

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 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): E. Gold

Enr: 166	Resp: 105							Retake: 64%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	4	23	57	12	5.8
Explains	0	0	1	7	32	46	14	5.7
Communicates	0	0	1	4	31	49	11	5.6
Teaching	0	0	1	6	21	60	12	5.8
Workload	0	2	4	69	19	0	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	2	10	53	22	8	0	4.3
Learn Exp	1	0	7	40	31	13	4	4.6

Gold was "organized, nice and friendly". She provided useful hand-outs and effective lectures. Students appreciated her helpfulness, but were not pleased with her test design, which "did not reflect assignments and lecture information". Some noted that there was a lot of homework and this should have been weighted more than what was allotted for it. Students would have appreciated clearer guidelines on Gold's assignments - most of the time, they didn't know what was expected making them challenging to complete.

Instructor(s): E. Gold

Enr: 146	Resp: 79							Retake: 71%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	1	1	24	39	33	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	4	27	43	25	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	5	24	48	21	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	6	20	40	32	6.0
Workload	0	3	11	55	21	2	5	4.2

ASSU ANTI-CALENDAR 133

Difficulty	0	3	2	64	22	2	3	4.3
Learn Exp	0	3	1	33	26	19	15	5.0

Most students found Gold very organized, enthusiastic and effective. A few felt she should have used a microphone, as they had difficult hearing her.

Many students found the tutorials to be unhelpful and the assignments should have been worth more. Overall, most students enjoyed the course.

LIN 200H1F Introduction to Language

Instructor(s): K. Phan Pierri

Enr: 216	Resp: 107							Retake: 65%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	1	0	1	8	22	39	23	5.6
Explains	0	0	1	10	22	36	26	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	4	14	34	44	6.1
Teaching	3	1	1	8	25	37	25	5.6
Workload	1	5	11	55	12	6	4	4.1
Difficulty	0	5	8	50	18	12	2	4.3
Learn Exp	4	2	4	32	39	11	5	4.6

Students found Phan Pierri to be enthusiastic and entertaining. However, several complaints were made about the quality of lectures, which often contained several errors.

Tests were thought to be too ambiguous. Several students questioned the necessity of LIN 200 for the Teaching English as a Second Language program.

LIN 201H1S Canadian English

Instructor(s): J. Chambers

Enr: 31	Resp: 17							Retake: 70%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	11	17	17	29	23	5.4
Explains	0	0	0	5	29	17	47	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	17	23	58	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	0	35	29	35	6.0
Workload	0	0	23	64	11	0	0	3.9
Difficulty	0	5	5	64	23	0	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	6	12	37	25	18	5.4

Most students enjoyed the course, describing Chambers as "excellent, encouraging, and fun". Lecture material was interesting and relevant to those who were curious about Canadian English. However, some students found the marking scheme ambiguous, and expressed a desire for more informative instructions.

LIN 203H1F English Words

Instructor(s): E. Dresher

Enr: 238	Resp: 92							Retake: 50%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	3	1	4	23	30	25	11	5.0
Explains	2	1	9	25	21	27	13	5.0
Communicates	2	4	2	13	21	40	16	5.3
Teaching	4	3	6	20	26	26	13	4.9
Workload	5	3	16	47	18	8	1	4.0
Difficulty	5	5	9	46	18	10	4	4.1
Learn Exp	5	5	8	37	17	17	8	4.4

Students found Dresher to be an enjoyable, humorous lecturer. The course material was very interesting, and Dresher was available to answer any questions outside of the classroom.

However, many students complained about the marking scheme for tests and assignments, which seemed to be much stricter than necessary. Instructions were written vaguely, so several students did not understand what they were being asked to do.

134 LINGUISTICS

LIN 203H1S English Words

Instructor(s): K. Phan Pierri

Enr: 270	Resp: 111							Retake: 67%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	10	22	41	24	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	10	32	29	25	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	15	20	38	24	5.7
Teaching	0	0	2	13	26	33	23	5.6
Workload	0	2	13	48	17	10	6	4.3
Difficulty	0	1	7	50	18	15	5	4.5
Learn Exp	1	2	9	27	28	22	9	4.8

Phan Pierri was organized, engaging, and many students appreciated her concise and detailed lecture notes. A significant number of those who answered showed concern over the marking scheme, wherein one midterm and the final constituted 90% of the total mark. Students also felt that the amount of morphemes they had to memorize was excessive, and detracted from the other interesting material that was covered.

