



Program Board Meeting - English

Date: 15 April 2020, 12:15-14

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://uib.zoom.us/j/780758318?pwd=ZmJ5ZmEyVnpzVmhlRjJucXRXYTdUZz09>

Meeting ID: 780 758 318

Password: 001799

Agenda:

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| 10/20 | Approval of agenda |
| 11/20 | Approval of minutes from last meeting - 22 January 2020 (<i>Attachment 1</i>) |
| 12/20 | Information items
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Corona – updates, questions, exams, orals etc |
| 13/20 | Redesign-project
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Student involvement on learning outcomes?2. Draft – overall program learning outcomes – revised after comments from UiB Læringslab. See <i>Attachment 2</i> for overall program learning outcomes3. Insentiv-søknader |
| 14/20 | Student evaluation
How should we evaluate our courses this semester? Add questions about the digital shift? We should also evaluate ENG350, but you might want different questions for that survey? |
| 15/20 | Report from external examiners (last batch from 2019)
See <i>Attachment 3</i> for report from the external examiners. Charles Armstrong (literature) has handed in a report on the courses at 200-level (offered spring 2019). Gjertrud Stenbrenden (linguistics) has handed in a report on 300-level (offered spring 2019).

The reports should be discussed in the program board meeting. The program coordinators will then write a short comment. Student adviser will send both the comment and the reports to <i>Studiestyret</i> , before uploading them to <i>Studiekvalitetsbasen</i> . |
| 16/20 | Grading scale on exams, spring 2020
Should we change the grading scale for exams in the spring semester from A-F to pass/fail?

<i>Suggested decision</i>
<i>The program board has decided to keep the grade scale A-F for all exams in the spring semester 2020.</i> |



UNIVERSITY OF BERGEN
Department of Foreign Languages

17/20

Other business

08.04.20/HSM



Attachment 1 - Minutes - Program Board Meeting – English

Date: 22 January 2020, 12:15-14

Room 301, HF-building

Present:

Dagmar Haumann, Randi Koppen, Jalaludeen Ibrahim, Raees Calafato, Kimberly Marie Skjelde, Nahum Welang, Bente Hannisdal, Aud Solbjørg Skulstad, Lene Johannessen, Hild E. Hoff, Zeljka Svrljuga, Kevin McCafferty, Jerzy Nykiel, Katherine Zieman, Tormod Lilleårstein (student representative), Anja Eriksen (student representative), Clara Debus (student representative) and Hanne Svanholm Misje (secretary)

01/20 Approval of agenda

Approved, no comments.

02/20 Approval of minutes from last meeting - 4 September 2019

Approved, no comments.

03/20 Information items

1. Provisional registration numbers from 16.01.20

200-level – recurring problem with some instructors having too many students to supervise for the BA-paper (this term it's ENG264). We may have to help alleviate the burden for Sara in ENG264 but will wait until the registration deadline to decide.

200-level is tricky – we have a lot of students, will have to take a better look at the organization of this level in the redesign project.

2. Mentoring (we're trying again spring 2020)

Only one student registered for the mentor-project in the fall semester, and the department wants to try again this semester. We hope that the low numbers in the fall semester can be explained by "information-overload" – that there's just too much information going to new students. If enough students register this semester, we will hire MA-students as mentors.

Tip from the student representatives: the student-mentors should visit lectures to advertise. Hopefully, that would help with recruitment. Perhaps the student-mentors could also help newer students set up study groups?

3. Dialogmøte 12 February

Dialogmøte with department leadership, followed by a redesign session on learning outcomes. Full day at Scandic City, specific times will be announced by Åse.

4. New language requirements for MAHF-ENG

The language requirements for applicants who have their BA from abroad are now the same as UiO.

5. Linguistic positions

Will be joining us for the *Dialogmøte* 12 February.



UNIVERSITY OF BERGEN

Department of Foreign Languages

6. Erasmus Staff Mobility visitor in week 7

Will be attending ENG224, ENGDI201, ENG223 and ENG115. Will contact course instructor afterwards to discuss best practice.

7. Meetings among those involved in teaching at the Lektor-program

Great initiative from didactics. All involved in courses in the L-program are invited to this start-of-term-meeting – will continue with this in future semesters.

8. MA conference

Deadline to submit abstract was 1 February. The conference will be held on 1 April.

