



Program Board Meeting - English

Date: 22 January 2020, 12:15-14

Room 301, HF-building

Agenda:

01/20 Approval of agenda

02/20 Approval of minutes from last meeting - 4 September 2019 (*Attachment 1*)

03/20 Information items

1. Provisional registration numbers from 16.01.20 (*Attachment 2*)
2. Mentoring (we're trying again spring 2020)
3. *Dialogmøte* followed by a redesign session on learning outcomes.
12 February, Scandic City, time: TBD, but full day
4. New language requirements for MAHF-ENG:
The language requirements are now the same as UiO. See *attachment 3* for the English version of the new admission requirements for MAHF-ENG
5. Linguistics positions
6. Visitor in week 7
Wants to attend ENG224, ENGDI201, ENG223 and ENG115
7. Meetings among those involved in the Lektor-program
8. MA conference
9. New programsensorer/eksterne fagfeller/external reviewers
Anne J. Dahl (NTNU) and Erika Kvistad (UiO)

04/20 Course reports, fall 2019 (*Attachment 4*)

The following courses from the fall semester 2019 have been evaluated, both with a course report and student evaluation:

ENG100
ENG107
ENG118
ENG119
ENG122
ENG339 + L
ENG341
ENG343
ENG331
ENG332
ENG333
ENGDI111
ENGDI101
DIDAENG1

The course reports (written by the course instructor) should be discussed in the meeting. After the meeting, the student adviser will upload the reports (course reports, not student evaluations) to *Studie kvalitetsbasen*. Please note that these



reports are the basis for the program evaluation we submit to the department. The program evaluation serves as the basis for the department's negotiations with the faculty/UiB about resources, staff etc. **It is therefore vital that you read all the reports, so that we can discuss what should go into the program evaluation.**

05/20

Changes to course ENGD1101

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

Suggested decision

The program board approves the suggested change in the course description for ENGD1101. A revised course description will be sent to the faculty before the spring 2021 deadline.

06/20

ECTSs changes in ENG221 and ENG223

At the 200-level, we offer two courses in linguistics: ENG221 (History of English) and ENG223 (Modern English linguistics). Whereas regular BA students take at least one of these, L-students have to take both, with Modern English linguistics being offered as a 5ECTs course. 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.

Suggested decision

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

07/20

30ECTs MA thesis for L-students (discussion)

08/20

Language requirements, incoming exchange students (discussion)

Incoming exchange students to UiB must document English language proficiency before they can take courses in English literature and linguistics. They need to have C1 level, and (for now) we only accept test results from IELTS, TOEFL, Cambridge etc. (see all here: <https://www.uib.no/en/education/96641/english-language-requirements#courses-in-english-language-nbsp-and-literature>)

Students coming to Bergen through the Erasmus+ program must take a language test through Erasmus, called **Online Linguistic Support (OLS)**. Should we open this test as a valid test for admission to our English courses (just for incoming exchange students, not full degree students)?

Benefits:

- the test is free
- will make the admission process easier

Drawbacks:

- online test (without supervision)
- students from outside Erasmus will still have to pay for an expensive language test



UNIVERSITY OF BERGEN

Department of Foreign Languages

Read more about the OLS-test here:

<https://erasmusplusols.eu/en/about-ols/>

https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/resources/online-linguistic-support_en

<https://support.erasmusplusols.eu/hc/en-gb/articles/360004390573-Language-Assessment-User-Guide#results>

09/20

Other business

16.01.20/HSM



Attachment 1 - Minutes - Program Board Meeting - English

Date: 4 September 2019, 12:15-14

Room 301, HF-building

Present: Dagmar Haumann (program coordinator, coordinator linguistics), Randi Koppen (coordinator literature), Sigrid Ørevik (coordinator didactics), Kevin McCafferty, Jalaludeen Ibrahim, Bente Hannisdal, Lene Johannessen, Jerzy Nykiel, André Storto, Zeljka Svrljuga, Laura Saetveit Miles, Joseph Tabbi, Anja Eriksen (student representative), Jon Martin Bildøy (student representative), Tormod Lilleårstein (student representative) and Hanne Svanholm Misje (secretary).

