



NOTAT FRA PROGRAMSTYRE KNYTTET TIL PROGRAMSENSORRAPPORT I ENGELSK FOR HØSTEN 2016

Dato for håndtering i programstyret: 24. august 2016

Kommentarer fra programstyret:

De nye programsensorene for engelsk, Gjertrud Flermoen Stenbrenden, UiO (lingvistikk) og Charles I. Armstrong, UiA (litteratur) har levert hver sin rapport om henholdsvis alle lingvistiske og litterære BA-emnene på 100-nivå samt introduksjonsemnet ENG100, som betjenes av både lingvistikk og litteratur.

Rapportene ble diskutert under i programstyremøte for engelsk 24. august 2016.

Den lingvistiske programsensoren sin rapport omfatter ENG107, ENG108, ENG109 og lingvistikkdelen av ENG100; den litterære programsensoren sin rapport ENG125 og den litterære delen av ENG100. Både rapporter kommenterer opplegget av ENG100 som delt emne, særlig med hensikt til karakterfordelingen mellom de to disiplinene.

Rapportene gjenspeiler både kursledernes og disiplinenes oppfatning av emnene. De få foreslåtte tiltak, såfremt ikke allerede implementert eller i gang satt, tas opp i disiplinmøtene.

Fagkoordinator: Dagmar Haumann

Dato: 24.08.2016

Report from *programsensor* for linguistics at the University of Bergen May 2016

Programsensor: Gjertrud Flermoen Stenbrenden, Associate Professor of English Language, University of Oslo

Courses evaluated: ENG100, ENG107, ENG108, ENG109

Scope of evaluation: autumn semester of 2015, spring semester of 2016

1. Introduction

The deadline for this (first) evaluation was 1 April 2016, but I had not received any documents by that date, probably due to very recent changes in staff at the Department of Foreign Languages. I received the documents 29 April from Hanne Svanholm Misje. The delay is non-problematic to me, and I hope it will not cause any difficulties for the Department or the University.

I will closely follow the *Retningslinjer for programsensor ved Universitetet i Bergen*, as outlined in the *Programsensormappe*. I thus see it as my duty to assess and evaluate the framework (*opplegg*) for and execution (*gjennomføring*) of a variety of courses offered in English language at the Department of Foreign Languages at the University of Bergen.

The aspects which the *Retningslinjer* specify for assessment and evaluation are:

- I. Syllabi, course structure, teaching;
- II. Forms of assessment, including the use of external examiners;
- III. The extent to which the *programsensor* has participated in discussions about quality development/improvement in the particular *studieprogram* in question;
- IV. Any special circumstances in the execution of relevant courses;
- V. The role and tasks of the *programsensor*.

Points I, II, IV call for an assessment of the courses themselves and their execution, including course descriptions, learning outcomes, syllabi, forms of assessment, exam results, etc., whereas points III and V ask the *programsensor* to self-evaluate and assess her role as such. Since this is my first annual report as *programsensor*, answers to questions III and V will be more relevant in later stages. I have not yet participated in discussions of quality or potential improvements. My role and tasks as *programsensor* will probably become clearer at a later stage too.

In the following sections, I will evaluate and comment on each individual course in terms of points I and II (and IV where relevant) as specified above (sections 2-5); use of external examiners has been given a separate sub-section (section 6). I will then assess my role as *programsensor* (section 7) and take a final look at the courses as part of a larger context (section 8).

2. ENG100 Introduction to English Studies

The course aims to provide students with basic insights into linguistics and literary studies as independent academic disciplines: “how to read carefully, discuss critically, and write analytically about English literature” (the report from the literature teachers, signed by Laura Saetveit Miles); “gi grunnleggende kunnskap om lingvistikk som disiplin, med vekt på tema

som gjeld engelsk språk” (the online course description). In its present format, this course was taught for the first time in the autumn semester of 2015.

Course description, syllabus, structure, teaching and special circumstances

The online course description is precise, and the learning outcomes are formulated clearly. (A minor note: the ‘English’ online version offers headlines in English, but the rest of the text is in fact in Norwegian.)

The instruction is given in the form of lectures and seminars, 28 hours in total. The choice of having groups/seminars is a good one for an introductory course like this, because smaller groups facilitate a more hands-on experience for the students: they can ask questions, discuss difficult topics, work with exercises, etc.

