# DEPARTMENT OF FRENCH

Introduction

Thank you to the Department of French for their assistance in providing these evaluations.

Editor

FCS 291H1F Special Topics in French Cultural Studies I: The Act and Culture of the Networked Society

Instructor(s): D. de Kerckhove

Enr: 48   Resp: 26   Retake: 65%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	11	0	46	19	19	3	0	3.5
Explains	4	0	16	48	28	4	0	4.1
Communicates	0	0	4	4	24	32	36	5.9
Teaching	0	4	16	20	28	20	12	4.8
Workload	4	4	24	52	16	0	0	3.7
Difficulty	4	4	16	48	24	4	0	4.0
Learn Exp	0	5	5	38	33	11	5	4.6

The course was described as a unique learning experience by a number of students. They found the material interesting and engaging. de Kerckhove was generally found to be very enthusiastic and knowledgeable, but many felt that he could have been a bit more organized. Some found the syllabus misleading to the actual course time line, and would have liked more guidance with assignment expectations.

FCS 310Y1Y French Cinema

Instructor(s): J. Cahill

Enr: 38   Resp: 29   Retake: 81%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	3	0	6	51	37	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	3	6	62	27	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	3	34	62	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	13	37	48	6.3
Workload	0	0	0	75	13	10	0	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	0	62	17	17	3	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	15	40	25	20	5.5

Cahill was an excellent instructor who students found extremely enthusiastic, passionate and engaging. He was also very approachable and was always available for consultation when students needed it. He made the course material very interesting. Students enjoyed the selection of movies.

The course covered a lot of material, but overall it was an amazing course taught by an amazing instructor.

FCS 331H1F Cinema and Literature in France

Instructor(s): D. de Kerckhove

Enr: 31   Resp: 27   Retake: 58%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	7	11	26	23	11	15	3	3.8
Explains	0	0	11	46	15	19	7	4.7
Communicates	0	0	0	7	15	34	42	6.1
Teaching	0	3	15	26	23	19	11	4.7
Workload	0	0	11	69	15	0	3	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	11	73	15	0	0	4.0
Learn Exp	0	15	10	42	10	10	10	4.2

Most students found the course material very interesting and engaging, citing the course as really informative and enjoyable. Many students felt that the course could have been better organized and thought that 4-hour lectures were a bit too long. Most found de Kerckhove to be a very enthusiastic and knowledgeable instructor, but felt that some of his tangential discussions made the assignment and test expectations unclear.

FCS 395H1S Sensuality and the French

Instructor(s): D. Clandfield

Enr: 68   Resp: 42   Retake: 70%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	2	26	33	19	19	5.3
Explains	0	0	4	14	26	28	26	5.6
Communicates	0	0	4	7	12	29	46	6.0
Teaching	0	0	2	9	38	16	33	5.7
Workload	0	7	9	57	19	4	2	4.1
Difficulty	2	2	2	69	14	9	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	11	3	37	25	18	3	4.5

Students could easily tell that Clandfield was very passionate about this course. He was very knowledgeable and approachable, and always available for consultation. Students appreciated his feedback on assignments and although some students found him a hard marker, they had a great experience overall, which included very interesting course material and a great, enthusiastic instructor.

FRE 241H1S Introduction to Research and Writing in Literary Studies

Instructor(s): D. Kullmann

Enr: 63   Resp: 30   Retake: 3%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	36	6	30	16	10	0	0	2.6
Explains	26	20	23	20	10	0	0	2.7
Communicates	6	16	16	33	10	13	3	3.8
Teaching	10	23	33	23	3	6	0	3.1
Workload	0	0	10	63	26	0	0	4.2
Difficulty	3	0	10	43	36	6	0	4.3
Learn Exp	36	22	22	13	0	0	4	2.4

Many students had many concerns about this course. First of all, there was no structure to the class so students did not know what to expect, and therefore the classes were very disorganized. Students felt it was unfair that they did not know what to expect for tests, which also did not reflect what was taught in class.

