



## 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 at frenchcourseunion@gmail.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): J. Papillon

Enr: 96	Resp: 69							Retake: 92%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	2	10	45	41	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	0	12	43	43	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	8	39	51	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	0	7	50	42	6.4
Workload	2	7	23	55	10	1	0	3.7
Difficulty	4	4	30	53	5	1	0	3.6
Learn Exp	0	0	2	20	28	38	12	5.4

Students thought that Papillon knew her material well, had fair tests and evaluations, and explained concepts well. The course was very interesting and enjoyable.

### FCS 290H1S Special Topics in French Cultural Studies: Pleasures of Versailles: Music in the Grand Century of France

Instructor(s): K. Komisaruk

Enr: 90	Resp: 70							Retake: 84%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	4	7	20	39	28	5.8
Explains	0	0	2	5	17	39	34	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	0	5	19	75	6.7
Teaching	0	0	1	1	13	33	50	6.3
Workload	1	11	25	54	7	0	0	3.5
Difficulty	0	5	26	55	10	1	0	3.8
Learn Exp	0	1	1	16	20	33	25	5.6

Students really enjoyed the instructor's enthusiasm and engaging lecture style. They felt that he opened their eyes to the material. However, they did not feel that the methods of evaluation were fair as the pop quizzes tested irrelevant and detailed information.

### FCS 291H1S Special Topics in French Cultural Studies I: The Art and Culture of the Networked Society

Instructor(s): D. De Kerckhove

Enr: 22	Resp: 18							Retake: 92%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	5	11	17	41	23	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	11	17	23	47	6.1

Communicates	0	0	0	0	11	17	70	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	12	12	25	50	6.1
Workload	0	0	11	73	5	0	5	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	11	58	23	0	5	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	21	14	14	50	5.9

Most students really enjoyed the interactive style of teaching. The instructor was enthusiastic and gave very interesting lectures. Some students mentioned that a more detailed course outline (grading, expectations) would have been appreciated.

### FCS 331H1F Cinema and Literature in France

Instructor(s): D. De Kerckhove

Enr: 15	Resp: 13							Retake: 92%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	25	25	41	8	0	4.3
Explains	0	0	0	25	41	25	8	5.2
Communicates	0	0	0	0	7	30	61	6.5
Teaching	0	0	7	15	30	30	15	5.3
Workload	0	0	23	76	0	0	0	3.8
Difficulty	0	0	38	61	0	0	0	3.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	25	25	37	12	5.4

Although slightly disorganized, students found the instructor to be very enthusiastic and highly knowledgeable. De Kerckhove made classes interesting by stimulating discussions and encouraging participation. Films were interesting even available to be borrowed.

### FCS 390H1S Special Topics in French Cultural Studies II: Cultural Studies in France: Foucault and after

Instructor(s): A. Motsch

Enr: 19	Resp: 11							Retake: 63%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	18	9	27	36	0	9	4.2
Explains	0	0	9	27	36	9	18	5.0
Communicates	0	0	9	9	18	27	36	5.7
Teaching	0	9	18	18	45	0	9	4.4
Workload	0	0	0	54	27	9	9	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	0	36	18	45	0	5.1
Learn Exp	0	0	22	11	44	11	11	4.8

### FCS 391H1F Special Topics in French Cultural Studies II: The Other Voice: Diaries of Women Writers in France and Quebec

Instructor(s): J. Le Blanc

Enr: 5	Resp: 5							Retake: 100%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	0	20	80	6.8
Explains	0	0	0	0	0	20	80	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	80	20	0	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	20	0	80	0	0	0	3.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	20	20	60	6.4

Le Blanc consistently tried to make sure that students grasped the material. She was well prepared and she was always available to help students. Students particularly enjoyed the class discussions.

### FRE 172H1S French Grammar

Instructor(s): J. Danciu

Enr: 35	Resp: 22							Retake: 65%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	4	28	42	14	9	5.0
Explains	0	0	0	28	42	23	4	5.0
Communicates	0	0	5	0	20	45	30	5.9
Teaching	0	0	4	0	59	22	13	5.4
Workload	0	4	9	31	40	4	9	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	9	36	9	18	27	5.2

Learn Exp 0 12 12 18 12 31 12 4.8

Many students thought that this course was difficult for a 100-level course. There was a wealth of material, and the students were all at different levels of knowledge. Danciu was praised for her enthusiasm and hard work in dealing with a difficult course.