The syllabus seems well-chosen; nevertheless, it might be an advantage for the students if the reading list and primary texts were listed explicitly online, but I have noted that this is not done for any of the courses I have looked at.

Assessment

The four obligatory qualifying assignments (two in linguistics, two in literature) seem to have worked according to plan, although specific details regarding their content may be usefully changed in the future, as suggested by the teachers themselves.

The choice of a traditional school exam seems natural, given the nature and level of the course. The questions posed appear to test the contents of the course; i.e., the pass marks A-E reflect the extent to which the learning outcomes have been achieved. The execution of the exam seems to have been unproblematic also. However, the literature teachers recommend that the students somehow be “forced” to spend the same amount of time on the two parts. A possibility would be simply to collect the students’ papers after two hours, though the logistics may prevent this from being a good solution. The language teachers also suggest that the exam be made digital, which seems a good idea, especially for the second question of the linguistics part, in which the students are asked to correct and re-write a somewhat lengthy piece of prose.

The grades obtained in the autumn semester of 2015 were rather lower for the literature part than the linguistics part, with a failure rate of 25 per cent. The language teachers suggest that it may be due to the fact that the two linguistics questions required shorter answers, and that the linguistics part was the first – the students may thus have spent more time on this part than on the literature tasks. The literature teachers give similar reasons, and also report that this is a trend even at higher levels (from the report, page 3):

the high failure rate roughly matches what happens in ENG125, so it is likely that these are simply the skills that students struggle the most with acquiring. That suggests that ENG100 remains an important opportunity for students to practice and improve those skills and thus be more successful in later literature courses.

The teachers have clearly reflected on the structure and set-up of the course, and the students’ answers to the questions in the course evaluation have been included in their entirety. I recommend that the teachers’ suggestions for improvement be followed up, but the course seems generally to have worked quite well and to have filled a gap in the course portfolio.

3. ENG107 English Grammar II

This course builds on an undergraduate course in English grammar (ENG101 English Linguistics I), and aims (a) to give the students insights into the structure of English, especially in terms of morphology and syntax, and (b) to provide them with analytical tools and terminology, so that they can describe English grammar and apply their knowledge on linguistic material.

Course description, syllabus, structure, teaching and special circumstances

The course description is clear, though somewhat short; the point called “General competence” under the heading “Learning Outcomes” could be made more specific – ‘the skills necessary to expand their knowledge through further studies’ is a little vague.¹

A minor note: there are some inconsistencies in the course title, in that the online course description and the reading list say “English Grammar II”, whereas the course report submitted (for the autumn of 2015) says “English Linguistics II – grammar”. If the course builds on “English Linguistics I”, then the latter appears to be a better title, except that a course with “linguistics” in its title ought to treat phonetics/phonology also, and possibly semantics, not just morphology and syntax.

The syllabus textbook seems well-chosen (Huddleston & Pullum 2005), but the course report states that the students were not entirely satisfied with it. There is no dearth of introductory textbooks on English grammar, however, so it should be possible to find another, more suitable one, if that is what the teachers want. The syllabus might usefully add some articles treating relevant topics within English language research, although it is not strictly necessary.

The number of teaching hours is fairly typical for this type of course, with 12 weeks of teaching, and 3 hours of teaching per week. The choice to give 2-hour lectures and 1-hour seminars has probably been discussed among the teachers; the opposite may be more common (i.e. having 1-hour lectures and 2-hour seminars), and indeed some of the students state that they wish the seminars would have been longer. It is at least something that could be considered for the next time the course is offered. Regarding the seminars, I gather from the course report that perhaps students should be obliged in the future to attend the group they have signed up for.

The student evaluations paint a pleasant picture, with general satisfaction regarding the usefulness and quality of both lectures and seminar groups, though some are critical of the textbook. The fact that one of the seminar teachers got ill during the course is mentioned, and is of course unfortunate for all the involved parties, not just the students...

Assessment

There is a requirement that the students submit one qualifying paper during the semester. Having two qualifying papers, instead of just one, would probably measure the students’ progress somewhat better, and test them in more of the syllabus topics before the final exam.

Again, the choice of a 3-hour school exam as the final assessment seems a natural choice. The amount of work required is fine for three hours; all the more so because the questions refer to bits of language which have been pre-selected (rather than ask the students themselves to identify relevant examples from an unmarked text). If relevant, perhaps in the future one of

¹ I realise that the wording is identical to that of some of the other courses.

the questions could be more open and ask the candidates to write a short essay/passage on a topic treated in the course, such as information structure in a longer text, or derivation/word formation principles in English?

