | ke: 78% | <u>Mean</u> 5.0 4.8 5.4 5.4 | |
|--------------|----------|---|---|----|----|------|---------|---|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 6 | 26 | 33 | 26 | 6 | 5.0 | |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 6 | 33 | 40 | 13 | 6 | 4.8 | |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 46 | 26 | 13 | 5.4 | |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 26 | 46 | 6 | 5.4 | |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 35 | 21 | 0 | 4.8 | |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 7 | 28 | 57 | 7 | 0 | 4.6 | |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 7 | 23 | 30 | 15 | 23 | 5.2 | |

Students loved the instructor's ability to explain the material clearly, and they appreciated the fact that the instructor went "an extra mile" to enrich their learning experience. Some students, however, felt that more instruction in English would have been helpful.

FSL 102H1S Introductory French

Instructor(s): S. Walsh

| Enr: 69 | Resp: 37 | | | | | Reta | ke: 79% | e: 79% Mean | | |
|--------------|----------|---|----|----|----|------|---------|----------------|--|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean | | |
| Presents | 2 | 2 | 5 | 37 | 31 | 20 | 0 | 4.5 | | |
| Explains | 0 | 5 | 0 | 27 | 19 | 22 | 25 | 5.3 | | |
| Communicates | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 13 | 30 | 47 | 6.1 | | |
| Teaching | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 31 | 37 | 20 | 5.5 | | |
| Workload | 0 | 5 | 2 | 54 | 22 | 8 | 5 | 4.4 | | |
| Difficulty | 0 | 2 | 11 | 48 | 28 | 5 | 2 | 4.3 | | |

| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 26 | 33 | 6 | 5.1 |
|-----------|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|-----|
|-----------|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|-----|

Students enjoyed the instructor's teaching style but felt that the course should have allowed for more oral practice and peer-peer interaction. Students felt that more resources geared towards oral comprehension would have been helpful.

FSL 121Y1Y Intermediate French

Instructor(s): M. Tsimenis

| Enr: 15 | Resp: 8 | | | | | Retal | ke: 100 | 0% |
|--------------|---------|---|---|-----|----|-------|---------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 75 | 6.8 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 75 | 6.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 7.0 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 7.0 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 4.2 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 33 | 50 | 6.3 |

Students appreciated Tsimenis' enthusiasm and knowledge. The following student's comment reflects the overall enjoyment of the class: "She made learning French fun, class was enjoyable!"

Instructor(s): M. Tsimenis

| Enr: 25 | | Re | sp: 10 |) | | Reta | ke: 80% | % |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|----|------|---------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 30 | 6.3 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 80 | 6.7 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 90 | 6.9 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 30 | 60 | 6.5 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 10 | 50 | 10 | 20 | 10 | 4.7 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 20 | 0 | 10 | 4.5 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 16 | 50 | 16 | 5.7 |

Students raved about the instructor's warmth and energy. They also noted that she was wonderful at explaining concepts. Only a few students commented that the oral component should have been worth more in the overall evaluation scheme.

Instructor(s): T. EI-Hoss

| Enr: 51 | | Res | sp: 29 |) | | Reta | ke: 72% | |
|--------------|---|-----|--------|----|----|------|---------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 24 | 34 | 24 | 5.7 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 24 | 58 | 10 | 5.7 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 3 | 48 | 34 | 6.0 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 17 | 48 | 27 | 6.0 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 3 | 37 | 34 | 20 | 3 | 4.8 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 6 | 37 | 48 | 3 | 3 | 4.6 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 4 | 4 | 28 | 23 | 33 | 4 | 4.9 |

Many students felt that the workload was too high, but the class found the instructor very good and enthusiastic.

Instructor(s): T. EI-Hoss

| Enr: 32 | Resp: 22 | | | | | Reta | ke: 95% | ke: 95% | | |
|--------------|----------|---|---|----|----|------|---------|---------|--|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean | | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 50 | 40 | 6.2 | | |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 45 | 40 | 6.2 | | |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 22 | 68 | 6.5 | | |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 31 | 59 | 6.5 | | |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 4 | 45 | 31 | 13 | 4 | 4.7 | | |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 13 | 27 | 9 | 5.0 | | |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 25 | 43 | 25 | 5.9 | | |

EI-Hoss' enthusiasm helped make the learning experience enjoyable. She communicated lessons very clearly and always answered students' questions.