06/19 Approval of agenda

Approved, no comments.

07/19 Approval of minutes from last meeting - 20 February 2019

Approved, no comments.

08/19 Information items

1. Registration numbers from 02.09.19

No big surprises when it comes to fall registration numbers. Please use this list as a reference point for the courses that we must arrange a re-sit exam for. Hanne will contact each course instructor to arrange their re-sit(s).

2. Mentoring (starts up fall 2019)

Mentoring for new BA-students starts in the fall semester 2019. All study program at UiB have been asked to suggest a mentoring program for their new students. For the bachelor program in English, we have decided to use experienced students as mentors.

Here is a short summary of the mentor program for BAHF-ENG:

- Offered to new students of BAHF-ENG
- Students sign up using an online form (distributed by student advisor) and are invited to two meetings per semester
- We hire experienced students (MA-students) to act as mentors. The number of mentors we need will depend on the number of new students who sign up
- The mentors (experienced students) will meet with program coordinator and student advisor before meeting the students. In addition, they will meet with program coordinator at the end of each semester to talk about the meetings they've had with students

Hanne asked for suggestions from the English faculty for student mentors.

3. Redesign project

Hanne held a short information session about the student workshop that was arranged as part of the redesign project. It was a two-day workshop, where 23 students (BA, MA and L) used a method called *Design Thinking* to work with the very general question "How can we create the best possible English-education for the future." We are very happy with how this turned out. It became clear that a lot of the ideas and comments that the students had about our program are areas that we are aware of and want to do something about. It was nice to see that we are on the same page. It is still very



UNIVERSITY OF BERGEN

Department of Foreign Languages

good to involve the students in this process and, based on their comments, this is something they appreciate.

What's next in the redesign project?

- Hanne will create a Teams (<https://it.uib.no/Teams>) for the project, where we will post news, minutes from meetings, interesting articles – basically a forum for you to keep up to date on the project (if you want). Whenever we need something from you, we will continue to use eng@if.uib.no
- We are finalizing an alumni-survey, will be sent to students who have obtained a degree in English in recent years (how recent is to be determined)
- **Full-day seminar with all staff 25 September!** This is the next big thing. No one is teaching on 25 September (Wednesday) and you are all expected to join us as Scandic City for a full-day seminar devoted to the redesign-project. The seminar will be hosted mainly by UiB Læringslab. More info will come as soon as we have it.

4. York chaperone

Jerzy goes in week 9, Lene goes in week 10.

5. Visitor in week 7

The English Department will receive an Erasmus+ visitor from Izmir Institute of Technology in week 7, here to observe our program and the teaching conducted in that week.

09/19 Course reports, spring 2019

The course reports were discussed in the meeting, and a few comments are noted here:

Combination courses

When teaching combination courses (like this years' ENG222/ENG262/KVIK223/KVIK203) it is very complicated to offer good and well thought through teaching when you have four course codes with different assessment forms. Ideally, you should be able to cater the course to a certain assessment form. This is hard to do with combination courses, and all our 200-level courses fall under this category. There is always a combination of students taking i.e. ENG222 with school exam and ENG262 with supervised term paper in the same class. This is something to keep in mind for the redesign project.

The course descriptions for KVIK223 and KVIK203 need to be updated with a word count for the home exams and language of assessment. Hanne will look into this. We should also try to be more in advance the next time English is teaching KVIK203 (every third spring semester), especially when it comes to registration numbers and possibly assessment forms. It was mentioned that it would be interesting to find out how the other departments engaged in KVIK203 deals with this course. We should ask colleagues from Comparative Literature and Nordic studies about this.

ENG340/ENG336/L-students

Is it possible to open this course to the L-students? Can we suggest more electives for the teacher training students, and do they have to take an equal amount of credits in literature/linguistics? Is there any wiggle room here? These questions came up when discussing several of the course reports, and it is something that we need to look into before the next teacher meeting in October. Is there



UNIVERSITY OF BERGEN

Department of Foreign Languages

anything we can do to help the teacher students along? Dagmar, Sigrid and Hanne will start working on this to see what wiggle room (if any) we have.