Kullmann was unable to answer questions effectively and was unapproachable.

All in all, students did not enjoy this course.

FRE 250H1S French Literature: From its Beginnings to the Twenty-First Century

Instructor(s): A. Glinoer

Enr: 49   Resp: 20   Retake: 55%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	5	5	10	45	35	6.0
Explains	0	0	5	10	15	45	25	5.8
Communicates	0	0	5	0	25	55	15	5.8

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Teaching	0	5	0	10	26	31	26	5.6
Workload	0	0	0	60	20	5	15	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	42	31	10	15	5.0
Learn Exp	0	6	0	43	31	6	12	4.7

Glinoer was a good instructor who was organized, enthusiastic and knowledgeable. However, many students were concerned about the way they were evaluated. They found the test extremely difficult, weighed too much and covered too much material. Some students thought that the test did not reflect what was taught in class.

FRE 272H1F The Structure of Modern French: An Introduction

Instructor(s): P. Bessler

Enr: 101   Resp: 57   Retake: 56%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	9	11	43	35	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	11	20	37	30	5.9
Communicates	0	0	3	11	31	29	24	5.4
Teaching	0	0	0	3	23	42	30	6.0
Workload	0	1	14	66	12	1	1	4.0
Difficulty	0	0	14	46	29	5	3	4.4
Learn Exp	0	2	2	44	26	13	11	4.8

Most students surveyed found Bessler to be a very knowledgeable and clear instructor. Many enjoyed the straight-forward and organized way in which he structured the course, but some felt that too much material from the textbook was reiterated. The course material was found by some to be rather dry, though generally valuable. The course was well-organized and the material was presented clearly and in an understandable way.

FRE 274H1S Introduction to the Linguistic Analysis of French

Instructor(s): P. Bessler

Enr: 37   Resp: 23   Retake: 70%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	8	39	52	6.4
Explains	0	0	0	4	8	39	47	6.3
Communicates	0	0	4	8	21	30	34	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	4	13	30	52	6.3
Workload	0	0	4	77	18	0	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	0	52	38	9	0	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	5	22	22	33	16	5.3

Bessler was a great instructor who cared about his students. He was very organized and came to class very well-prepared. He presented his material in a very clear and easy to understand way and students appreciated this. He was patient and made the hard course material enjoyable.
Overall, students had a great experience.

FRE 304H1S Contemporary French Women's Prose Fiction

Instructor(s): A. Cozea

Enr: 31   Resp: 10   Retake: 40%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	10	20	40	0	10	10	10	3.5
Explains	10	30	20	10	10	0	20	3.6
Communicates	0	30	10	30	0	10	20	4.1
Teaching	30	10	30	10	0	0	20	3.2
Workload	0	0	30	70	0	0	0	3.7
Difficulty	0	0	0	70	30	0	0	4.3
Learn Exp	22	22	11	22	0	0	22	3.4

Students found it hard to evaluate Cozea because she missed quite a bit of class time. Overall, this was not a very good learning experience.

FRE 324H1S French Literature in the Time of Revolutions and Industrialization

Instructor(s): A. Glinoer

Enr: 23   Resp: 14   Retake: 84%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	14	21	21	42	5.9
Explains	0	0	0	7	28	42	21	5.8
Communicates	0	0	7	0	30	30	30	5.8
Teaching	0	0	7	0	21	35	35	5.9
Workload	0	0	0	42	50	7	0	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	50	42	7	0	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	0	30	40	30	0	5.0

Glinoer was a great, organized instructor who presented the course material in an effective way with enthusiasm. Students appreciated the online notes as well.
Overall, a good learning experience.

FRE 326H1F Contemporary French Literature

Instructor(s): A. Cozea

Enr: 35   Resp: 34   Retake: 76%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	3	0	10	23	26	30	6	4.9
Explains	0	0	13	13	10	48	13	5.3
Communicates	0	0	0	10	10	23	56	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	24	10	37	27	5.7
Workload	0	0	0	83	13	0	3	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	3	63	30	3	0	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	12	29	25	20	12	4.9

While some students said they appreciated Cozea's unconventional teaching methods, others said it created a less organized class. Most students said they enjoyed the passion and enthusiasm that she displayed in class. Students found her engaging.