78 FRENCH

Instructor(s): M. Tsimenis

| Enr: 16 | Resp: 12 | | | | | Reta | ke: 75% | |
|--------------|----------|---|---|----|----|------|---------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 33 | 16 | 33 | 5.4 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 36 | 36 | 9 | 5.4 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 33 | 50 | 6.3 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 25 | 33 | 33 | 5.9 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 8 | 83 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 8 | 75 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 4.2 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 9 | 54 | 18 | 9 | 9 | 4.5 |

Students praised Tsimenis' enthusiasm, organization, patience and willingness to help. However, most students felt that the course could have been better organized, especially in terms of the oral component.

Instructor(s): M. Tsimenis

| Enr: 11 | Resp: 14 | | | | | Reta | ke: 92% | |
|--------------|----------|---|---|----|----|------|---------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 50 | 42 | 6.4 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 28 | 57 | 6.4 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 7 | 78 | 6.6 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 71 | 6.7 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 7 | 57 | 21 | 14 | 0 | 4.4 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 35 | 14 | 0 | 4.6 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 16 | 50 | 16 | 5.7 |

Students thoroughly enjoyed the instructor's enthusiasm and dedication, noting that it was easy to participate in class discussions. The instructor was helpful and allowed students to learn and ask questions without feeling hesitant or insecure. An excellent instructor and course.

FSL 161Y1Y Practical French

Instructor(s): A. Le Bris

| Enr: 33 | Resp: 24 | | | | | Reta | ke: 79% | |
|--------------|----------|---|----|----|----|------|---------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 4 | 29 | 29 | 16 | 20 | 5.2 |
| Explains | 0 | 4 | 8 | 26 | 30 | 8 | 21 | 5.0 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 4 | 16 | 25 | 20 | 33 | 5.6 |
| Teaching | 0 | 4 | 4 | 16 | 37 | 12 | 25 | 5.2 |
| Workload | 0 | 4 | 29 | 62 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3.7 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 5 | 70 | 20 | 4 | 0 | 4.2 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 5 | 10 | 25 | 20 | 30 | 10 | 4.9 |

Students enjoyed Le Bris' enthusiasm and felt encouraged to keep learning French. Several students noted the need for a more updated text. Some felt that the labs were rather useless and unnecessarily difficult.

Instructor(s): V. Masse

| Enr: 35 | Resp: 24 | | | | | Reta | Retake: 54% | | | |
|--------------|----------|---|----|----|----|------|-------------|------|--|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean | | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 21 | 39 | 17 | 5.5 | | |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 30 | 26 | 26 | 5.6 | | |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 26 | 21 | 34 | 5.7 | | |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 36 | 27 | 31 | 5.9 | | |
| Workload | 4 | 0 | 20 | 66 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3.8 | | |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 12 | 70 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 4.1 | | |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 10 | 30 | 25 | 25 | 10 | 4.9 | | |

The class appreciated Masse's enthusiasm, organization, and clear explanations as well as his sense of humour. A few felt the course was challenging and that more involvement in class discussion would have helped.

Instructor(s): G. Poiret

| Enr: 35 | | Re | sp: 21 | | | Reta | Retake: 50% 6 7 4 0 14 0 | | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|----|------|-----------------------------------|------|--|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean | | |
| Presents | 9 | 4 | 14 | 38 | 28 | 4 | 0 | 3.9 | | |
| Explains | 0 | 9 | 9 | 38 | 28 | 14 | 0 | 4.3 | | |
| Communicates | 4 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 52 | 28 | 4 | 5.0 | | |
| Teaching | 4 | 14 | 4 | 33 | 28 | 14 | 0 | 4.1 | | |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 4 | 71 | 19 | 4 | 0 | 4.2 | | |
| Difficulty | 0 | 4 | 0 | 28 | 38 | 19 | 9 | 5.0 | | |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 5 | 17 | 35 | 35 | 5 | 0 | 4.2 | | |

Students commented that they would have benefitted from a more structured lesson plan, and that the instructor was at times harsh in his approach.

FSL 163H1F Practical French: Oral

Instructor(s): N. Miele

| Enr: 10 | Resp: 6 | | | | | Retak | e: 100 | % |
|--------------|---------|---|---|-----|----|-------|--------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 6.0 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 16 | 33 | 5.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 66 | 6.7 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 66 | 6.7 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 4.2 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 75 | 6.8 |

Miele was unanimously considered friendly, approachable, enthusiastic and "one of the most enjoyable instructors at UofT."