The course reports will be uploaded to Studiekvalitetesbasen.

(<https://www.uib.no/studiekvalitet/77815/studiekvalitetsbasen>)

10/19 Other business

Midterm evaluation

It was suggested in the meeting that we try out midterm evaluation instead of the online survey we send out at end of term. Some of the staff have done so already, getting a much larger response rate than the online survey. It was decided in the meeting that we will try midterm evaluation this semester, fall 2019. Hanne reminds everyone about the midterm evaluation in a couple of weeks. In the meantime, if you have arranged a midterm evaluation before, please share your questions with the rest of us by e-mailing eng@if.uib.no (or any other way you see fit). But please make sure to also share between disciplines.

It was noted in the meeting that we will need to keep track of these evaluations. Each course instructor should comment on the evaluations in the course reports and give the reports to student advisor for archiving. We have to send these to the programsensor, and if possible, please make the midterm evaluation sheet scanner friendly.

A student representative pointed out that we should not stop with the end of term evaluation, but perhaps shorten it or make it non-digital. Hanne, together with the program coordinators, will look into revising the end of term evaluation and aligning it more with the questions we now ask in midterm evaluation.

New exchange agreement

Jerzy has been in contact with University of Silesia in Poland, and after a presentation in the meeting it was decided that we will establish an Erasmus-like agreement with the English section at the University of Silesia.

L-students and master level

We have some work to do when it comes to the teacher training program and master level courses. Might also be an idea to look into creating "separate" L courses for master level that will be opened only for L-students and that can run when we have the resources.

10.09.2019/HSM

Comments? Send Hanne by 17 September

**FS520.002 : Oppmeldingstall for sted**

Sted: 184.11.20.* Institutt for fremmedspråk med alle grupper

Termin: 2020 - VÅR

Emnekode	Vurd.stat.		Vurd.ordn.	Vurd.form	Emnenavn	Antall meldt	Dato
ARA100 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S	S	S	Innføringskurs i arabisk språk og	1	11.03.2020 3t
ARA111 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S1	S	S	Grunnkurs i moderne standardaræ	23	04.03.2020 4t
ARA112 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S1	S	S	Grunnkurs i moderne standardaræ	21	12.05.2020 4t
ARA113 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S1	S	S	Grunnkurs i moderne standardaræ	2	04.03.2020 4t
ARA115 0	2020 VÅR	ORD O1	O	O	Innføring i arabisk språkvitenskap	1	Frist innlevering:
ARA211 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S1	S	S	Tekststudier i klassisk og modern	7	12.05.2020 4t
ARA252 0	2020 VÅR	ORD OM	OM		Arabisk språk og samfunn	1	
ARA350 0	2020 VÅR	ORD MAO	MAO		Arabisk mastergradsoppgave	1	
ARA621 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S	S	S	Arabisk språk og kultur	5	04.03.2020 3t
ARA622 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S	S	S	Grunnkurs i moderne standardaræ	10	15.05.2020 3t
DIDAENG2 0	2020 VÅR	ORD O	O	O	Engelskdidaktikk 2	9	Frist innlevering:
DIDAENG2 0	2020 VÅR	ORD M	M	M	Engelskdidaktikk 2	2	25.05.2020-29.0
DIDAFRAN2 0	2020 VÅR	ORD O	O	O	Fransk didaktikk 2	4	Frist innlevering:
DIDAFRAN2 0	2020 VÅR	ORD M	M	M	Fransk didaktikk 2	1	25.05.2020-29.0
DIDASPA2 0	2020 VÅR	ORD O	O	O	Spanskdidaktikk 2	5	Frist innlevering:
DIDATYS2 0	2020 VÅR	ORD O	O	O	Tyskdidaktikk 2	1	Frist innlevering:
EAS250 0	2020 VÅR	ORD BAO	BAO	O	Bacheloroppgave i japansk	26	Frist innlevering:
EAS251 0	2020 VÅR	ORD BAO	BAO	O	Bacheloroppgave i kinesisk	17	Frist innlevering:
ENG107 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S	S	S	Engelsk grammatikk II	15	25.02.2020 3t
ENG114 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S	S	S	Engelsk grammatikk I	172	15.05.2020 4t
ENG115 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S	S	S	Engelsk fonetikk og fonologi	163	12.05.2020 3t
ENG118 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S	S	S	Utvalgt emne i engelsk språkstruk	6	04.03.2020 3t
ENG119 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S	S	S	Utvalgt emne i engelsk språkvarie	10	03.03.2020 3t
ENG122 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S2	S	S	Amerikansk litteratur og kultur	7	27.02.2020 5t
ENG125 0	2020 VÅR	ORD H	H	H	Britisk litteratur og kultur	163	Uttak: 22.05.202
ENG221 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S	S	S	Engelsk lingvistikk: språkhistorie	64	28.05.2020 4t
ENG222 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S	S	S	Engelskspråklig litteratur og kultu	33	19.05.2020 4t
ENG223 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S	S	S	Engelsk lingvistikk: moderne lingv	20	11.05.2020 4t
ENG223L 0	2020 VÅR	ORD O	O	O	Engelsk lingvistikk: moderne lingv	24	Frist innlevering:
ENG224 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S	S	S	Engelskspråklig litteratur og kultu	20	14.05.2020 4t