#### FRE 210Y1Y Introduction to Quebec Literature and Culture

Instructor(s): V. Masse

	Resp: 28							Retake: 46%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	3	7	32	32	17	7	4.8
Explains	0	3	0	32	28	25	10	5.0
Communicates	3	0	3	28	21	32	10	5.0
Teaching	0	3	7	14	32	32	10	5.1
Workload	0	0	0	53	46	0	0	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	3	46	39	7	3	4.6
Learn Exp	0	4	4	62	16	12	0	4.3

Students felt that the material was interesting but more class participation and student interaction was needed. A few thought that Masse lacked a bit of enthusiasm and experience teaching university students.

#### FRE 240Y1Y Introduction to Literary Analysis

Instructor(s): A. Tcheuyap

	Resp: 21							Retake: 71%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	9	9	38	42	6.1
Explains	0	0	5	5	5	60	25	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	0	9	47	42	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	4	33	28	33	5.9
Workload	0	0	0	70	30	0	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	52	38	9	0	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	6	43	18	25	6	4.8

Tcheuyap was a good instructor who both motivated and explained the material well. The only problem students felt was his unclear expectations on essays and tests. They believed that he was expecting a rather high level of French for only a 200-level course.

Instructor(s): A. Motsch

	Resp: 25							Retake: 68%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	16	8	28	28	12	4	4	3.4
Explains	8	8	24	20	12	16	12	4.2
Communicates	4	0	4	32	24	12	24	5.0
Teaching	16	8	8	20	24	16	8	4.1
Workload	0	0	0	32	12	36	20	5.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	36	20	20	24	5.3
Learn Exp	18	9	13	40	9	4	4	3.5

Some students were disappointed with the instructor, citing disorganized lectures and too many readings. Also, obtaining course texts proved to be difficult and frustrating. The instructor's expectations were never made clear for the tests and assignments.

#### FRE 250Y1Y Literary History in Context

Instructor(s): A. Glinoyer

	Resp: 21							Retake: 95%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	9	14	28	47	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	4	33	38	23	5.8
Communicates	0	4	0	4	28	42	19	5.6
Teaching	0	0	0	9	14	61	14	5.8
Workload	0	0	0	75	15	0	10	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	68	31	0	0	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	17	35	23	23	5.5

Students found that the lectures were coherent, organized and well-planned. Some students thought that the material was challenging for FSL. Students wished that there had been more time to further discuss the readings or perhaps have a tutorial for the course.

Instructor(s): L. Morra

	Resp: 18							Retake: 44%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	2	21	22	22	22	0	4.1
Explains	0	22	16	11	27	16	5	4.2
Communicates	0	0	11	33	27	16	11	4.8
Teaching	0	16	27	5	16	27	5	4.3
Workload	0	0	0	70	11	17	0	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	47	35	17	0	4.7
Learn Exp	0	14	14	42	7	14	7	4.1

Morra was considered a kind and caring instructor although the lectures were somewhat disorganized. This could have been because she was fairly new to teaching.

#### FRE 272Y1Y The Structure of Modern French: An Introduction

Instructor(s): Y. Roberge

	Resp: 68							Retake: 61%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	0	6	20	50	23	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	3	10	56	29	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	15	53	31	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	0	13	52	33	6.2
Workload	0	4	7	69	12	3	1	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	11	58	22	5	1	4.3
Learn Exp	4	0	0	50	22	18	6	4.6

Students commented that while the tutorials for this course were not very helpful, however, the lectures were interesting and fun, thanks to the very organized, humorous, enthusiastic, and encouraging instructor. Roberge kept the students on their toes and passed on his enthusiasm for the material.

Instructor(s): J. Steele

	Resp: 48							Retake: 65
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	0	2	2	15	47	32	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	8	23	43	23	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	2	21	58	17	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	2	13	67	16	6.0
Workload	0	0	4	65	15	10	4	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	2	51	25	12	8	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	2	50	31	10	5	4.7

Students thought Steele was very approachable and enthusiastic. His lectures were very well-organized.