9. New programsensorer/eksterne fagfeller/external reviewers/external examiners

Anne J. Dahl (NTNU) and Erika Kvistad (UiO) appointed for the period 2020-2024.

04/20 Course reports, fall 2019

The course reports were discussed in the meeting and will form the basis for the yearly program evaluation of both the BA and the MA-program (2019).

The course reports will be uploaded to *Studiekvalitetsbasen*.

Some comments from the meeting:

ENG100: this course needs a serious revision, does not work with the overall program. Is it possible to link ENG100 and the *mentorordning* together? Seems like an idea worth looking into.

Important to make sure that we separate between “smaller” changes (changes we want to make before a course runs again) and the bigger redesign changes. It’s no problem changing smaller things while being in the process of redesigning the program.

The yearly report should focus on the recurring issues:

Linguistics: failure rate. Failure and not attending class/not submitting exercises. The courses need more contact hours – this should be emphasized in the report. For lower level linguistics: possible to have fewer lectures and more (mandatory) seminars?

General:

Exam forms: this is commented on again and again by both students and staff.

Separate L-courses: we need separate courses for L-students, specially at 200 and 300-level. 100-level could stay the same. This would be beneficial for several reasons: 1) professional relevance 2) class size 3) difference in “level” of English (regular students have more credits in English than L) 4) schedule/other organizational aspects.

Side-note: the program board in English wants to meet people involved in the L-program. Should ask to meet with the new *L-direktør*.

We should also find out if it’s possible to rely on funding for student assistants in the future. Perhaps possible to use for literature as well?



UNIVERSITY OF BERGEN

Department of Foreign Languages

05/20 Changes to course ENGD101

It is proposed to add the use of an English-English dictionary to the examination aids.

Decision

The program board approves the suggested change in the course description for ENGD101. A revised course description will be sent to the faculty before the spring 2021 deadline.

06/20 ECTSs changes in ENG221 and ENG223

It is suggested that we change the numbers of credits we give for ENG221 (History of English) and ENG223L (Modern Linguistics). From a 'relevance for work life' perspective, it would make much more sense to offer Modern English linguistics as a 10 ECTS course and History of English as a 5 ECTS course.

Decision

The program board approves the suggested change in ECTSs for ENG221 and ENG223 for MAHF-LÆFR. As of spring 2021, History of English will be offered as a 5 ECTS course (ENG221L) and Modern English Linguistics as a 10 ECTS course.

This will have to go to UUI – Hanne will start working on the formalities.

07/20 30ECTs MA thesis for L-students

A tricky subject, and a discussion we should table for a later meeting, perhaps after we meet with higher-ups from the L-program. This will have to be approved at HF (and probably UiB) level.

08/20 Language requirements, incoming exchange students

Both pros and cons here – but it will make the admission process a lot easier for the student advisor and the board generously agreed to give it a go. If we see that this affects grades/level of accomplishment for international students, we can always remove the OLS-test from valid test scores.

Hanne will update the information online: <https://www.uib.no/en/education/96641/english-language-requirements#courses-in-english-language-nbsp-and-literature>

09/20 Other business

The student representatives suggested that we use the course-student representatives for midterm-evaluations. Either that a form is filled out, or that the student representatives are given some time in class to talk to the other students. The student representatives in each course can then talk with the course instructors, might be a more efficient way to start a dialogue. The suggestion as well received, and we should start looking into doing this for at least some of the courses this semester.

04.02.2020/HSM

Comments? Send Hanne by 14 February



Attachment 2 – Overall Program Learning Outcomes – BAHF-ENG

Please keep in mind that this is a working document and can be changed.

LEARNING OUTCOMES

BACHELOR PROGRAMME IN ENGLISH

Admission into the programme requires a strong background in oral and written English.¹

The programme offers training in the academic study of English Linguistics and English-language Literatures. Students deepen their knowledge of the language system, its development, variation, change and usage, and of central topics, periods and approaches in English literary and cultural studies. Throughout the study programme and across the disciplines, students learn to develop their critical, analytic, linguistic and problem-solving skills by engaging with a broad range of texts and genres and a variety of approaches to reading. Through written assignments and oral presentations, students also enhance their oral and written skills in academic English.

Graduates of the Bachelor Programme in English are prepared to pursue further study of English Linguistics and English-language Literatures, either independently or on an MA programme, and they fulfil the English requirement for entry to postgraduate teacher education (PPU) in Norway.