**FS520.002 : Oppmeldingstall for sted**

Sted: 184.11.20.* Institutt for fremmedspråk med alle grupper

Termin: 2020 - VÅR

Emnekode	Vurd.stat.		Vurd.ordn.	Vurd.form	Emnenavn	Antall meldt	Dato
ENG261 0	2020 VÅR	ORD OM	OM		Semesteroppgave i engelsk lingvi	9	
ENG262 0	2020 VÅR	ORD OM	OM		Semesteroppgave i engelskspråk	11	
ENG263 0	2020 VÅR	ORD OM	OM		Semesteroppgave i engelsk lingvi	14	
ENG264 0	2020 VÅR	ORD OM	OM		Semesteroppgave i engelskspråk	26	
ENG331 0	2020 VÅR	ORD HM	HM		Masteremne i engelskspråklig litte	2	
ENG333 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S	S	S	Masteremne i engelskspråklig litte	2	27.02.2020 4t
ENG335 0	2020 VÅR	ORD HM	HM		Masteremne i engelskspråklig litte	12	
ENG337 0	2020 VÅR	ORD O	O	O	Masteremne i engelskspråklig litte	30	Frist innlevering:
ENG339L 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S	S	S	Masteremne i engelsk lingvistikk I	4	25.02.2020 3t
ENG340 0	2020 VÅR	ORD L	L	L	Forberedelse til masteroppgavesk	10	Frist innlevering:
ENG341 0	2020 VÅR	ORD O	O	O	Masteremne i engelsk lingvistikk I	1	Frist innlevering:
ENG343 0	2020 VÅR	ORD H1	H	H	Masteremne i engelsk lingvistikk I	2	Uttak: 25.02.202
ENG345 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S	S	S	Masteremne i engelsk lingvistikk I	4	12.03.2020 4t
ENG349 0	2020 VÅR	ORD HM1	HM		Masteremne i engelsk lingvistikk I	3	
ENG350 0	2020 VÅR	ORD MAO	MAOM		Engelsk mastergradsoppgave	34	
ENGDI101 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S	S	S	Fagdidaktikk i engelsk i lektorutd	1	24.02.2020 4t
ENGDI201 0	2020 VÅR	ORD O	O	O	Fagdidaktikk i engelsk for integri	25	Frist innlevering:
ENGDI301 0	2020 VÅR	ORD O	O	O	Fagdidaktikk i engelsk for integri	20	Frist innlevering:
ENGMAU641 0	2020 VÅR	ORD O	O	O	Engelsk språk	8	Frist innlevering:
ENGMAU650 0	2020 VÅR	ORD MAOM	MAOM		Erfaringsbasert masteroppgave i	4	
ENGMAU651 0	2020 VÅR	ORD U	O	O	Fellesemne: Profesjon, refleksjon	3	
FRAN100 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S	S	S	Introduksjon til franskstudiet	1	04.03.2020 4t
FRAN120 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S	S	S	Fransk grammatikk 1	26	25.02.2020 4t
FRAN121 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S	S	S	Fransk grammatikk 2	20	21.04.2020 4t
FRAN122 0	2020 VÅR	ORD H	H	H	Innføring i fransk litteratur	18	Uttak: 04.05.202
FRAN204 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S	S	S	Fordypning i fransk litteratur	2	12.05.2020 4t
FRAN205 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S	S	S	Fordypning i fransk grammatikk o	4	22.05.2020 6t
FRAN254 0	2020 VÅR	ORD OM	OM		Fordypning i fransk litteratur med	3	
FRAN255 0	2020 VÅR	ORD OM	OM		Fordypning i fransk grammatikk o	1	
FRAN255L 0	2020 VÅR	ORD OM	OM		Fordypning i fransk grammatikk o	1	