Around two-thirds (103) of the students who had initially signed up for the course (145) sat for the final exam, which is a typical number. Of these 103, nine students failed, which gives a very good pass rate. The percentages of the individual grades are typical also, with C being the average.

4. ENG108 English as a Global Language

ENG108 aims to describe linguistically some varieties of English world-wide, and to provide a social and political context for English as a global language. The course report states that the topics treated in ENG108 used to be part of a bigger course, ENG106, but that ENG106 was split into two (or three).

Course description, syllabus, structure, teaching and special circumstances

The online description is short and succinct, and could perhaps be made more specific: it could state briefly which varieties of English will be chosen for analysis, and some social and/or political variables that will be considered.² In the learning outcomes, the social and political aspects of the course are again highlighted, but there is no mention of the varieties with which the students will be familiarised. As for the point “General competence”, see my comment above under ENG107.

The submitted course report states that the instruction is in the form of lectures. It could very well be that these lectures are like seminars, with a lecture bit and a bit where the students get the chance to ask questions and work with the course material and exercises, etc., but this is not the impression given by the report (which states that the instruction is given as 12 lectures of 2 hours each). The high number of registered students (134) means that additional groups would probably be out of the question, but perhaps the course might benefit from a structure like the one suggested above (a lecture bit, followed by some two-way communication between the lecturer and the students); one of the students makes a similar observation. The report indicates that few students in fact read the uploaded course materials on *Mi Side*, which is a shame, given the time and effort invested on the teacher’s part. If the students were asked questions about this material, or given a 5-minute quiz in the lecture (there are apps for this sort of thing), it might encourage the students to read up before each lecture. The lecturer should be commended for making the material available before each lecture.

The student evaluations are generally positive; they have clearly enjoyed studying this course. One student, however, is not a fan of the Trudgill textbook, but likes Crystal. This is not to say that the choice of Trudgill’s *Sociolinguists: An introduction to language and society* is a poor choice: student opinions always vary. The syllabus consists of classics, and has the right breadth and depth for a course on this level.

Assessment

There is a requirement that one qualifying paper be submitted during the course; having two would enable the teacher to test both a specific variety of English **and** the politics of a global language.

² The submitted exam questions for 2015 II and 2016 I do, however, indicate the range of topics treated.

A three-hour school exam seems a good choice for the course. The grades/exam results produce typical Gaussian statistics, though Cs and Ds were awarded in roughly equal numbers, making C/D the average grade. The pass rate is 94.5 %, which is very good.

The exam questions themselves are quite extensive, but the students are told to spend *ca.* 35 minutes on each of the five questions, so they have a good idea what is expected of them. Given that the questions cover a wide range of topics, the grades should reflect the students' learning outcomes very well.

A minor note: The external examiner seems to have made a comment to the effect that the overall exam results for ENG108 are better than they were for ENG106; the teacher concludes that splitting the old course appears to have been a good idea.

5. ENG109 Varieties of English

This course builds on ENG101 (introduction to English phonetics and grammar), and presumably covers different accents of English – the course description says that it “will give students insight into and knowledge of the pronunciation features in a number of varieties of English”. It will also equip students with the terminology to describe and analyse language, and they should be able to distinguish between the different varieties upon completion of the course.

It transpires from the report that this course was taught for the first time in its present state in the autumn of 2015, as a 5-credit course; the course content used to be part of a 15-credit course (ENG106)

Course description, syllabus, structure, teaching and special circumstances

The course description is succinct; upon reading it, I thought that the focus on phonetics/phonology might usefully be reflected in the course title itself: “varieties of English” could easily refer to different written, standard or non-standard, varieties of English also, or even to varieties of English texts. Besides, a hint might have been given as to which accents will be studied. However, further down in the course description, it is specified that the course treats “different international varieties of English”, so one must assume that the course investigates the phonological systems (and possibly the phonetic realisations of the phonemes) of a range of national varieties of English. The course report verifies all these assumptions, and I think it would be beneficial for the students if they could glean this information from the online course description. The report also states that the textbooks cover all linguistic aspects of international varieties of English, but that the course has focussed on phonological features only, which is only fair for a 5-credit course.

This course is taught as presumably 12 lectures of 2 hours each, 24 hours in total. The lectures have had a practical component also, with the students working on exercises, and with the lecturer going through sound recordings/clips. A division of time such as this is a very good solution when having smaller groups would be too costly.