FSL 163H1S Practical French: Oral

Instructor(s): N. Miele

| Enr: 12 | Resp: 9 | | | | | Retake: 100% | | | |
|--------------|---------|---|----|----|----|--------------|----|------|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 33 | 44 | 6.2 | |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 11 | 66 | 6.4 | |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 77 | 6.8 | |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 77 | 6.8 | |
| Workload | 11 | 0 | 11 | 55 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 4.0 | |
| Difficulty | 11 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 4.0 | |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 42 | 42 | 6.1 | |

FSL 181Y1Y Language Practice I

Instructor(s): S. Farsandaj

| Enr: 39 | Re | sp: 37 | , | | Reta | ike: 88% | | |
|--------------|----|--------|----|----|------|----------|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 2 | 0 | 13 | 13 | 21 | 29 | 18 | 5.2 |
| Explains | 0 | 5 | 2 | 10 | 24 | 18 | 37 | 5.6 |
| Communicates | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 22 | 27 | 41 | 6.0 |
| Teaching | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 18 | 24 | 45 | 5.9 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 2 | 58 | 32 | 5 | 0 | 4.4 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 3 | 65 | 28 | 3 | 0 | 4.3 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 19 | 34 | 7 | 5.1 |

Most students felt that Farsandaj was very good. A few thought she was disorganized at times.

Instructor(s): A. Watanabe

| Enr: 36 | | Re | esp: 27 | 7 | | Retake: 88% | | |
|--------------|---|----|---------|----|----|-------------|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 53 | 23 | 11 | 5.3 |
| Explains | 3 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 38 | 26 | 19 | 5.3 |
| Communicates | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 42 | 23 | 5.7 |
| Teaching | 3 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 30 | 53 | 3 | 5.4 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 14 | 74 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 14 | 74 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 |
| Learn Exp | 4 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 28 | 9 | 4 | 4.5 |

Students enjoyed Watanabe's professional but friendly teaching style, and found him to be knowledgeable and helpful. They felt, however, that there was not enough time allocated to oral practice, and that the mandatory compositions were graded with expectations that exceeded those of a 100-level course.

FSL 261Y1Y Practical French II

Instructor(s): H. Pagan

| Enr: 35 | Resp: 25 | | | | | Reta | ake: 80% | | | |
|--------------|----------|---|----|----|----|------|----------|------|--|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean | | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 16 | 40 | 40 | 6.2 | | |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 20 | 56 | 20 | 5.9 | | |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 36 | 56 | 6.5 | | |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 44 | 40 | 6.2 | | |
| Workload | 4 | 4 | 24 | 60 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3.6 | | |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 24 | 56 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | | |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 23 | 23 | 0 | 4.7 | | |

Students found the lecture's enjoyable. Students praised Pagan for her ability to stimulate oral discussion and felt that their language skills improved as a result. Pagan was friendly, approachable and overall, a very good instructor.

Instructor(s): E. Muller

| Enr: 40 | | Res | sp: 24 | | | Reta | ke: 87% | 6 |
|--------------|---|-----|--------|----|----|------|---------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 34 | 52 | 6.3 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 29 | 33 | 25 | 5.7 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 20 | 45 | 6.1 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 45 | 37 | 6.2 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 8 | 62 | 16 | 4 | 8 | 4.4 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 8 | 54 | 16 | 20 | 0 | 4.5 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 29 | 35 | 11 | 5.4 |

Generally, students found Muller to be organized and likeable. However, some thought that marking of assignments was severe.

FSL 263H1S Language of the Media: Spoken French

Instructor(s): A. Le Bris

| Enr: 24 | Resp: 14 | | | | | Reta | ke: 92% | 6 |
|--------------|----------|---|----|----|----|------|---------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 46 | 23 | 5.9 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 50 | 14 | 5.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 54 | 27 | 6.1 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 25 | 41 | 6.1 |
| Workload | 7 | 0 | 14 | 42 | 14 | 7 | 14 | 4.4 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 21 | 14 | 0 | 4.5 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 12 | 50 | 5.8 |

The class appreciated Le Bris' enthusiasm, approachability and effective organization of the course.

FSL 281Y1Y Language Practice II: Written and Oral French

Instructor(s): M. Tsimenis

| Enr: 41 | Resp: 33 | | | | | Reta | etake: 84% | | | |
|--------------|----------|---|----|----|----|------|------------|------|--|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean | | |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 27 | 21 | 45 | 6.1 | | |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 21 | 39 | 36 | 6.1 | | |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 30 | 66 | 6.6 | | |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 30 | 54 | 6.4 | | |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 15 | 50 | 21 | 12 | 0 | 4.3 | | |
| Difficulty | 0 | 3 | 3 | 45 | 32 | 16 | 0 | 4.5 | | |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 40 | 11 | 14 | 5.1 | | |

Students loved the instructor's dedication, enthusiasm and encouragement. Some felt that more feedback for assignments would have been helpful.