FRE 344H1F Literary Theory

Instructor(s): A. Glinoer

Enr: 21   Resp: 14   Retake: 71%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	7	0	7	57	28	6.0
Explains	0	0	7	0	14	35	42	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	14	21	7	57	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	14	0	21	64	6.4
Workload	0	0	0	78	21	0	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	64	21	14	0	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	9	45	9	36	0	4.7

Glinoer was appreciated by students as an enthusiastic, helpful, and approachable instructor. He tried to make sure that the concepts were clear to his students.
A few students mentioned that they found the lectures a little fast-paced.

FRE 376H1F French Phonology and Phonetics

Instructor(s): P. Bhatt

Enr: 31   Resp: 23   Retake: 83%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	4	21	43	30	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	4	13	40	40	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	4	17	30	47	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	0	21	34	43	6.2
Workload	0	8	0	60	26	4	0	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	4	56	26	8	4	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	0	38	33	16	11	5.0

Students found Bhatt to be an knowledgeable instructor with a good grasp of the material. He explained concepts well with good use of examples.

Some students suggested that the mark distribution could be revised to make the essay worth less of their final mark.

FRE 378H1F French Syntax

Instructor(s): P. Bessler

Enr: 28		Resp: 17				Retake: 43%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	5	0	17	17	29	17	11	4.6
Explains	0	0	35	17	17	23	5	4.5
Communicates	5	0	23	17	23	23	5	4.5
Teaching	0	5	11	29	35	11	5	4.5
Workload	0	0	5	58	29	5	0	4.4
Difficulty	0	0	0	35	29	29	5	5.1
Learn Exp	0	0	36	27	27	9	0	4.1

Students said they found the explanations in class inadequate and that key concepts were not presented clearly.

FRE 379H1F Sociolinguistics of French

Instructor(s): A-M. Brousseau

Enr: 23		Resp: 16				Retake: 60%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	31	25	43	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	0	31	25	43	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	6	31	62	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	25	25	50	6.2
Workload	0	0	0	87	6	0	6	4.2
Difficulty	0	0	0	68	18	6	6	4.5
Learn Exp	0	0	8	41	25	16	8	4.8

Students found Brousseau to be an enthusiastic, knowledgeable and approachable. She was said to be friendly. A few students suggested that the marking scheme be changed.

FRE 383H1F Experimental and Quantitative Methods for the Study of French

Instructor(s): J. Steele

Enr: 42		Resp: 25				Retake: 28%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	12	25	36	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	4	20	48	28	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	8	16	36	40	6.1
Teaching	0	0	0	4	4	48	44	6.3
Workload	0	0	0	37	45	12	4	4.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	24	48	20	8	5.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	65	20	5	10	4.6

Steele was appreciated by students for the passion he had for the material. They found him approachable and helpful.

Students mentioned the amount of mathematical/statistical knowledge required for the course was surprising and caught some of them off guard, while others appreciated the chance to take a course like this.

FRE 387H1S French Morphology

Instructor(s): P. Bessler

Enr: 25		Resp: 24				Retake: 39%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	4	37	25	20	12	5.0
Explains	0	0	20	25	16	29	8	4.8
Communicates	4	0	8	37	12	33	4	4.7
Teaching	0	0	4	33	20	37	4	5.0
Workload	0	0	4	79	16	0	0	4.1
Difficulty	0	0	0	70	29	0	0	4.3
Learn Exp	0	5	16	44	22	11	0	4.2

Although the course material was dry, Bessler was approachable and was available for help when students needed it.

FRE 388H1S Bilingualism and second language acquisition of French

Instructor(s): J. Steele

Enr: 29		Resp: 21				Retake: 60%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	0	47	52	6.5
Explains	0	0	0	0	19	42	38	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	42	57	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	4	0	42	52	6.4
Workload	0	0	4	7	28	19	0	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	52	38	4	4	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	6	40	20	26	6	4.9

Steele was a great instructor who was helpful and always willing to answer students' questions.