Both an oral mid-term evaluation and a final written evaluation (submitted) were carried out, and showed that the students were very satisfied with the course, its content and the way it had been taught. The students suggested in the mid-term evaluation that they wanted more exercises and some kind of overview showing the differences between the two textbooks.

This is a problem frequently encountered: despite their respective strengths, different textbooks commonly use different terminology and phonetic symbols, making them difficult to navigate for undergraduates without much background knowledge of phonology. The teacher rectified the problems, which is reflected in the very positive evaluation.

The choice of textbooks is good and uncontroversial, and the number of pages has been limited to ca. 250 pages, which is wise for a 5-credit course and for a course dealing with phonology, which is always difficult to grasp for students (except those who understand it almost intuitively).

Assessment

The students have to submit one qualifying assignment. The teacher expresses satisfaction with the course, but states that the qualifying assignment should not be obligatory, as it increases the work load for the teacher and is a stress factor to the students. Although I know the problem of a heavy work load all too well, I disagree: a paper forces the students to put into writing what they have learned, to synthesise the information provided both in the lectures and in the textbooks, and helps them learn to write *about* language in an appropriately academic way. It also makes them reflect more deeply on the topics covered, and on what is important (and what is less so). This is an essential learning outcome of any university course, especially for those (few) who end up as master's students and research fellows.³

92 students had signed up for the course, of whom 79 sat the final exam; 83 % received a pass mark, and the average grade is C. These are typical numbers.

A written exam of 3 hours is a good choice of assessment, as is also the conclusion drawn by the teacher. The teacher wishes that in the future, the exam might be made digital and involve sound material, with which I whole-heartedly agree. The exam questions are on point and cover essential aspects of pronunciation differences between accents, and thus test the course content well.

6. Use of external examiners

The University of Bergen's regulations regarding the use of external examiners are laid out on the following website: <http://www.uib.no/fremmedsprak/24103/sensur-og-evaluering>. The regulations are meant to ensure that institutions do not develop (a) unfortunate 'in-house' grading habits (for lack of a better word), or (b) permanent 'links' between a certain teacher and a certain external examiner, as stated in point 6:

Det er vesentleg å sikra eige nivå gjennom å variera samansetjinga av kommisjonane, og på den måten unngå faste koplingar mellom rettleiar og ekstern sensor.

The regulations are quite strict,⁴ which is a good thing: usually teachers benefit greatly from working with external examiners, as they bring a different point of view to the table. At the

³ In my own course entitled "Accents of English in the British Isles", the students are given a worksheet with questions for every seminar, to ensure that they know the crucial bits. On each worksheet is one more comprehensive question relevant to the accent treated that week. As their qualifying assignment, the students have to pick five of these comprehensive questions and write approximately one standard page on each. This ensures that the students read up every week, and that they have had a chance to digest and write about five topics before the final written exam. In fact, it makes it less time-consuming for the teacher to correct, as each topic is treated briefly; the students express great satisfaction with this type of assignment every time.

⁴ That is, they restrict the use of internal-only examiners.

University of Bergen, not all courses are required to use an external examiner, and in these cases, using a *programsensor* may make up for this, as expressed in point 5. I have therefore considered the exams and assessments in some detail in the foregoing.

Of the courses I have looked at, the following courses used external examiners in the autumn semester of 2015: ENG107, ENG108, ENG109. In the course reports submitted, no mention is made of any disagreements over grades, so the system appears to work well.

7. The role and tasks of the *programsensor*

Points III and V in the *retningslinjer for programsensor* regard “the extent to which the *programsensor* has participated in discussions about quality development/improvement in the particular *studieprogram* in question” and “the role and tasks of the *programsensor*”.

With reference to the first, I have not participated in discussions of quality development prior to this report being written, but I consider this report to *be* part of such a discussion – of the quality of the courses taught and of potential improvements thereof. In the future, it might be more natural – if the University of Bergen and the Department wish me to – to participate more directly in such discussions.

I have seen it as my role to comment on all the aspects explicitly stated in the *retningslinjer*, and to offer my opinions and even words of advice where I have deemed it relevant. Any such advice is offered only as suggestions, and it is up to the Department to initiate and implement any or all of them. I am at the Department’s and teachers’ disposal should they wish to consult me.