#### FRE 273Y1Y General History of the French Language

Instructor(s): S. Marzano

	Resp: 31							Retake: 96%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Presents	0	3	12	9	29	22	22	5.2
Explains	0	0	3	9	29	22	35	5.8
Communicates	0	0	3	0	3	22	70	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	9	9	41	38	6.1
Workload	3	3	13	70	6	3	0	3.8
Difficulty	0	6	16	70	3	3	0	3.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	14	37	25	22	5.6

Students commented that Marzano's enthusiasm really brought to life what they anticipated to be a dull subject, and were fascinated by the topic by the end of the course.

**FRE 304H1F Women Writers**

Instructor(s): B. Havercroft

Enr: 17	Resp: 12							Retake: 100%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	25	50	25	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	8	16	41	33	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	0	16	33	50	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	0	25	50	25	6.0
Workload	0	0	8	75	8	8	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	83	8	8	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	33	33	22	11	5.1

Havercroft was a very enthusiastic and approachable instructor who made the effort to get to know each of the students. Students found the subject and the readings very interesting. Most students found the course exceptional.

**FRE 314H1F From Modernism to Postmodernism: Contemporary Quebec Fiction**

Instructor(s): J. Le Blanc

Enr: 20	Resp: 17							Retake: 70%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	5	5	29	35	23	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	11	35	41	11	5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	0	11	35	52	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	5	17	64	11	5.8
Workload	0	0	5	82	5	5	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	0	76	17	5	0	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	9	27	18	18	27	5.3

Le Blanc received comments from both sides of the spectrum. While some found her to be extremely encouraging and helpful, she did not spend enough time on the analysis of each novel. Students appreciated her time and effort to give students opportunities for learning and achieving marks.

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

Instructor(s): A. Glinioer

Enr: 11	Resp: 10							Retake: 66%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	10	10	0	70	10	5.6
Explains	0	0	11	22	11	44	11	5.2
Communicates	0	0	30	20	30	10	10	4.5
Teaching	0	0	0	30	20	40	10	5.3
Workload	0	0	10	90	0	0	0	3.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	90	10	0	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	28	14	28	28	0	4.6

Glinioer was nice and helpful, however, the lectures could have been more related to the assignments. Students would have preferred a more in-depth analysis of the readings instead of a general history of the novels.

Instructor(s): D. Speirs

Enr: 10	Resp: 9							Retake: 88%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	0	66	33	6.3
Explains	0	0	0	0	11	66	22	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	44	55	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	11	77	11	6.0
Workload	0	11	0	77	11	0	0	3.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	88	0	11	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	25	50	0	25	5.2

Students enjoyed Speirs' enthusiasm and freedom in learning the course materials. Some feedback on marking for assignments or presentations would have been appreciated.

**FRE 332H1F Francophone Literature I**

Instructor(s): A. Tcheuyap

Enr: 12	Resp: 8							Retake: 57%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	37	37	0	25	0	4.1
Explains	0	0	25	25	12	25	12	4.8
Communicates	0	0	12	0	37	12	37	5.6
Teaching	0	0	25	0	50	12	12	4.9
Workload	0	0	12	37	12	37	0	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	12	37	25	25	0	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	16	33	33	16	0	4.5

Students found the instructor's feedback unnecessarily harsh and critical, that more time should have been spent doing analysis and course work rather than individual feedback during class.

**FRE 375Y1Y Comparative Stylistics**

Instructor(s): S. Mastromonaco

Enr: 34	Resp: 24							Retake: 90%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	4	37	29	29	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	0	20	33	45	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	0	4	25	70	6.7
Teaching	0	0	0	0	8	50	41	6.3
Workload	0	4	26	56	8	4	0	3.8
Difficulty	0	0	21	70	0	4	0	3.9
Learn Exp	0	0	0	33	26	20	20	5.3

Mastromonaco was said to be an engaging and enthusiastic lecturer. Her use of anecdotes and numerous examples made lectures enjoyable to attend.