FRE 443H1F Advanced Topics: Authors

Instructor(s): R. Le Huenen

Enr: 19		Resp: 13				Retake: 66%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	7	30	15	46	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	7	30	23	38	5.9
Communicates	0	0	15	0	15	23	46	5.8
Teaching	0	0	0	7	23	38	30	5.9
Workload	7	7	7	69	0	7	0	3.7
Difficulty	0	0	7	53	30	7	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	0	25	33	33	8	5.2

Students found the instructor knowledgeable about the course material. He gave dense lectures, which were very informative, and well-organized. Students appreciated his enthusiasm and the interesting course material.

FRE 471H1F Medieval French Language

Instructor(s): D. Kullmann

Enr: 21		Resp: 12				Retake: 41%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	8	33	25	25	8	4.9
Explains	0	0	16	33	25	16	8	4.7
Communicates	0	8	0	8	33	25	25	5.4
Teaching	0	0	16	8	33	25	16	5.2
Workload	0	0	0	66	16	8	8	4.6
Difficulty	0	0	0	50	33	0	16	4.8
Learn Exp	0	20	0	60	10	0	10	4.0

While students found the course material interesting, they did not feel it was relevant. Kullmann was appreciated by students as being knowledgeable about the material but they felt that sometimes concepts were not explained clearly. A few students said that they were expected to already know more of the material going into the class.

FRE 487H1S Advanced Topics in Bilingualism and L2 acquisition

Instructor(s): J. Steele

Enr: 9		Resp: 6				Retake: 66%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	16	50	33	6.2
Explains	0	0	0	0	0	83	16	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	0	0	66	33	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	66	33	6.3
Workload	0	0	0	16	0	66	16	5.8
Difficulty	0	0	0	0	33	50	16	5.8
Learn Exp	0	0	0	0	75	25	0	5.2

This was a very interesting, but very challenging course. Steele was a very helpful instructor who guided the students very well throughout the project. Overall, a great learning experience.

FSL 102H1S Introductory French

Instructor(s): T. Robinson

Enr: 40   Resp: 14   Retake: 84%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	28	28	21	21	5.4
Explains	0	0	7	14	14	42	21	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	15	0	38	46	6.2
Teaching	0	0	7	0	21	42	28	5.9
Workload	0	0	14	35	21	21	7	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	0	42	28	14	14	5.0
Learn Exp	0	0	8	16	25	25	25	5.4

Robinson was an enthusiastic and helpful instructor. However, students commented that he should have talked in French more. Students also wanted more opportunities to practice their conversation skills in class.

Instructor(s): S. Monsef-Rao

Enr: 44   Resp: 18   Retake: 88%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	5	11	16	33	33	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	22	11	27	38	5.8
Communicates	0	0	0	5	11	44	38	6.2
Teaching	0	0	0	5	22	27	44	6.1
Workload	0	5	11	44	27	5	5	4.3
Difficulty	0	0	11	50	38	0	0	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	21	28	28	21	5.5

Overall, Monsef-Rao was a good instructor who was very helpful and willing to answer students' questions.

FSL 121Y1Y French Language I

Instructor(s): E. Kalisa

Enr: 47   Resp: 28   Retake: 64%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	25	17	17	28	7	3	3.9
Explains	3	11	22	14	22	22	3	4.2
Communicates	0	0	7	7	35	32	17	5.5
Teaching	0	7	21	10	28	28	3	4.6
Workload	7	10	17	53	3	7	0	3.6
Difficulty	0	11	7	40	22	7	11	4.4
Learn Exp	4	8	20	36	16	12	4	4.0

While students seemed to find Kalisa approachable and nice, some students felt that he taught the course at a higher standard. A few students said they could not understand some concepts because of the level of French that was being used in class.

Some students said the course could be better organized.