**FS520.002 : Oppmeldingstall for sted**

Sted: 184.11.20.* Institutt for fremmedspråk med alle grupper

Termin: 2020 - VÅR

Emnekode	Vurd.stat.		Vurd.ordn.	Vurd.form	Emnenavn	Antall meldt	Dato
FRAN308 0	2020 VÅR	ORD O	O	O	Litterært særemne	2	Uttak: 15.04.202
FRAN308L 0	2020 VÅR	ORD O	O	O	Litterært særemne	1	Uttak: 15.04.202
FRAN313 0	2020 VÅR	ORD O	O	O	Fransk språkvitenskap	3	Uttak: 15.05.202
FRAN313L 0	2020 VÅR	ORD O	O	O	Fransk grammatikk	3	Uttak: 15.05.202
FRAN350 0	2020 VÅR	ORD MAO	MAO		Fransk mastergradsoppgave	3	
FRANDI301 0	2020 VÅR	ORD O	O	O	Fagdidaktikk i fransk for integrert	4	Frist innlevering:
FRANDIKU301 0	2020 VÅR	ORD O	O	O	Utdanning, samfunn og digitale te	1	Frist innlevering:
FRANDIKU302 0	2020 VÅR	ORD M	M	M	Utdanning, samfunn og digitale te	1	11.05.2020-15.04
ITAL121 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S	S	S	Italiensk språk 1	14	12.05.2020 4t
ITAL123 0	2020 VÅR	ORD M	M	M	Muntlig italiensk med fonetikk	8	
ITAL125 0	2020 VÅR	ORD H	H	H	Moderne italiensk kortprosa	5	Uttak: 20.04.202
ITAL203 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S	S	S	Italiensk språk og lingvistikk	5	22.05.2020 4t
ITAL250 0	2020 VÅR	ORD OM	OM		Eldre italiensk litteratur	5	
ITAL301 0	2020 VÅR	ORD L	L		Italiensk språkhistorie og språklig	1	
ITAL304 0	2020 VÅR	ORD M	M	M	Italiensk teoriemne	6	25.05.2020
JAP110 0	2020 VÅR	ORD L-1	L	L	Japansk språk 1	34	Frist innlevering:
JAP205 0	2020 VÅR	ORD L	L		Japansk språk 3	27	Frist innlevering:
KIN100 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S	S	S	Kultur, historie og samfunn i Kina	1	04.03.2020 3t
KIN101 0	2020 VÅR	ORD L	L	L	Kinesisk språk 1	40	Frist innlevering:
KIN102 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S2	S	S	Kinesisk språk 2	30	11.05.2020 4t
KIN103 0	2020 VÅR	ORD M2	M	M	Kinesisk språk 3	2	04.03.2020
KIN104 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S2	S	S	Kinesisk språk 4	3	03.03.2020 4t
KIN201 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S1	S	S	Kinesisk språk 5	17	11.05.2020 4t
LITTIF200 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S	S	S	Litteraturteori	24	25.02.2020 2t
RUS100 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S	S	S	Grunnkurs i skriftlig og muntlig ru	3	06.03.2020 4t
RUS120 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S	S	S	Russisk språk I	21	25.05.2020 6t
RUS121 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S	S	S	Russisk historie og kultur	27	13.05.2020 4t
RUS130 0	2020 VÅR	ORD S	S	S	Russisk språk II	2	04.03.2020 4t
RUS240 0	2020 VÅR	ORD SM	SM		Russisk språk og språkvitenskap	8	
RUS251 0	2020 VÅR	ORD O	O	O	Russisk litteratur II	8	Frist innlevering:

**FS520.002 : Oppmeldingstall for sted**

Sted: 184.11.20.* Institutt for fremmedspråk med alle grupper

Termin: 2020 - VÅR

Emnekode		Vurd.stat.	Vurd.ordn.	Vurd.form	Emnenavn	Antall meldt	Dato
RUS301 0	2020 VÅR ORD	S	S	S	Russisk språkhistorie og språkstr	1	06.03.2020 6t
RUS303 0	2020 VÅR ORD	L2	L	L	Særemne i russisk språk-, litterat	2	
RUS306 0	2020 VÅR ORD	H	H	H	Særemne	1	Uttak: 18.05.202
RUS350 0	2020 VÅR ORD	MAO	MAO		Masteroppgave i russisk	1	
SAP100 0	2020 VÅR ORD	R	R	R	Språkstudenter i arbeidspraksis	3	Frist innlevering:
SEK100 0	2020 VÅR ORD	H	H	H	Sammenlignende europeiske kult	2	Uttak: 21.02.202
SLAN614 0	2020 VÅR ORD	L	L	L	Latinamerikansk litteratur (fjernun	10	Frist innlevering:
SPANSK622 0	2020 VÅR ORD	M	M	M	Spansk 2: Spansk språk, kultur og	23	12.05.2020-13.0
SPLA100 0	2020 VÅR ORD	S	S	S	Introduksjon til spansk og latinam	1	06.03.2020 4t
SPLA107 0	2020 VÅR ORD	S	S	S	Spansk grammatikk I	46	13.05.2020 4t
SPLA108 0	2020 VÅR ORD	M	M	M	Latinamerikansk litteratur I	37	05.05.2020-06.0
SPLA109 0	2020 VÅR ORD	S	S	S	Latinamerikansk historie	31	11.05.2020 4t
SPLA207 0	2020 VÅR ORD	OS	OS		Fordypning i spansk grammatikk i	10	
SPLA208 0	2020 VÅR ORD	S	S	S	Fordypning i latinamerikansk litter	12	22.05.2020 4t
SPLA209 0	2020 VÅR ORD	S	S	S	Fordypning i latinamerikansk kult	7	13.05.2020 4t
SPLA257 0	2020 VÅR ORD	OM	OM		Fordypning i spansk grammatikk i	6	
SPLA258 0	2020 VÅR ORD	OM	OM		Fordypning i latinamerikansk litter	2	
SPLA259 0	2020 VÅR ORD	OM	OM		Fordypning i latinamerikansk kult	8	
SPLA311 0	2020 VÅR ORD	O	O	O	Teori og metode i spansk lingvistik	2	Frist innlevering:
SPLA314 0	2020 VÅR ORD	H	H	H	Prosjektdesign og forskningsform	7	Uttak: 16.03.202
SPLA315 0	2020 VÅR ORD	O1	O	O	Spesialisering i latinamerikastudie	7	Frist innlevering:
SPLA350 0	2020 VÅR ORD	MAO	MAO	O	Mastergradsoppgave i spansk og	8	
TYS105 0	2020 VÅR ORD	S	S	S	Grunnemne i tysk språk I	15	13.05.2020 4t
TYS106 0	2020 VÅR ORD	H	H	H	Tyskspråklig kultur og historie	14	Frist innlevering:
TYS107 0	2020 VÅR ORD	L	L	L	Tysk språk og tekstkunnskap	9	Frist innlevering:
TYS116 0	2020 VÅR ORD	HM	HM		Tyskspråklig litteratur	1	
TYS201 0	2020 VÅR ORD	S	S	S	Fordypning i tysk språk	8	22.05.2020 6t
TYS206 0	2020 VÅR ORD	S	S	S	Fordypning i tyskspråkleg litteratu	1	12.05.2020 4t
TYS251 0	2020 VÅR ORD	OM	OM		Fordypning i tysk språk med sem	2	
TYS251L 0	2020 VÅR ORD	OM	OM		Fordypning i tysk språk med sem	1	