Instructor(s): F. Collins

Enr: 39	Resp: 28							Retake: 92%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	3	15	38	42	6.2
Explains	0	3	0	0	3	23	69	6.5
Communicates	0	0	0	0	3	23	73	6.7
Teaching	0	0	0	3	0	18	77	6.7
Workload	3	7	11	55	7	11	3	4.0
Difficulty	0	0	7	40	18	14	18	5.0
Learn Exp	0	0	4	4	9	38	42	6.1

Many students commented that the instructor was the best that they have had at UoT. He was enthusiastic, funny and engaging.

**FRE 376H1F French Phonology and Phonetics**

Instructor(s): P. Martin

Enr: 20	Resp: 14							Retake: 30%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	28	28	14	21	7	4.5
Explains	0	0	21	35	14	21	7	4.6
Communicates	0	0	7	7	7	42	35	5.9
Teaching	0	7	14	21	21	28	7	4.7
Workload	0	0	0	85	14	0	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	0	64	35	0	0	4.4
Learn Exp	9	0	9	27	45	9	0	4.3

Some students thought that Martin gave little guidance for assignments and was not clear on the course expectations. Although very knowledgeable in the material, Martin did not make the course very accessible, which frustrated some of the students.

**FRE 378H1F French Syntax**

Instructor(s): Y. Roberge

Enr: 25	Resp: 24							Retake: 73%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	8	4	29	58	6.4

Explains	4	0	0	4	8	16	66	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	4	20	75	6.7
Teaching	0	0	0	4	4	16	75	6.6
Workload	0	0	0	82	13	4	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	50	29	16	4	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	35	29	17	17	5.2

Students consistently commented that Roberge was excellent, and explained concepts very clearly. He was approachable, helpful, kind and enthusiastic about the material. The material was at times a bit difficult to grasp, but Roberge ensured that the students understood it by addressing their questions and concerns.

#### FRE 386H1F French Semantics

Instructor(s): A-M. Brousseau

Enr: 18	Resp: 16							Retake: 93%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	25	31	43	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	0	18	43	37	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	6	6	18	68	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	43	56	6.6
Workload	0	0	0	68	18	12	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	56	25	12	6	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	25	18	37	18	5.5

Students loved the course and the instructor. Brousseau was cited as outstanding, enthusiastic, engaging and wonderful at explaining concepts with good examples. She was available for help outside of class hours. Students found the material to be very interesting, and presented in a very clear and insightful manner.

#### FRE 420H1S Ardour and Armour in Medieval France

Instructor(s): D. Kullmann

Enr: 19	Resp: 18							Retake: 50%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	11	47	35	5	0	4.4
Explains	0	0	5	58	17	17	0	4.5
Communicates	0	0	5	5	41	17	29	5.6
Teaching	0	0	11	16	50	16	5	4.9
Workload	0	0	27	50	5	16	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	16	50	16	11	5	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	20	46	13	6	13	4.5

The class was divided for this course; most found the instructor warm, approachable and engaging; a few found her to be disorganized.

#### FRE 449H1F French Poetry

Instructor(s): A. Cozea

Enr: 11	Resp: 10							Retake: 88%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	11	33	22	22	11	4.9
Explains	0	0	0	10	30	10	50	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	10	0	20	70	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	20	10	20	50	6.0
Workload	0	0	0	50	40	0	10	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	0	10	40	40	10	5.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	20	10	20	50	6.0

While some students found the course expectations and requirements to be a bit vague, every comment cited the instructor as encouraging, enthusiastic, knowledgeable and wonderful in her teaching. The course seemed to have developed students' critical thinking, renewed their love for learning, and in some cases, changed their lives.

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

Instructor(s): D. Speirs

Enr: 8	Resp: 8							Retake: 100%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	12	0	87	6.8
Explains	0	0	0	0	12	12	75	6.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	12	0	87	6.8
Teaching	0	0	0	0	12	0	87	6.8
Workload	0	0	0	37	50	12	0	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	75	25	0	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	28	14	57	6.3

Students were attracted to Speirs' enthusiasm for the course material. In addition, her extremely organized lecture style was very much appreciated.