FSL 221Y1Y French Language II

Instructor(s): M. Witek

Enr: 33   Resp: 22   Retake: 90%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	52	28	19	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	0	14	33	52	6.4
Communicates	0	0	0	0	19	28	52	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	0	9	33	57	6.5
Workload	0	5	30	65	0	0	0	3.6
Difficulty	0	0	9	85	0	0	4	4.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	29	17	35	17	5.4

Students said that Witek was easy-going, approachable and obviously knowledgeable about the material. She was an effective language teacher who was able to communicate key concepts well to her students.

Instructor(s): J. Steele

Enr: 35   Resp: 26   Retake: 100%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	15	30	53	6.4
Explains	0	0	0	0	11	46	42	6.3
Communicates	0	0	0	0	7	23	69	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	46	53	6.5
Workload	0	0	3	61	23	7	3	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	7	46	23	19	3	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	16	16	29	37	5.9

Students said Steele was knowledgeable and enthusiastic about the course material. He presented the material clearly. He was approachable and available to students who asked for his help. Students seemed to have enjoyed having Steele as their lecturer.

Instructor(s): R. Inch

Enr: 35   Resp: 30   Retake: 93%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	23	50	26	6.0
Explains	0	0	0	6	10	56	26	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	0	13	36	50	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	0	13	46	40	6.3
Workload	0	6	10	73	3	6	0	3.9
Difficulty	3	0	13	70	10	3	0	3.9
Learn Exp	0	0	0	36	24	20	20	5.2

Students said Inch was an overall effective teacher who was enthusiastic, friendly and answered students' questions well. He made the learning experience comfortable and positive.

Instructor(s): M. Marukhnayak

Enr: 31   Resp: 31   Retake: 92%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	3	7	37	37	14	5.5
Explains	0	0	0	11	26	38	23	5.7
Communicates	0	0	3	0	7	37	51	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	3	23	42	30	6.0
Workload	0	3	3	55	7	22	7	4.6
Difficulty	0	3	11	51	18	11	3	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	22	18	40	18	5.5

Students said the Marukhnayak was a dedicated instructor who worked hard to teach her students. She was enthusiastic and passionate making for an enjoyable experience.

However, some students said they would have benefitted from more conversation in the classroom. Some also found the workload a little heavy.

Instructor(s): N. Daou

Enr: 31   Resp: 19   Retake: 89%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	15	31	21	31	5.7
Explains	0	0	0	15	26	26	31	5.7
Communicates	0	0	5	10	31	15	36	5.7
Teaching	0	0	0	10	21	36	31	5.9
Workload	0	0	26	52	21	0	0	3.9
Difficulty	0	0	10	57	21	10	0	4.3
Learn Exp	0	0	0	40	20	26	13	5.1

Students found Daou to be an encouraging, kind and helpful instructor who was passionate and enthusiastic about teaching French. She was well-prepared and organized for lectures.

Some students said the 3-hour class was too long for a language course.

Instructor(s): S. Bello

Enr: 34　　　　　Resp: 26　　　　　Retake: 92%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	15	34	50	6.3
Explains	0	0	0	0	11	53	34	6.2
Communicates	0	0	0	4	8	40	48	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	0	8	48	44	6.4
Workload	0	7	15	57	7	11	0	4.0
Difficulty	3	0	11	53	23	7	0	4.2
Learn Exp	0	0	8	20	33	33	4	5.0

Bello was appreciated by students as a caring, passionate and enthusiastic French teacher. Students said she was fun and approachable to students.

Some students felt more conversing in class would benefit them even more.

Instructor(s): A. Viselli

Enr: 34　　　　　Resp: 23　　　　　Retake: 91%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	4	0	13	43	39	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	4	8	39	47	6.3
Communicates	0	0	4	0	4	13	78	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	4	0	39	56	6.5
Workload	4	0	13	77	4	0	0	3.8
Difficulty	0	4	13	54	18	9	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	14	33	38	14	5.5

Students said Viselli was enthusiastic and engaging. He was well-prepared for lectures and tried to ensure that he was making the concepts clear to his students. He was available to his students and was helpful.