**FS520.002 : Oppmeldingstall for sted**

Sted: 184.11.20.* Institutt for fremmedspråk med alle grupper

Termin: 2020 - VÅR

Emnekode	Vurd.stat.		Vurd.ordn.	Vurd.form	Emnenavn	Antall meldt	Dato
TYS256 0	2020 VÅR	ORD OM	OM		Fordypning i tyskspråklig litteratur	6	
TYS308 0	2020 VÅR	ORD HM	HM		Litteratur, interpretasjon og oversettelse	2	
TYS308L 0	2020 VÅR	ORD HM	HM		Litteratur, interpretasjon og oversettelse	4	
TYS311 0	2020 VÅR	ORD HM1	HM		Moderne tysk språk og litteratur	2	
TYS350 0	2020 VÅR	ORD MAO	MAO		Tysk mastergradsoppgave	7	
TYSDI201 0	2020 VÅR	ORD M	M	M	Fagdidaktikk i tysk for lektorutdan	2	
TYSDI301 0	2020 VÅR	ORD O	O	O	Fagdidaktikk i tysk for integrert l	5	

Antall emner : 125

Antall vurd.enheter: 127

Antall meldinger: 1750



Attachment 3 – Admission requirements, MAHF-ENG

In order to apply for the Master's Programme in English, you need a bachelor's degree in English or equivalent. You must hold a minimum of 80 ECTS in the relevant courses, such as English literature, culture or linguistics, or equivalent. **Bachelor degrees from UiB that qualify:**

- Bachelor degree in English

Bachelor degrees that qualify:

- Other bachelor degrees can qualify if you can document 80-100 ECTS in English literature, culture or linguistics, or equivalent.
- Applicants with education from outside of Norway, must have finished a three- or four-year undergraduate (Bachelor's) degree at an approved institution of higher education. The bachelor degree must include a specialization in English equivalent to one and a half years of full-time study.

You also need to document:

- Average grade of minimum C ([equivalent to Norwegian grade C](#))
- [Proficiency in English](#)
- Other language requirements: Please note that admission to the Master's Programme in English requires higher test results than the general requirements for UiB. The language requirements for the Master's Programme in English are:
 - IELTS academic - International English Language Test System
 - Minimum overall band score: 7.5
 - TOEFL - Test of English as a Foreign Language, internet-based test (iBT)
 - Minimum total score: 108 We do not accept TOEFL MyBest Score to meet our English language requirements.
 - PTE Academic - Pearson test of English Academic
 - Minimum overall score: 74



Attachment 4 – Course reports, fall 2019

UiBs kvalitetssystem for utdanning

Egenvurdering på emne- og programnivå

Emnenivå: Fylles ut av emneansvarlig Emne/program	ENG100 Introduction to English Studies
År	Høst 2019
Emneansvarlig/ Programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)	Lene Johannessen
Samlet vurdering av gjennomføringen av emnet/programmet	ENG 100 har fått få timer til at studentene får det utbyttet som loves i emneomtale. Når det er sagt, ble litteraturkomponenten gjennomført tilfredsstillende nok, gitt rammene.
Emne: Er emnet student-evaluert? Hva kom i så fall fram der? Program: Funn i eventuelle programsensorrapporter sist år.	Ja, svært få respondenter men de uttrykker de samme bekymringene som det forelesere gjør.
Var det noe som ikke fungerte godt nok? Er det behov for å foreta justeringer eller sette inn tiltak for å forbedre emnet/programmet? Hvilke?	Opplegget med kun tre forelesninger og tre seminarer per modul (i tillegg til tre digitale forelesninger på litteratur delen) er ikke på langt nær nok til å gi nybegynnere en forståelse for English Studies. Evalueringsformen nå er et slags term paper der de får tilbakemelding på utkast via epost, men dette er svært utilfredsstillende og reflekteres også i studentenes evalueringer og resultater. ENG100 er et emne det med fordel kunne settes inn MA studenter på obligatoriske kollokvie grupper, der forelesninger reduseres slik at seminarer økes, og der evaluering baseres på f eks hjemmeeksamen med muntlig eksaminasjon. Oppmøte bør dessuten være obligatorisk.
Andre kommentarer eller innspill	