Knowledge

On completion of the programme, graduates are able to

- apply analytical concepts, theories, and methods for the scientific study of language, literary texts, and cultural contexts
- describe the central aspects of linguistic and literary systems using linguistic and literary terminology
- describe, explain and analyse specialised topics in English linguistics, e.g. phonetics and phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics and pragmatics, sociolinguistics, and language history
- describe, explain and analyse specialised topics in British, American, and World literatures, literary criticism, and critical theory
- describe, analyse and interpret a variety of literary texts
- discuss and assess the significance of historical and cultural contexts to the interpretation of language and texts

Skills

On completion of the programme, graduates are able to

- critically engage with scientific concepts and methods
- analyse authentic linguistic data and a variety of literary and non-literary texts
- examine links and interfaces between language structure and use
- examine links and interfaces between literary texts and historical and cultural contexts
- demonstrate and employ key research abilities:

¹ For Norwegian students, the minimum grade in English from VG1 is 4; for international students, the following minimum scores are required: IELTS: 7.5, TOEFL: 108, Pearson: 74.



- assess research materials from a range of sources, primary and secondary
- evaluate different sources and identify what is significant in a large body of material
- recognize and cite open-access and other scholarly databases, including literary and linguistic journals, glossaries, community-built encyclopaedias, language corpora and other accredited scholarly resources
- read diverse texts closely and critically
- analyse problems, compare and evaluate different views
- formulate independent and well-argued hypotheses
- initiate and complete a piece of independent, original research (bachelor thesis)
- reflect on their acquired research abilities

General competence

On completion of the programme, graduates are able to

- think and argue analytically, critically, and independently about topics within and beyond their academic field
- use their research skills to find, evaluate, and use information within and beyond their academic field
- work autonomously, motivate themselves, plan their own work, and achieve goals and meet deadlines
- employ collaborative skills – the ability to engage in critical and constructive discussion as part of a team
- demonstrate written communication skills – the ability to write clearly and effectively in English, and to adjust writing style appropriately to the content, the context, nature, and purpose of the subject
- demonstrate oral communication skills – the ability to communicate effectively and efficiently in spoken English, to explain their ideas to others and to present a longer argument with confidence

Learning by design → could be converted into text

The above knowledges, skills, and competences are acquired by/through

- autonomous work
- preparing for and participating in lectures and seminars
- written assignments
- peer review and feedback in small-group seminars and collaborative group projects
- individual supervision/one-to-one tutorials offering advice and feedback on written work
- giving and receiving feedback on oral presentations
- initiating, planning and completing a piece of independent, original research



Attachment 3 – Reports, external examiners

Charles I. Armstrong

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

Oppnevnt for perioden 1.1.2016 – 31.12.2019 (med forlengelse våren 2020)

Rapport mars 2020

ENG222/262/224/264: Evalueringsrapport

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

Denne rapporten tar for seg fire emner på 200-nivå i engelskspråklig litteratur/kultur, som tilbys om høsten som del av bachelorprogrammet i engelsk. Hvert av emnene er på 10 studiepoeng. Emnene ENG222 og ENG262 har samme underviser og tema, og skiller seg i realiteten kun fra hverandre på grunnlag av eksamensform. Det samme gjelder ENG224 og ENG264, som altså i realiteten er ett kurs med to forskjellige eksamensformer. Emnebeskrivelsene til de fire emnene er generelle når det gjelder det faglige innholdet, og sier for eksempel at studentene skal tilegne seg «utvida kunnskap om de trekkene som kjenneteikner den litteraturen og/eller kulturen studiet fokuserer på», og gjøres i stand til å «reflektere kring dei teoretiske spørsmåla studiet reiser». Ellers antyder beskrivelsen av studieprogrammet at ENG222/262 som oftest tar for seg britisk litteratur og/eller kultur, mens ENG224/264 vanligvis omhandler amerikansk litteratur og/eller kultur. Utover disse generelle rammene, gis emnene mer spesifikt innhold fra semester til semester. Våren 2020 har emnene de mer spesifikke titlene «Human and Nonhuman Animals in British Literature» (ENG222/262) og «Literature, Social Justice and Environment (224/264)». Året før hadde de titlene «Gendering Empire: Representations, Tropes and Discourses of Gender in British Colonial Literature, 1860-1914» (ENG222/262) og «Introduction to Modernism: 'The Long Modernism''' (ENG224/264). Innholdsmessig virker disse emnene kanskje noe spesialiserte for å være 200-emner - men det studentene går glipp av i form av å få en bred standardinnføring i utvalgte epoker eller genrer, kompenseres formodentlig ved at undervisningen blir mer forskningsrelevant. Det er også positivt at emnene som gis parallelt inkluderer teoretiske elementer, og gjør bruk av samme innføringsverk i moderne litteraturteori.