Instructor(s): L. Popic

Enr: 31　　　　　Resp: 15　　　　　Retake: 86%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	6	33	33	26	5.8
Explains	0	0	6	20	26	26	20	5.3
Communicates	0	0	0	20	33	13	33	5.6
Teaching	0	0	0	6	20	46	26	5.9
Workload	6	0	13	73	0	0	0	3.7
Difficulty	0	6	6	60	20	6	0	4.1
Learn Exp	0	0	0	30	30	23	15	5.2

Overall, Popic was a good instructor who was enthusiastic and helpful.

Instructor(s): R. Inch

Enr: 28　　　　　Resp: 21　　　　　Retake: 85%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	19	52	28	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	0	20	50	30	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	9	47	42	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	0	15	50	35	6.2
Workload	4	0	14	61	14	4	0	4.0
Difficulty	0	0	9	33	38	14	4	4.7
Learn Exp	0	0	0	31	31	26	10	5.2

Inch was seen as a very enthusiastic instructor who was well-organized, helpful, and explained concepts clearly. Some students suggested that there should be more smaller assignments and quizzes. They also would have preferred more oral components to the class so that they could improve on their conversation skills.

Overall, students enjoyed this class.

Instructor(s): M. Pillet

Enr: 29　　　　　Resp: 22　　　　　Retake: 70%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	0	27	72	6.7
Explains	0	0	9	0	4	40	45	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	9	23	66	6.6
Teaching	0	0	0	0	5	45	50	6.4
Workload	0	5	25	45	25	0	0	3.9
Difficulty	0	0	4	52	28	9	4	4.6
Learn Exp	6	6	0	26	13	33	13	4.9

Pillet was an excellent instructor who was very enthusiastic and passionate. Her classes were all very well-prepared and this made the class interesting and engaging.

Instructor(s): M. Alkurdi-Alzirkly

Enr: 33　　　　　Resp: 21　　　　　Retake: 68%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	4	4	19	19	19	14	19	4.6
Explains	0	10	10	15	35	10	20	4.8
Communicates	14	9	14	19	9	9	23	4.2
Teaching	9	0	14	9	38	9	19	4.7
Workload	4	0	14	57	19	4	0	4.0
Difficulty	4	0	9	47	28	9	0	4.2
Learn Exp	6	0	6	43	25	18	0	4.4

Instructor(s): R. Saverino

Enr: 25　　　　　Resp: 17　　　　　Retake: 94%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	0	35	64	6.6
Explains	0	0	0	0	0	17	82	6.8
Communicates	0	0	0	0	5	11	82	6.8
Teaching	0	0	0	0	0	11	88	6.9
Workload	0	0	0	70	5	23	0	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	29	29	35	5	5.2
Learn Exp	0	0	0	25	8	33	33	5.8

Saverino was an excellent instructor who was knowledgeable and presented the material very well. She was very enthusiastic, approachable, and was very helpful. She cared about the students and students appreciated it. Overall, a very good class.

FSL 321Y1Y French Language III

Instructor(s): C. Micu

Enr: 40　　　　　Resp: 23　　　　　Retake: 85%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	4	39	26	17	13	5.0
Explains	0	0	4	21	47	17	8	5.0
Communicates	0	0	0	21	17	60		6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	8	34	39	17	5.7
Workload	0	0	25	65	10	0	0	3.8
Difficulty	0	0	4	63	22	9	0	4.4
Learn Exp	0	0	5	47	31	0	15	4.7

Other than some course organizational issues (dealing with dates of assignments, etc), students generally seemed to enjoy the course.

Micu was liked by students as an effective language teacher. He was enthusiastic, engaging and attentive to his students.

Instructor(s): Y. Saddul

Enr: 35　　　　　Resp: 31　　　　　Retake: 76%

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	6	25	51	16	5.8
Explains	0	0	0	3	19	51	25	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	6	19	38	35	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	6	19	54	19	5.9
Workload	6	3	10	70	10	0	0	3.7
Difficulty	0	3	3	70	13	10	0	3.7
Learn Exp	0	3	7	19	30	30	7	5.0

Saddul was an enthusiastic and knowledgeable instructor. Students commented that not enough time was allotted for the test.