Instructor(s): C. Prud'homme

| Enr: 11 | | Resp: 10 Retake: 70% | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|----------------------|----|----|----|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 40 | 20 | 10 | 5.1 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 30 | 50 | 0 | 5.3 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 40 | 30 | 10 | 5.2 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 40 | 30 | 10 | 5.3 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 10 | 80 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 4.1 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 28 | 14 | 42 | 0 | 14 | 4.6 |

Students would have preferred a greater emphasis on grammar and written exercises. The instructor was generally helpful in answering questions.

Instructor(s): T. EI-Hoss

| Enr: 37 | | Res | sp: 32 | | | Reta | ke: 90% | |
|--------------|---|-----|--------|----|----|------|---------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 46 | 34 | 6.1 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 22 | 29 | 41 | 6.1 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 28 | 62 | 6.5 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 37 | 53 | 6.4 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 9 | 68 | 12 | 6 | 3 | 4.2 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 3 | 50 | 31 | 15 | 0 | 4.6 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 4 | 27 | 36 | 13 | 18 | 5.1 |

Students found El-Hoss excellent, enthusiastic and approachable.

Instructor(s): M. Tsimenis

| Enr: 24 | | Res | sp: 18 | | | | | |
|--------------|---|-----|--------|----|----|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 44 | 50 | 6.4 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 27 | 66 | 6.6 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 27 | 66 | 6.6 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 38 | 55 | 6.4 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 5 | 72 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 4.3 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 5 | 55 | 33 | 5 | 0 | 4.4 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 57 | 7 | 28 | 5.6 |

Students appreciated this instructor's enthusiasm, dedication and organization.

Instructor(s): E. Muller

| Enr: 13 | | Re | sp: 10 |) | Retake: 100% | | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|--------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 40 | 30 | 6.0 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 80 | 10 | 6.0 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 70 | 20 | 6.1 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 20 | 10 | 6.2 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 10 | 50 | 30 | 10 | 0 | 4.4 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 22 | 11 | 0 | 4.4 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 37 | 0 | 25 | 5.1 |

While students found Muller very encouraging, they felt there could have been more grammar reviewed. They also enjoyed the "current" topics discussed in class.

FSL 361Y1Y Practical French III

Instructor(s): S. Marzano

| Enr: 45 | | Re | sp: 29 |) | Retake: 96% | | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|-------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 17 | 34 | 44 | 6.2 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 24 | 58 | 6.3 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 82 | 6.8 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 62 | 6.6 |
| Workload | 6 | 3 | 24 | 62 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3.5 |
| Difficulty | 6 | 0 | 13 | 68 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 3.8 |

80 FRENCH

| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 4 | 16 | 20 | 25 | 33 | 5.7 |
|-----------|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|-----|
|-----------|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|-----|

Students felt that Marzano was extremely enthusiastic and energetic. Lectures were interesting and practical and Marzano was always available for extra help.

FSL 366H1F Business French

Instructor(s): M.A. Visoi

| Enr: 37 | Resp: 29 | | | | | Reta | ke: 68% | |
|--------------|----------|----|----|----|----|------|---------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 8 | 25 | 41 | 20 | 4 | 4.9 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 25 | 45 | 4 | 5.3 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 20 | 41 | 20 | 5.6 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 41 | 26 | 12 | 5.4 |
| Workload | 0 | 12 | 12 | 70 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3.7 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 8 | 20 | 58 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 3.8 |
| Learn Exp | 5 | 5 | 0 | 36 | 42 | 10 | 0 | 4.4 |

Most enjoyed Visoi and found the course material relevant. A few found the course boring and the instructor a little disorganized at times.

FSL 381Y1Y Language Practice III: Written and Oral French

Instructor(s): A. Cozea

| Enr: 24 | | Resp: 18 | | | | Reta | Retake: 88% | | |
|--------------|---|----------|----|----|----|------|-------------|------|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean | |
| Presents | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 55 | 16 | 11 | 5.1 | |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 61 | 5 | 5.4 | |
| Communicates | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 55 | 6.3 | |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 55 | 33 | 18 | 6.1 | |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 11 | 77 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 | |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 11 | 83 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3.9 | |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 8 | 0 | 16 | 33 | 25 | 16 | 5.2 | |

Overall, students liked this course and Cozea as the instructor. They thoroughly enjoyed her enthusiasm and said that she encouraged "thinking outside the box". Students had the chance to talk quite a bit in this course, thereby improving their oral skills.