Mens ENG222 og ENG224 har en firetimers skoleeksamen, eksamineres ENG262 og ENG264 i form av semesteroppgave etterfulgt av muntlig eksamen. Semesteroppgaven er på ca. 4500 ord, og studentene må møte på minst to obligatoriske veiledningsmøter. Studenter som velger spesialisering i litteratur, vil i et normalt semester ha en firetimers skoleeksamen i det ene emnet, og semesteroppgave etterfulgt av muntlig eksamen i det andre emnet. Dette gir god variasjon, og er derfor en fordeling som er velegnet til å teste studentene på forskjellige evner og arbeidsmetoder. Samtidig er det klart at en firetimers skoleeksamen ikke er den beste måten å eksaminere et litterært emne. Men selv om studentene nok kunne



trenget den skriveøving og faglege fordypning som ville følgje av ein annan eksamensform, er skoleeksamen eit greit redskap når ein har relativt store studentgrupper.

Ifølgje emnebeskrivelsene, tilbys det totalt 24 timar undervisning på kvart av emnene, fordelt over 12 undervisningsuker. Det vil kunne justeres på dette, dersom mindre enn fem studenter melder seg på – men dette har ikkje skjedd nylig. Selv om det er like mykje undervisning i emnene, virker det ikkje som pensum alltid er av same omfang. Våren 2019, som er det semestret som det foreligger mest data om, var det store forskjeller mellom ENG222/262 («Gendering Empire») og ENG224/264 («Introduction to Modernism»). Sistnevnte emne hadde eit langt større pensum enn førstnevnte, men ein god del flere romanar på leselisten. Gitt at arbeidsomfanget for studentene skal vere omtrent like stort på desse emnene, kan det vere grunn til å se på dei interne rutinene her.

Programsensor har fått tilgang til studentevalueringane frå våren 2018 og våren 2019. Disse gir ingen grunn til å tro noko annett enn at dette har vært faglege interessante emner, styrt av dyktige forelesere. Men det er likevel vanskelig å komme fram til nok sikker kunnskap på basis av evalueringane. For det er slående at studentenes deltagelse i evalueringane er synkende frå det ene året til det neste, og empirien frå 2019 er såpass liten (med kun 4 innleverte skjema på kvart av emnene) at desse dokumentene er av heller begrenset verdi. Hvis ikkje den lave oppslutningen i evalueringane skyldes helt særlege forhold, kan det vere grunn til å kikke på dei interne rutinene også her. Ved programsensors eget lærested, har det vist seg at automatiserte, digitale «påminnelser» til studentene om å fylle ut evalueringsskjema på plattformen Canvas, har forårsaket ein ganske radikal økning i antall utfylte evalueringsskjema. Ganske små justeringar kan altså muligens forbedre ting ganske radikalt på denne fronten.

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

Foreleser på EN22/262 har fylt ut ein egenervaluering, hvor interessant informasjon om studentenes prestasjoner fremkommer. Det viser seg at emnet det semestret ble gitt både for «ordinære» engelskstudenter som deltar i bachelorprogrammet i engelsk, og for studenter som deltok i bachelorprogrammet for kjønnsstudier (i emnene KVIK203 og KVIK223). Det er oppsiktsvekkende at sistnevnte studentgruppe klarte seg langt bedre på eksamen, selv om «pensum og undervisningsopplegg ikkje var spesielt innrettet mot deres faglege forutsetninger». Dette kan nok reflektere nasjonale trender, der studenter som velger eit bachelorløp i engelsk ikkje alltid har ein sterk faglig basis. Men det kan uansett vere grunn til å spørre seg om f.eks. vektleggingen av teori på 200-nivået kan oppleves som spesielt krevende for studentene i bachelorprogrammet i engelsk, hvis dei har hatt lite teori på engelsk 100-nivå.