LIN 204H1S English Grammar

Instructor(s): C. Pittman

Enr: 185	Resp: 71							Retake: 47%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	2	23	36	28	8	5.2
Explains	0	1	7	20	34	28	7	5.0
Communicates	0	0	1	17	28	40	12	5.5
Teaching	1	0	5	26	21	37	7	5.1
Workload	1	8	11	57	16	4	0	3.9
Difficulty	0	1	8	59	25	5	0	4.3
Learn Exp	1	1	10	53	24	8	0	4.2

Pittman was praised as a thorough conscientious, and passionate instructor. Many students commented on the instructor's devotion to answering students' questions on the bulletin board. Some students appreciated Pittman's sense of humour.

Notwithstanding the above, certain complaints recurred frequently. Notably, many students lamented about the marking scheme for the midterm. They didn't think that taking off marks for wrong answers was fair. Students also commented that posting answers to assignments would have been beneficial. A few students complained that the second assignment was difficult and unclear.

LIN 228H1F Phonetics

Instructor(s): S. MacKenzie

Enr: 138	Resp: 83							Retake: 65%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	8	25	45	20	5.8
Explains	0	0	1	15	32	30	20	5.5
Communicates	0	0	1	12	30	28	27	5.7
Teaching	0	0	2	9	24	45	18	5.7
Workload	0	3	12	57	19	4	2	4.2
Difficulty	0	3	7	43	31	8	4	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	6	32	22	30	8	5.0

Students were quick to criticize the dry material of the course, but did not let this interfere with their impression of the instructor as intelligent, enthusiastic, and friendly. Some felt that the difficulty of the latter half of the course was very surprising.

LIN 231H1F Morphological Patterns in Language

Instructor(s): E. Gold

Enr: 86	Resp: 55							Retake: 74%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	7	27	38	27	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	10	23	38	27	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	7	23	40	29	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	7	25	38	29	5.9
Workload	0	0	12	70	12	1	1	4.1

Difficulty	0	1	9	61	16	9	1	4.3
Learn Exp	0	4	12	30	32	14	8	4.6

Several students commented that they enjoyed this course immensely. Many students praised the instructor for being a clear, systematic and organized lecturer who showed genuine interest in the material. Many students lamented that tutorials were not useful. Some students commented that the wording of questions on assignments and tests could have been clearer. Overall, a good course.

LIN 256H1F Sociolinguistics

Instructor(s): S. Tagliamonte

Enr: 50	Resp: 38							Retake: 66%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	10	26	21	31	10	5.1
Explains	0	0	2	23	26	42	5	5.2
Communicates	0	0	0	5	15	31	47	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	15	36	36	10	5.4
Workload	0	0	2	65	21	10	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	7	42	31	13	5	4.7
Learn Exp	3	0	6	28	43	18	0	4.7

Overall, students thought that the instructor was enthusiastic and engaging. Tutorials were excellent, and several students enjoyed the mini-project. However, several students were dissatisfied with the layout of the course. Several people felt that tests emphasized memorization of unclear terminology.

Lecture notes and online notes did not cover the same topics, leading to confusion over what material students would be tested on.

LIN 305H1F Quantitative Methods in Linguistics

Instructor(s): R. Smyth

Enr: 8	Resp: 6							Retake: 66%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	33	50	16	0	4.8
Explains	0	0	0	33	50	0	16	5.0
Communicates	0	0	0	0	33	33	33	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	20	20	40	20	5.6
Workload	0	0	0	66	33	0	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	50	50	0	0	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	25	75	0	0	0	3.8

LIN 322H1S Phonological Theory

Instructor(s): K. Rice

Enr: 25	Resp: 21							Retake: 95%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	10	20	70	6.6
Explains	0	0	0	0	5	25	70	6.7
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	7.0
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	20	80	6.8
Workload	0	0	0	60	25	10	5	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	4	47	28	14	4	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	7	7	42	42	6.2

Most students found the course very interesting and the instructor very knowledgeable. They found her accessible and very helpful as well as enthusiastic and well-informed. A few found the material quite challenging but the value of the experience was excellent.