8. Summing up

All the four courses evaluated seem to have worked well, both at their intended level and as part of the totality of courses taught on English language. The teachers have reflected on their teaching, the syllabus and the assessments, and have demonstrated the ability and willingness to change things that may not have been optimal – some have even implemented changes already. The first time a course is taught is always like a test round, and teachers make changes in response to their own experiences and to feedback, including student evaluations. There is in my experience a high degree of self-monitoring among university faculty, who tend to be high achievers by nature, so I am certain that they either have addressed or will address and rectify any less than satisfactory aspects of the courses they teach.

I have only minor suggestions for improvement:

- make online course descriptions more explicit and detailed, regarding course content and sometimes learning outcomes;
- provide detailed reading lists (syllabus) in online course descriptions, so the students know what to prepare for;
- make course titles consistent and truly descriptive of the course content.

Sincerely,



Gjertrud Flermoen Stenbrenden

Oslo, 31 May 2016

Charles I. Armstrong

Programsensor for engelsk litteratur ved Det humanistiske fakultet, Institutt for fremmedspråk, UiB

Oppnevnt for perioden 1.1.2016 – 31.12.2019

Rapport for april 2016.

ENG100: Evalueringsrapport

ENG100, «Introduksjon til engelskstudiet»

1. Læremiddel, studieopplegg, prøveordning/eksamen og undervisning:

Dette er et valgfritt introduksjonskurs, som skal (i følge emnebeskrivelsen) gi studenten «eit godt grunnlag for vidare studium i engelsk lingvistikk, litteratur og kultur». Emnet gir en uttelling på 10 studiepoeng, og i så måte kan undervisningsomfanget – som spesifiseres å være opp til 28 timer – virke noe tynt. Dette kompenseres trolig av de obligatoriske arbeidskravene. Studentene må levere inn hele fire arbeidskrav: to i lingvistikk og to i litteratur/kultur. Selv om dette tallet er uvanlig høyt for et emne på kun 10 studiepoeng, virker det fornuftig å prioritere dette individuelle arbeidet på bekostning av forelesninger og seminarer i plenum, gitt at dette er et emne som skal fungere som en introduksjon og som skal sikre at studentene har basisferdighetene på plass før de går videre med studiet.

Pensumlisten for litteraturen virker godt tilrettelagt et introduksjonskurs av denne sorten, og er dominert av generelle tekster om fortolkning og litteraturkritikk, i tillegg til et utvalg primærtekster. Lingvistikkpensumet virker til sammenligning mer dominert av et ønske om å trene opp grunnleggende ferdigheter i akademisk skiving - i stedet for den innholdsmessige, faglige siden ved engelsk språk - men nettopp lingvistikk-delen anses ikke å være et viktig anliggende for akkurat denne rapporten. Det litterære pensumet består av prosa- og poesitekster, og en vektlegging av sistnevnte genre blir i emnerapporten begrunnet i studentenes åpenbare problemer med å fortolke lyrikk i senere deler av bachelorprogrammet.

Det kan nok være utfordrende å finne riktig type lærer, og kanskje også riktig motivasjon, for et slikt emne - siden det faglig sett trolig vil være mindre krevende enn resten av bachelorprogrammet, samtidig som de pedagogiske utfordringene til tider kan være store, og en god relasjon til senere pensum i faget også er et viktig premis for at emnet skal fungere som det skal. Høsten 2015 ble de tre forelesningene i emnet gitt av tre forskjellige forelesere – alle fast ansatte, med sin hovedkompetanse i litteratur/kultur - som også hadde ansvar for hver sin seminargruppe. Faren med et slikt opplegg er at det fort kan bli for fragmentert: spesielt i tilfeller der de pedagogiske utfordringene står i høysetet, kan det være riktig å prioritere at studenten får enhetlig undervisning gitt av så få lærere som mulig.

Når det gjelder selve eksamen – som er en fire timers skoleeksamen – virker en todeling, der studenten må stå i både lingvistikk og litteratur/kultur – formålstjenlig.

Dessverre brukte imidlertid mange studenter så mye tid på den innledende lingvistikk-delen, at de ikke fikk tid til å besvare den etterfølgende litteraturdelen på fullstendig vis. Det opplyses i emnebeskrivelsen at skoleeksamen «kan bli digital»: gitt det faktum at studentene sjeldent kommer til å arbeide med penn og papir i fremtiden, er det ønskelig at digital eksamen blir normalformen så snart som mulig.