Instructor(s): N. Lezama

Enr: 32		Resp: 25					Retake: 60%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	0	20	48	32	6.1
Explains	0	0	0	4	16	44	36	6.1
Communicates	0	0	0	0	16	29	54	6.4
Teaching	0	0	0	0	20	56	24	6.0
Workload	0	0	12	44	32	8	4	4.5
Difficulty	0	0	0	25	50	20	4	5.0
Learn Exp	0	5	5	35	30	25	0	4.7

Lezama was a great instructor who was enthusiastic and made the class an enjoyable experience in an effective manner. However, the students found the evaluation method had very high expectations and were marked hard.

FSL 375Y1Y Comparative Stylistics

Instructor(s): S. Sacre

Enr: 64		Resp: 42					Retake: 44%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	2	2	9	45	30	9	5.3
Explains	0	0	4	12	31	31	19	5.5
Communicates	0	0	0	7	16	38	38	6.1
Teaching	0	0	2	4	19	39	34	6.0
Workload	2	0	19	53	12	7	4	4.1
Difficulty	0	2	7	10	30	35	15	5.3
Learn Exp	3	6	6	32	16	22	12	4.7

Many students thought that Sacre was a great instructor who was very helpful and encouraging. He was very enthusiastic and made his best efforts to make this course an enjoyable experience.

However, many students had a lot to say about the course structure. They felt that the course description did not reflect what was taught in class. Students commented that this class was too hard for a 3rd year course, and in order to do well in this class students had to have a solid background in French and French grammar. Students were not aware that this was a full translation course. Students also would have preferred if there were more methods of evaluation.

Overall, a great instructor, but students felt that this course should be restructured.

FSL 421Y1Y French Language IV

Instructor(s): R. Machado

Enr: 36		Resp: 30					Retake: 50%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	3	14	32	14	35	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	17	28	28	25	5.6
Communicates	0	0	0	10	3	14	71	6.5
Teaching	0	0	0	22	25	18	33	5.6
Workload	3	0	3	59	11	22	0	4.4
Difficulty	3	0	7	51	11	14	11	4.6
Learn Exp	11	5	0	38	22	11	11	4.3

Machado was a great instructor who was very well-organized. However, students found the marking for the tests too hard.

Instructor(s): M-A. Visoi

Enr: 37		Resp: 26					Retake: 80%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	8	0	24	24	12	32	5.3
Explains	0	0	7	15	30	23	23	5.4
Communicates	0	0	0	7	23	30	38	6.0
Teaching	0	0	0	7	26	23	42	6.0
Workload	0	3	3	50	15	19	7	4.7
Difficulty	0	0	3	57	19	11	7	4.6
Learn Exp	0	0	5	27	33	11	22	5.2

Visoi was a great instructor who was enthusiastic, helpful and caring.

Some students thought that the tests did not reflect what was taught in class. Overall, an enjoyable class where students were able to improve in their language skills.

FSL 443H1S French Language V: Oral French

Instructor(s): S. Sacre

Enr: 33		Resp: 23					Retake: 89%	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean
Presents	0	0	0	9	31	45	13	5.6
Explains	0	0	0	0	30	39	30	6.0
Communicates	0	0	0	0	17	39	43	6.3
Teaching	0	0	0	4	13	60	21	6.0
Workload	4	4	39	39	8	0	4	3.6
Difficulty	0	4	4	81	4	0	4	4.0
Learn Exp	0	0	0	40	26	20	13	5.1

This was a good class taught by an enthusiastic instructor. Some students suggested that this class should be divided into 2 smaller groups. They thought that the class was too big for a language practice course.

Overall, a very interesting course.

IAN HAS SECOND THOUGHTS ABOUT GIVING HIS TRUE LOVE THE THREE FRENCH HENS