#### FRE 473H1S The Acquisition of French

Instructor(s): J. Steele

Enr: 11	Resp: 7							Retake: 83%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	14	42	42	6.3
Explains	0	0	0	0	14	57	28	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	14	57	28	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	0	14	42	42	6.3
Workload	0	0	0	28	57	14	0	4.9
Difficulty	0	0	0	28	71	0	0	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	16	50	0	33	5.5

Students thought the course and instructor were very good.

#### FRE 479H1S Sociolinguistics of French

Instructor(s): Y. Roberge

Enr: 22	Resp: 17							Retake: 82%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	17	35	47	6.3
Explains	0	0	0	0	5	41	52	6.5
Communicates	0	0	0	0	5	41	52	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	0	5	41	52	6.5
Workload	5	0	5	70	11	5	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	5	0	58	29	5	0	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	7	23	38	7	23	5.2

Students felt that Roberge was very engaging and a great lecturer. The course content was also very interesting.

#### FRE 480Y1Y Translation: French to English

Instructor(s): F. Collins

Enr: 28	Resp: 21							Retake: 100%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	14	14	71	6.6
Explains	0	0	0	0	4	23	71	6.7
Communicates	0	0	0	0	4	19	79	6.7
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	23	76	6.8
Workload	0	0	10	75	10	5	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	5	70	20	5	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	23	38	38	6.2

Students loved the instructor's wit, enthusiasm and passion for teaching. Many felt he was the best university instructor they have ever had.

#### FRE 481Y1Y Translation: English to French

Instructor(s): J. Hanna

Enr: 21	Resp: 18							Retake: 62%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	5	33	27	27	5	4.9
Explains	0	0	0	22	27	33	16	5.4
Communicates	0	0	5	16	22	27	27	5.6
Teaching	0	5	0	27	27	33	5	5.0



## 94 FRENCH

Workload	0	0	0	83	5	11	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	5	44	38	0	11	4.7
Learn Exp	0	5	0	35	17	17	23	5.1

Students commented that Hanna could be harsh in her criticism, but in the end it made for a good learning experience. Some felt that the course was slightly misnamed, as it was not so much a french translation course as it was a stylistic course.

### FRE 489H1S Special Topics in Advanced Linguistics II

Instructor(s): Y. Roberge

Enr: 16	Resp: 10						Retake: 90%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	20	30	50	6.3
Explains	0	0	0	0	10	30	60	6.5
Communicates	0	0	0	0	10	30	60	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	0	20	20	60	6.4
Workload	0	0	0	77	22	0	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	44	33	22	0	4.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	33	33	22	11	5.1

Students commented on Roberge's great lecture style and an overall great learning experience.

### FSL 100H1F French for Beginners

Instructor(s): R. Penate

Enr: 47	Resp: 23							Retake: 85%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	18	45	13	22	0	4.4
Explains	0	4	9	22	31	18	13	4.9
Communicates	0	0	4	19	47	23	4	5.0
Teaching	0	4	4	27	31	22	9	4.9
Workload	0	4	4	61	4	9	14	4.5
Difficulty	0	4	13	47	26	4	4	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	37	31	25	6	5.0

Most students thought Penate was a good and approachable instructor. The course material was useful and enjoyable but fast paced.

Instructor(s): C. Barker

Enr: 52	Resp: 37							Retake: 54%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	2	0	18	40	29	8	0	4.2
Explains	2	5	18	40	29	2	0	4.0
Communicates	5	13	40	32	8	0	0	3.2
Teaching	8	13	10	51	13	2	0	3.6
Workload	0	0	5	36	38	16	2	4.8
Difficulty	2	0	2	50	22	16	5	4.6
Learn Exp	0	8	20	40	20	4	8	4.2

Students found that the expectation was too high for students who were just beginning to learn French. Students would have liked more time assigned for oral practice and didn't find the on-line homework helpful.

### FSL 100H1S French for Beginners

Instructor(s): K. Zawada

Enr: 52	Resp: 38						Retake: 86%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	5	21	40	32	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	2	19	36	41	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	2	16	40	40	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	2	13	39	44	6.3
Workload	0	2	5	31	28	14	17	5.0
Difficulty	2	5	16	45	10	13	5	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	29	25	16	29	5.5

Most students thought Zawada was understanding and knowledgeable.