2. Studie- og eksamenskrav og generelt om studentenes prestasjoner:

Alle studenter som er tatt opp på bachelorprogrammet i engelsk ved UiB kan ta emnet. Det spesifikke fokuset på litteratur og lingvistikk gjør at det nok ikke er aktuelt for studenter som kun trenger mer praktisk skolering og basisopplæring i engelsk. Studentene presterte jevnt over bedre på lingvistikk-delen enn på litteraturdelen – på sistnevnte var D, E og F de hyppigste karakterene, mens man på lingvistikk oppnådde noe tilnærmet lik Gausskurven. Dette avviket er slående, og tilsier at fagmiljøene bør gå i en dialog med hverandre om krav, ambisjoner og opplegg for dette studiet.

3. Vurderingsprosess og praktisering av karakterskala:

Vurderingsprosessen følger normale prosedyrer. Det kan selvfølgelig vurderes om et slikt innføringsemne kun burde operere med bestått/ikke bestått, men det er fare for at det ville undergrave studentenes motivasjon.

4. Programsensors deltagelse i drøftelser i fagmiljøet:

Programsensor har ikke deltatt i interne drøftelser av emnet i fagmiljøet.

5. Særlige forhold ved gjennomføringen av studieprogrammet i perioden:

Dette er et nytt emne, som først ble tilbudt høsten 2015 – og som programsensor forstår har blitt introdusert pga. endringer i hvordan UiB organiserer førstesemesterstudiet. Emnet kan fungere bra som et tilbud som forbereder førstesemesterstudenter på videre studier i engelskfaget, og det vil trolig også være viktig for å sikre at engelskfaget konkurrerer på lik fot med andre fag som har tilbud på dette nivået. Samtidig er det ingen tvil om at engelskfaget tradisjonelt har fått en viss andel studenter som har hatt tilstrekkelig basiskunnskaper i faget ved studiestart, og for disse studentene kan emnet oppleves som nokså unødvendig. Man bør følge nøye med, og følge tett opp de erfaringene som blir gjort i de første årene med dette studiet.

6. Rollen og oppgavene som programsensor

Rapporten for både ENG100 og ENG122 er levert noe sent, og programsensor må selv ta noe av ansvaret for dette. Forhåpentligvis vil de neste rapportene bli levert punktlig!

Charles I. Armstrong

Programsensor for engelsk litteratur ved Det humanistiske fakultet, Institutt for fremmedspråk, UiB

Oppnevnt for perioden 1.1.2016 – 31.12.2019

Rapport for april 2016.

ENG125: Evalueringsrapport

ENG125, «Britisk litteratur og kultur»

1. Læremiddel, studieopplegg, prøveordning/eksamen og undervisning:

Dette emnet favner bredt, siden det skal fungere som en generell innføring i britisk litteratur og kultur på universitetsnivå. Ser man på historisk spredning er det en imponerende bredde på det litterære pensumet, siden det – ifølge oversikten for våren 2016 - går helt tilbake til middelalderen, og har to hele forelesninger viet Chaucers *Canterbury Tales*, i tillegg til den tradisjonelle vektleggingen av for eksempel Shakespeare, romantikken og litteratur fra tidlig i det 20. århundret. Man kunne kanskje ønsket flere nyere tekster – her er *Waiting for Godot* (1953) det siste større verket på pensumet – men alt i alt er dette et fint sammensatt litterært pensum. Det virker imidlertid ikke som studentene blir bedt om å lese tekster om metode og teori, noe som denne rapporten vil komme tilbake til.

Ifølge timeplanen tilbys en kombinasjon av forelesninger og seminarer, med et totalt omfang for hver student på cirka seks timer i uka: dette må anses som et balansert og godt tilbud for et 100-nivås emne på 15 studiepoeng. Med unntak av to seminargrupper som ledes av en Phd-student, blir hele undervisningen våren 2016 gitt av tre fast ansatte med spesialisering i nettopp britisk litteratur og kultur. Opplegget året før var nokså likt. Det er positivt at studentene på dette nivået eksponeres for forskjellige forelesere med høy kompetanse. Eksamensformen er en syv dagers hjemmeeksamen, som gir studentene en fin mulighet til fordypning og til oppøving av skriveferdighetene sine. Uten noen form for avsluttende muntlig prøve eller skoleeksamen, er det samtidig selvfølgelig en viss risiko for at studentene forholder seg selektivt til pensumet og ikke fullt ut tilegner seg den bredde av kunnskap som tilbys. Dette har imidlertid blitt noe motvirket gjennom hvordan oppgavene på skoleeksamen er formulert: på eksamen våren 2015 ble studentene bedt om å sammenligne tre tekster fra forskjellige tidsperioder og i ulike generer.