I emnene der studentene skriver semesteroppgave (ENG262 og ENG264) er det som nevnt obligatorisk veiledning. I emnebeskrivelsene til alle dei fire emnene står det at det er «venta at studentane er til stades og tek aktivt del i undervisninga». Men det er ikkje obligatorisk oppmøte i desse emnene, og – så vidt programsensor kan se – er det heller ikkje nok obligatoriske presentasjonar som må gjennomførast. I egenervalueringen for ENG222/262, skriver foreleser at av «dei 32 som gjennomførte» emnet, deltok kun «ca 15-20 i undervisning». Hun differensierer ikkje her mellom engelsk- og KVIK-studentene, men det ville vere interessant å vite om dei relativt svake resultatene til engelskstudentene kan vere relatert til manglande oppmøte. Foreleseren påpeker også at den heterogene



studentmassen og variasjonen i eksamensformene (knyttet til to KVIK-koder og to engelsk-emner) skaper pedagogiske utfordringer.

3. Vurderingsprosess og praktisering av karakterskala:

Normal karakterskala benyttes. Programsensor har ikke blitt forelagt detaljert karakteroversikt, utover det som fremkommer av forelesers egenvurdering av ENG222/262, våren 2019. Der fremkommer det at ENG262 hadde en snittkarakter på C, mens ENG222 hadde en snittkarakter på D og 25% stryk. De tilsvarende snittene på KVIK-emnene var B (på KVIK203) og C (på KVIK223). De relativt svake resultatene til studentene i bachelorprogrammet i engelsk, tilsier at man burde følge aktivt med utviklingen for denne studentgruppen de neste årene.

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:

Programsensor er ikke klar over noen spesielle forhold.

6. Rollen og oppgavene som programsensor:

Opprinnelig skulle dette emnet vurderes av programsensor høsten 2019.

Rapporteringsdatoen ble imidlertid utsatt av UiB av diverse årsaker, og denne rapporten tar altså utgangspunkt i hvordan emnene ble gjennomført våren 2019.

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

February 2020

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

Courses evaluated: ENG345, ENG349

Scope of evaluation: spring 2017 to spring 2019

1. Introduction

I received the documents pertaining to the courses evaluated in December 2019. The documents submitted for each course were: online and written course descriptions, the teachers' course reports and literature lists, student evaluations, exam questions and exam statistics.

I will closely follow the *Retningslinjer for programsensor ved Universitetet i Bergen*, as outlined in the *Programsensormappe*. They suggest that my duties are to assess and evaluate the framework (*opplegg*) for and execution (*gjennomføring*) 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. This is my third annual report as *programsensor*, so questions III and V will be addressed very briefly here: I have not yet participated in discussions of quality or potential improvements.

In the following sections, I will evaluate and comment on the courses assessed this time, in terms of points I and II (and IV where relevant) as specified above (sections 2-3); my role as *programsensor* is assessed (section 4), and I take a final look at the courses as part of a larger context (section 5).

2. ENG345 English(es) in contact

This course is a 300-level course whose content may vary; when it was taught in the spring of 2019, it was called "English(es) in contact", and was concerned with contact between English and other languages to "produce such diverse outcomes as standard English, New Zealand English, the New Englishes of former British and American colonies, and pidgin and creole varieties" (from the teacher's report).

Course description, syllabus, structure, teaching and special circumstances

In terms of the knowledge gained, the students are supposed to acquire insights into methodological and theoretical approaches within the field. The students are further supposed

to be able to apply their knowledge and skills in teaching and disseminating research, and to be able to express themselves clearly in academic English.

The textbook was Schreier & Hundt 2013, and there was a list of further reading made available digitally.

Instruction was given in the form of two-hour seminars running for eight weeks, for a total of 16 hours of teaching. When the course was taught in the spring of 2019, the students had to present two texts each from the reading list. The final assessment is a four-hour written school exam.

Assessment

The online course description is clearly formulated, a couple of typographical errors notwithstanding; it is also somewhat vague, given that the contents of the course may vary. However, the description provided by the teacher and found under “Reading list” when the course was taught is very clear. The pensum is well-chosen, and there are no negative comments on the students’ part that suggest it is too difficult.

The course report written by the teacher is informative, and indicates no particular problems. One of the students comments that s/he would have liked to know earlier that the students would have to present syllabus texts, but it does not appear to have been much of an issue at all.