Instructor(s): T. El-Hoss

| Enr: 22 | | Resp: 16 Retake: 78% | | | | | | |
|--------------|----|----------------------|----|----|----|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 53 | 33 | 6.1 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 18 | 37 | 37 | 6.1 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 6 | 50 | 31 | 6.0 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 56 | 31 | 6.1 |
| Workload | 12 | 6 | 18 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.3 |
| Difficulty | 6 | 0 | 12 | 68 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 3.8 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 23 | 23 | 7 | 4.9 |

Students felt that El-Hoss was well-organized, helpful and approachable. The labs were very useful and well-structured.

FSL 382H1F Language Practice III: Written French

Instructor(s): S. Joseph

| Enr: 21 | | Resp: 14 Retake: 58% | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|----------------------|---|----|----|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 28 | 42 | 6.1 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 35 | 28 | 21 | 5.5 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 14 | 71 | 6.5 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 42 | 35 | 6.1 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 7 | 38 | 23 | 30 | 0 | 4.8 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 38 | 38 | 0 | 5.2 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 9 | 27 | 18 | 45 | 0 | 5.0 |

Joseph was generally considered energetic and helpful. Many thought the language labs were not well-organized and a waste of time.

FSL 383H1S Language Practice III: Oral French

Instructor(s): T. EI-Hoss

| Enr: 40 | | Re | sp: 30 |) | Retake: 86% | | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|-------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 27 | 41 | 24 | 5.8 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 33 | 26 | 5.9 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 34 | 62 | 6.6 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 53 | 36 | 6.3 |
| Workload | 3 | 3 | 33 | 53 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3.6 |
| Difficulty | 3 | 0 | 20 | 53 | 16 | 6 | 0 | 4.0 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 26 | 23 | 11 | 5.1 |

Students were pleased with this instructor's enthusiasm and organization. They felt, however, that there should have been more emphasis on oral practice in the classroom.

FSL 461Y1Y Practical French IV

Instructor(s): C. Vercollier

| Enr: 27 | Resp: 27 | | | | | Retake: 84% | | |
|--------------|----------|---|----|----|----|-------------|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 34 | 23 | 26 | 5.4 |
| Explains | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 15 | 19 | 50 | 5.8 |
| Communicates | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 23 | 46 | 6.0 |
| Teaching | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 34 | 42 | 5.9 |
| Workload | 0 | 3 | 11 | 46 | 26 | 11 | 0 | 4.3 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 3 | 7 | 50 | 23 | 11 | 3 | 4.4 |
| Learn Exp | 5 | 5 | 0 | 15 | 45 | 25 | 5 | 4.8 |

Most students felt that Vercollier was very creative, insightful and interesting. A few commented that the class was sometimes too intense and that the marking scheme was severe. Also, they would have liked clearer assignment expectations at the beginning of the year.

FSL 482H1F Language Practice IV: Written French

Instructor(s): C. Vercollier

| Enr: 10 | | Re | sp: 8 | | Retake: 100% | | | |
|--------------|---|----|-------|-----|--------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 25 | 62 | 6.5 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 75 | 6.8 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 62 | 6.6 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 87 | 6.9 |
| Workload | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.0 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 4.3 |
| Learn Exp | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 14 | 42 | 14 | 5.4 |

Students lauded Vercollier on her effective and efficient teaching style, and a few even called her the best university instructor that they'd ever had. However, some noted that the 3 hour class was too long and that Vercollier's expectations of the students were too high.

FSL 483H1S Language Practice IV: Oral French

Instructor(s): S. Mastromonaco

| Enr: 19 | | Re | sp: 13 | 5 | Retake: 75% | | | |
|--------------|---|----|--------|----|-------------|----|----|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mean |
| Presents | 0 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 30 | 23 | 15 | 5.1 |
| Explains | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 46 | 30 | 7 | 5.2 |
| Communicates | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 15 | 15 | 61 | 6.3 |
| Teaching | 0 | 0 | 7 | 23 | 15 | 46 | 7 | 5.2 |
| Workload | 0 | 16 | 50 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.2 |
| Difficulty | 0 | 16 | 25 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.4 |
| Learn Exp | 9 | 0 | 9 | 45 | 18 | 9 | 9 | 4.3 |

Students felt that there could have been more oral practice. However, students still applauded Mastromonaco for her enthusiasm.