### FSL 102H1S Introductory French

Instructor(s): S. Beal

Enr: 51	Resp: 30							Retake: 75%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	6	6	20	16	30	20	0	4.2
Explains	10	3	20	10	33	23	0	4.2
Communicates	6	0	3	13	24	13	37	5.4
Teaching	3	3	6	27	31	24	3	4.7
Workload	0	0	6	65	20	3	3	4.3
Difficulty	3	0	0	83	10	3	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	5	40	35	15	5	4.8

Students were divided, some thought Beal was enthusiastic, while others thought she was a bit dry and monotonous. More examples would have been appreciated.

### FSL 121Y1Y French Language I

Instructor(s): M. Tsimenis

Enr: 52	Resp: 38							Retake: 72%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	2	29	27	40	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	5	39	18	36	5.9
Communicates	0	0	0	0	24	27	48	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	5	21	44	28	6.0
Workload	0	0	2	65	21	10	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	8	37	35	13	5	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	6	33	27	24	9	5.0

Students thought the instructor was nice, enthusiastic, approachable and organized. However, they did not feel any value was gained with the oral or tutorial portion of the course. The marking was also a bit more difficult than anticipated, and more practical application opportunities would have been appreciated.

Instructor(s): M. Tsimenis

	Enr: 47						Resp: 42		Retake: 85%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean		
Presents	0	0	0	0	7	45	47		6.4	
Explains	0	0	0	0	7	50	42		6.3	
Communicates	0	0	0	0	7	40	52		6.5	
Teaching	0	0	0	0	2	59	38		6.4	
Workload	0	5	5	48	30	10	0		4.4	
Difficulty	0	2	5	47	32	12	0		4.5	
Learn Exp	0	0	6	30	21	36	6		5.1	

Students enjoyed the instructor's enthusiasm and useful handouts. She was very well-organized and made the course enjoyable.

### FSL 221Y1Y French Language II

Instructor(s): K. Larquier

Enr: 40	Resp: 33						Retake: 75%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	3	9	18	36	33	5.9
Explains	0	0	3	15	30	30	21	5.5
Communicates	3	0	6	18	30	36	6	5.1
Teaching	3	0	3	12	30	36	15	5.4
Workload	0	6	21	60	6	6	0	3.8
Difficulty	0	0	9	69	18	3	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	3	16	45	12	9	12	4.5

Larquier was a good instructor who encouraged students to participate. Students liked how the class was organized but wished more time was spent on conversation and auditory skills.

Instructor(s): K. Larquier

Enr: 48	Resp: 25							Retake: 78%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	4	24	40	32	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	16	28	24	32	5.7
Communicates	0	0	0	12	40	28	20	5.6
Teaching	0	0	0	4	24	48	24	5.9
Workload	4	0	12	68	8	8	0	4.0
Difficulty	4	0	12	58	25	0	0	4.0
Learn Exp	0	0	4	47	23	14	9	4.8

Students found Larquier friendly and engaging. Some students disliked copying notes from the board and wished that there were handouts made available. Also, the class size was too big for oral practice and some students were disappointed that the level of French differed greatly among students. Overall, most students liked the course.

Instructor(s): J. Whelan

Enr: 37	Resp: 27							Retake: 66%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	25	33	29	11	5.3
Explains	0	0	7	29	22	29	11	5.1
Communicates	0	0	0	14	40	29	14	5.4
Teaching	0	0	3	29	33	29	3	5.0
Workload	7	0	3	66	11	7	3	4.1
Difficulty	3	0	3	62	14	14	0	4.3
Learn Exp	4	0	16	54	16	4	4	4.1

Students found Whelan energetic and enthusiastic. Some students disliked the placement test and complained that the class was difficult for their level of French. Nonetheless, students found Whelan's powerpoint presentations helpful in understanding French grammar.