As for the student evaluations, they are generally very positive for both spring 2018 and spring 2019, but even more positive for 2019, which points to a good development. The course scores full points on availability of information about the course, level of difficulty, progression, syllabus, learning outcomes and relevance, and the quality of teaching is rated between 4 and 5, with 5 being the highest. Students have spent 2 hours a week on average on the course, which is low, but a common phenomenon.

As for the exam, the questions were pertinent and central to the topic; the three students who sat the final exam in spring 2019 were awarded a B, a C, and a D, respectively, for an average of C. A school exam is perfectly adequate, though one wonders whether a term paper or home exam might be better at this level. That is of course up to the teacher to determine.

3. ENG349 Words, words, words

As with ENG345, the contents of this course may vary; when it was taught in the spring of 2019, the working title was “Words, words, words”, and was concerned with “English morphology and morphological theory. It provides the descriptive, analytical and theoretical tools for studying the internal structure of words as well as the various processes by which words are formed and changed. Special emphasis is placed on the interplay between morphology and other components of the language system, such as phonology and syntax, as well as on diachronic and acquisitional aspects of English morphology” (from the teacher’s report).

Course description, syllabus, structure, teaching and special circumstances

The learning outcomes are identical to those specified for ENG345: in terms of the knowledge gained, the students are supposed to acquire insights into methodological and theoretical approaches within the field. The students are further supposed to be able to apply their knowledge and skills in teaching and disseminating research, and to be able to express themselves clearly in academic English.

The instruction was given in the form of seminars of two hours for eight weeks, for a total of 16 hours of teaching.

The textbooks were Bauer 2010 and Booij 2012, in addition to nine articles or chapters by various scholars collected in a compendium or available online.

The final assessment was a combination of a take-home exam asking the students to produce one long essay of 1500 words, and three short answers of 500 words each, and an oral exam based on the written exam.

Assessment

The online course description is somewhat vague, as the contents of the course may vary; but the description provided by the teacher (and found under “Reading list”) is precise and clear. The learning outcomes are formulated clearly.

The syllabus texts seem well-chosen, and the students do not seem to have found them difficult in the spring of 2019; in previous semesters, students have commented that the pensum is too extensive with too much to read.

Student reviews are generally very favourable for spring 2019, which points to a good development. The course scores full marks on availability of information, level of difficulty, progression, extent and relevance of the syllabus, and learning outcomes. The quality of teaching is very high, scoring 5 (out of 5) on teaching, in-course feedback and feedback on assignments. Only two students took the course, both have responded in the evaluation; one has spent two hours a week on average on the course, the other 5 or more hours. The students report that they liked the slides, tasks and discussions in class. One student suggests that they limit themselves to one theory rather than having to read about several theories, but at this level, students must expect to familiarise themselves with different models of language.

The exam questions posed in the spring of 2019 covered central topics in the syllabus. The teacher’s report states that 1 A and 1 B were awarded to the two students who sat the exam. The choice of a take-home exam combined with an oral exam seems like a good decision, although one of the students comments that it felt like having two separate exams.

4. The role and tasks of the *programsensor*

Points III and V in the *retningslinjer for programsensor* concern “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*”.

Regarding the first point, I have not participated in discussions of the development of quality at the University of Bergen, but I consider this report and prior reports to *be* part of such a discussion, as they address the quality of the courses taught as well as potential improvements. If the University of Bergen and the Department would like me to, I am of course willing to participate more directly in such discussions.

The *programsensor*’s role, in my opinion, is to address all the topics explicitly raised in the *retningslinjer*, and to offer suggestions for improvement, if relevant. Any such suggestions are advisory only, and it is up to the Department to implement them. The Department and teachers are very welcome to contact me if there are matters which are unclear.

5. Summing up

The two courses evaluated here seem to have worked very well, both at their intended level and as part of the totality of courses taught on English language and linguistics.

Challenges with the courses may be related to low student numbers, but that is a national trend for master's studies in English language, and little can be done to change it. Other, more course-specific, challenges seem to have been addressed satisfactorily by the teachers, as issues which are raised in student evaluations for 2017 and 2018 are not commented on in the evaluation for 2019.

The more precise course descriptions are found online only under "Reading list". I understand that this is due to the fact that the course content may vary although the course code remains the same, but I still wonder if it is possible to provide them in the general course description or make them more visible in some way.

Oslo, 13 February 2020

Sincerely,



Gjertrud Flermoen Stenbrenden