LIN 323H1F Acoustic Phonetics

Instructor(s): M. Chasin

Enr: 43	Resp: 36							Retake: 58%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	16	27	33	22	5.6
Explains	0	0	5	13	25	33	22	5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	2	11	27	58	6.4
Teaching	0	0	2	5	25	36	30	5.9
Workload	0	0	25	72	2	0	0	3.8

Difficulty	0	0	11	61	2	25	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	6	9	30	21	21	12	4.8

Students enjoyed Chasin's engaging sense of humour and enthusiasm for the material. The fieldtrip to the Canadian Hearing Centre was very well-received.

Several students complained that they received no feedback on assignments, which many found frustrating.

LIN 331H1F Syntactic Theory

Instructor(s): A. Johns

	Enr: 20							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	12	25	43	18	0	4.7
Explains	0	0	18	12	43	25	0	4.8
Communicates	0	0	0	12	37	31	18	5.6
Teaching	0	0	0	18	50	18	12	5.2
Workload	0	0	0	50	37	6	6	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	0	56	37	6	0	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	7	35	35	14	7	4.8

Students described the class as "insightful" and "interesting". Some students felt that lectures were sometimes unorganized and relied too heavily on readings from the textbook. Overall, this was thought to be a good continuation of 200-level Syntax.

LIN 362H1F Historical Linguistics

Instructor(s): E. Burstynsky

	Enr: 37							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	13	22	22	18	22	0	0	3.1
Explains	0	33	19	14	28	4	0	3.5
Communicates	0	4	4	9	45	18	18	5.2
Teaching	0	18	27	18	18	113	4	4.0
Workload	0	9	4	63	18	4	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	4	0	45	45	0	4	4.5
Learn Exp	0	18	25	12	25	12	6	4.1

Several students complained that assigned readings did not reflect the lecture material, and that assignments reflected neither the readings nor the lectures. Lessons were, at times, disorganized to the point of not being understandable.

Many students also commented that Burstynsky was extremely approachable and clearly interested in the material.

LIN 432H1S Advanced Morphology: Morphosyntax

Instructor(s): E. Cowper

	Enr: 8							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	0	50	50	6.5
Explains	0	0	0	0	16	50	33	6.2

Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	33	66	6.7
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	83	16	6.2
Workload	0	0	0	50	33	16	0	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	0	33	33	16	16	5.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	16	50	33	0	5.2

LIN 451Y1Y Urban Dialectology

Instructor(s): S. Tagliamonte

	Enr: 20							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	71	14	14	5.4
Explains	0	0	0	14	42	28	14	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	0	14	28	57	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	0	33	33	33	6.0
Workload	0	0	0	71	14	14	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	57	42	0	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	66	16	0	16	4.7

Many students enjoyed the hands-on nature of the course. Suggestions included more explanations of the terminology, more class time spent discussing the research project, and less technically assigned readings. Some students felt that Syntax and Sociolinguistics pre-requisites would have been very helpful.

LIN 458H1F Revitalizing Languages

Instructor(s): K. Rice

	Enr: 24							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	16	16	33	33	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	0	11	55	33	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	11	88	6.9
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	68	31	6.6
Workload	0	0	11	58	23	5	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	11	88	0	0	0	3.9
Learn Exp	0	0	0	30	30	30	7	5.2

Students loved Rice! The class was well-organized, informative and interesting. Rice was accessible and genuinely cared for the well-being of her students.

LIN 481H1S Introduction to Analysis and Argumentation

Instructor(s): E. Dresher

	Enr: 8							Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	0	14	42	4.2	6.3
Explains	0	0	0	0	14	42	42	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	14	28	57	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	57	42	6.4
Workload	0	0	0	85	14	0	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	14	57	14	14	0	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	16	16	33	33	5.8