På et mer overordnet plan er det bemerkelsesverdig at ingen emner på 100-nivå i bachelorprogrammet i engelsk involverer muntlig prøve. Dette reduserer effekten av å ha seminarer, og står også i motsetning til målet om å gjøre studentene «i stand til å uttrykkja seg klårt og presist [...] både skriftleg og munnleg» (som det for eksempel står formulert i emnebeskrivelsen for ENG-125).

2. Studie- og eksamenskrav og generelt om studentenes prestasjoner:

Emnet inngår i bachelorprogrammet i engelsk, men er åpent for alle med studierett ved UiB. Det er også anbefalt at studentene har gode karakterer fra studiespesialisering i engelsk på videregående skole, samt fullført ENG100 og emne om språk og kommunikasjon i førstesemesterstudiet. Dersom man virkelig får studenter med denne bakgrunnen, burde det borge for bra basisforutsetninger. Som tidligere nevnt inneholder timeplanen for ENG-125

tilsynelatende få eller ingen timer primært viet grunnlagsspørsmål og metode, og det er kanskje forventet at studentene allerede har tilegnet seg denne kunnskapen fra førstesemesterstudiet.

Våren 2015 møtte 117 studenter til eksamen i emnet. Av disse strøk 12 stykker, altså drøyt 10%. Ellers var gjennomsnittskarakteren på D, med en overvekt av studenter med svakere karakterer (32 med D, og 31 med E) og få over gjennomsnittet (8 B'er og 8 A'er). Dette er et nokså svakt resultat. Så lenge man har ingen grunn til å tro at studentene er urettferdig strengt bedømt, må fokuset ligge på å hjelpe studentene til å prestere bedre. Emnerapporten peker på en rekke relevante forhold, inkludert størrelsen på seminargruppene. Den emneansvarlige forklarer også svakere karakterer enn forventet med studentenes manglende analytiske evner, og sier også at det kan «virke som et mer systematisk fokus på metakognitive evner og terminologi kunne vært nyttig». Emnebeskrivelsen konstaterer for øvrig at studentene ikke bare skal få «auka innsikt i og kunnskap om britisk litteratur», men også at de skal «utvikle evne til sjølvstendig vurdering av og kritisk haldning til pensumtekstane», blant annet gjennom «ei innføring i tekstanalyse i dei litterære hovudmodusane». Forelesningsplanen og pensumutvalget (se pkt 1., over) kan indikere at de sistnevnte aspektene ikke blir prioritert høyt nok i sammensetningen av undervisningsopplegget.

Underveis i semesteret kreves oppmøte på 75% av seminarene, og innlevering av et veiledet essay på cirka 3-4 sider er også en forutsetning for å kunne ta eksamen. Det organiseres frivillige skriveseminar i sammenheng med sistnevnte essays. Alt i alt virker dette som et grundig og godt opplegg, som er kalkulert til å sikre at store deler av den gjengse studentmasse skal møte vel forberedt til eksamen. Samtidig påpekes det i emnerapporten at mange studenter tilsynelatende ikke tar innover seg tilbakemeldinger på det obligatoriske essayet, noe som tilsier at noe skurrer i et tilsynelatende velorganisert regime. Kan det være grunn til å vie et eget seminar, underveis i semestret, til de viktigste funnene og problemene fra det obligatoriske essayet?

3. Vurderingsprosess og praktisering av karakterskala:

Vurderingsprosessen følger normal prosedyre for et slikt emne. Bestått/ikke bestått er ikke noe alternativ for et slikt emne.

4. Programsensors deltagelse i drøftelser i fagmiljøet:

Programsensor har ikke deltatt i interne drøftelser av emnet i fagmiljøet.

5. Eventuelle særlige forhold ved gjennomføringen av studieprogrammet i perioden:

Programsensor er ikke kjent med slike spesielle forhold.

6. Rollen og oppgavene som programsensor:

Jeg gjør oppmerksom på at programsensoravtalen stipulerte at det skulle rapporteres på ENG-122 i denne første rapporten. Koordinator har imidlertid forklart at ENG-125 vurderes i stedet ved denne korsvei, pga. sykdom i staben.