Instructor(s): N. Lezama

Enr: 37	Resp: 24							Retake: 62%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	4	4	39	39	13	5.5
Explains	0	0	4	4	29	33	29	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	8	8	30	52	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	8	16	45	29	6.0
Workload	0	0	8	65	17	4	4	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	4	50	18	22	4	4.7
Learn Exp	0	12	0	25	43	12	6	4.6

Students thought that Lezama did a very good job trying to teach repetitive, dry material. His creativity was praised.

Instructor(s): M. Tsimenis

Enr: 48	Resp: 34							Retake: 82%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	2	0	8	38	50	6.3
Explains	0	0	2	0	8	41	47	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	5	17	76	6.7
Teaching	0	0	2	0	0	29	67	6.6
Workload	0	3	3	60	15	15	3	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	3	54	24	15	3	4.6
Learn Exp	0	4	0	17	17	39	21	5.5

Students thought the instructor was helpful, enthusiastic and very approachable. They enjoyed the quick turn-around on assignments and marking. They also enjoyed the organization of the lectures and handouts.

**FSL 277Y1Y French Pronunciation**

Instructor(s): P. Martin

Enr: 40	Resp: 18							Retake: 75%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	5	5	44	22	22	5.5

Explains	0	0	5	22	22	38	11	5.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	16	38	44	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	16	38	27	16	5.4
Workload	0	5	27	55	5	5	0	3.8
Difficulty	0	0	5	72	16	5	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	37	18	31	12	5.2

Overall, students enjoyed the course, citing Martin's enthusiasm for the material and the French language in general. Some students found that the pace of lectures was a bit too quick at times, leaving students flustered and falling behind. Students commented that the grading scheme should have been adjusted to more fairly represent students' progress in the course.

Instructor(s): S. Mastromonaco

Enr: 36	Resp: 27							Retake: 83%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	3	7	25	14	48	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	7	11	29	51	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	11	18	70	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	3	7	44	44	6.3
Workload	3	3	3	66	14	7	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	0	55	25	14	3	4.7
Learn Exp	5	0	5	15	10	42	21	5.4

The instructor was praised for being enthusiastic, approachable and friendly. The classes were interesting and encouraged discussions. The lab portion of the course was thought to be of little use.

Instructor(s): S. Mastromonaco

Enr: 36	Resp: 27							Retake: 83%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	3	7	25	14	48	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	7	11	29	51	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	11	18	70	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	3	7	44	44	6.3
Workload	3	3	3	66	14	7	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	0	55	25	14	3	4.7
Learn Exp	5	0	5	15	10	42	21	5.4

Students really enjoyed the instructor's approachable and enthusiastic attitude towards somewhat difficult material.

Instructor(s): J. Steele

Enr: 37	Resp: 31							Retake: 83%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	3	6	13	43	33	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	9	16	32	41	6.1
Communicates	0	0	3	6	12	29	48	6.1
Teaching	0	0	3	6	6	26	56	6.3
Workload	3	0	6	63	16	6	3	4.2
Difficulty	0	3	0	53	33	3	6	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	4	19	38	23	14	5.2

Students thought Steele was very helpful and approachable. The lectures were very well-presented and enjoyable.

**FSL 331Y1Y Practical French I**

Instructor(s): J. Lamouchi

Enr: 40	Resp: 33							Retake: 63%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	3	21	48	27	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	0	21	42	36	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	3	9	27	60	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	0	15	51	33	6.2
Workload	3	12	31	46	3	0	3	3.5
Difficulty	3	3	32	45	9	3	3	3.8
Learn Exp	3	0	11	40	18	14	11	4.6

Students felt that the class was too big and thus made discussions in French difficult. However, the instructor was very engaging and enthusiastic which made the course fun. Most students also expressed their concern for tutorials being rather unhelpful.

#### FSL 431Y1Y Practical French II

Instructor(s): K. Zawada

Enr: 65	Resp: 60						Retake: 78%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	3	6	35	38	15	5.6
Explains	0	0	1	13	16	43	25	5.8
Communicates	0	1	1	6	15	45	30	5.9
Teaching	0	0	0	8	23	36	31	5.9
Workload	10	5	28	52	3	0	0	3.3
Difficulty	5	8	18	61	6	0	0	3.6
Learn Exp	2	0	15	52	15	9	4	4.2

Students had a positive learning experience with Zawada. She provided a valuable teaching method that ensured that students understood the course concepts. Some students wished there was more writing component to the course and found that the class size was too big for a language class.

Instructor(s): A. Tcheuyap

Enr: 49	Resp: 39						Retake: 82%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	5	17	38	23	15	5.3
Explains	0	0	0	10	41	30	17	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	0	18	45	35	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	10	28	38	23	5.7
Workload	15	7	28	47	0	0	0	3.1
Difficulty	10	7	18	60	2	0	0	3.4
Learn Exp	6	6	6	51	16	9	3	4.1

Students thought Tcheuyap was enthusiastic and likeable. However, they thought the course was a bit too easy and did not focus on grammar enough.

Instructor(s): S. Sacre

Enr: 64	Resp: 47						Retake: 55%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	4	0	2	28	30	23	10	5.0
Explains	0	2	8	24	28	24	11	5.0
Communicates	4	2	6	21	36	19	10	4.8
Teaching	0	4	4	13	32	28	17	5.3
Workload	10	10	21	40	8	4	4	3.6
Difficulty	4	12	14	46	10	4	6	3.9
Learn Exp	18	0	15	36	12	9	9	3.9

Students had mixed comments for this course. On one hand, Sacre was said to be enthusiastic and engaging. On the other hand, the textbook was said to be outdated and full of errors and the class size was much too large for a conversation class.

#### FSL 442H1F Language Practice II: Written French

Instructor(s): S. Mastromonaco

Enr: 21	Resp: 21						Retake: 66%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	20	0	10	5	40	15	10	4.3
Explains	0	15	5	5	35	20	20	5.0
Communicates	5	0	5	5	25	20	40	5.7
Teaching	5	0	10	20	20	30	15	5.0
Workload	0	5	5	47	21	15	5	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	11	50	27	5	5	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	15	30	15	23	15	4.9

Mastromonaco was very approachable and helpful, and always encouraging students to seek help. Students felt that she could have been more organized with time and lectures. Depending on their level of French,

some thought it was a rather challenging course while others said it was not as advanced as they had hoped.

#### FSL 442H1S Language Practice II: Written French

Instructor(s): F. Collins

Enr: 28	Resp: 15						Retake: 100%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	33	46	20	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	0	6	40	53	6.5
Communicates	0	0	0	0	13	46	40	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	0	13	20	66	6.5
Workload	0	13	26	53	6	0	0	3.5
Difficulty	0	0	13	80	6	0	0	3.9
Learn Exp	0	0	8	0	41	33	16	5.5

Overall, students found Collins to be approachable, likeable and enthusiastic. They praised him as an instructor and felt that the class was very beneficial for the development of their grammar skills.

#### FSL 443H1F Language Practice II: Oral French

Instructor(s): S. Sonina

Enr: 15	Resp: 12						Retake: 91%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	8	16	25	50	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	0	16	50	33	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	41	58	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	8	0	41	50	6.3
Workload	0	8	16	50	16	8	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	0	25	58	0	16	0	4.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	11	33	44	11	5.6

Sonina was regarded as an enthusiastic, caring and patient instructor. Her lectures were fun and students learned a lot with appropriate and helpful feedback.

#### FSL 461Y1Y Practical French III

Instructor(s): M.A. Visoi

Enr: 53	Resp: 42						Retake: 66%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	2	2	2	25	32	20	15	5.0
Explains	0	0	7	21	31	24	14	5.2
Communicates	0	0	0	4	39	43	12	5.6
Teaching	0	0	4	17	31	34	12	5.3
Workload	7	7	35	45	5	0	0	3.3
Difficulty	5	7	17	58	7	2	0	3.6
Learn Exp	2	5	5	44	23	8	8	4.4

Many students were grateful for Visoi's time and patience. Her topics varied greatly, but not very much in depth. Students found the material devoted to job searching such as letter writing, resume-building and vocabulary to be very useful.

The class was surprisingly large, especially for a language course and not everybody could be accommodated. Some students thought that topics such as French-Quebecois culture, art and literature were overly redundant and lacking in depth and substance.