Emne/program	ENG100 (Lingvistikk)
År	2019
Emneansvarlig/ Programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)	Raes Calafato
Samlet vurdering av gjennomføringen av emnet/programmet	Jeg kan bare snakke om gjennomføringen av ENG100 og følger at det er godt gjennomført selv om vi kan tettere knytte begge deler (lingvistikk og litteratur) til hverandre for å opprette synergi. For tiden de ser ut som to veldig forskjellige ting.
Emne: Er emnet student- evaluert? Hva kom i så fall fram der? Program: Funn i eventuelle programsensorrappporter sist år.	Ja, det er student-evaluert. Studentene for de meste syntes at kurset i generelt var relevant for deres videre studier og at de gjorde tilstrekkelige framskritt. Flest studenter også syntes at seminarene var spesielt nyttige og praktiske.
Var det noe som ikke fungerte godt nok? Er det behov for å foreta justeringer eller sette inn tiltak for å forbedre emnet/ programmet? Hvilke?	For tiden er det ingen behov for å foreta justeringer. Alt fungerte bra og elevene for de meste interesserte seg for å delta i seminarer og forelesninger. ENG100 virker bra som en innledning til lingvistikk og tjener som et godt grunnlag for videre studier.
Andre kommentarer eller innspill	Finnes ikke.



Emne/program	ENG107
År	Fall 2019
Emneansvarlig/ Programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)	Jerzy Nykiel
Samlet vurdering av gjennomføringen av emnet/programmet	<p>ENG107 is a 5 credit course composed of 12 lectures and 12 seminar sessions. A 13th seminar session was added at the students' request on account of a long gap between the last regular seminar and the exam date. The lectures and seminars were taught by Jerzy Nykiel. There was one seminar group. There were also 12 grammar HelpDesk sessions led by MA student assistant <i>Yulia Hathaway</i>. The course aims to give the students insight into the more advanced structures of the English language, especially in terms of syntax and semantics. It also equips the students with precise linguistic vocabulary as a working tool.</p> <p>The number of registered students was 121. The lectures were attended regularly by ca. 40-50 students and the seminars had similar attendance. Seminar tasks were posted to Mitt UiB ca. 5-6 days before each seminar session. Some of the seminar tasks were online tasks made available to the students through platforms such as socrative.com, menti.com, and kahoot.it. PowerPoint materials were uploaded on Mitt UiB before class. A number of students attended the Grammar HelpDesk sessions where the students obtained instant feedback on their work on the seminar tasks and other grammar tasks. The schedule of the HelpDesk sessions was adjusted to the needs of the students with a greater concentration of the sessions toward the end of the semester. The last sessions were attended by an increased number of students.</p> <p>There were six non-obligatory papers in the course of the semester. The following numbers of students submitted the non-obligatory assignments: paper 1: 48 students; paper 2: 29 students; paper 3: 38 students, paper 4: 38 students; paper 5: 31 students; paper 6: 17 students. All the students received detailed video feedback on their performance on the paper in that every student was sent a link to a personalized video file in which the other MA student assistant Anders Samland talks the student through the paper.</p> <p>88 students took a 3-hour school exam. The results were as follows:</p> <p>A - 10 = 11%</p>



	<p>B - 5 = 6%</p> <p>C - 17 = 19%</p> <p>D - 14 = 16%</p> <p>E - 15 = 17%</p> <p>F - 27 = 30%</p>
<p>Emne: Er emnet student-evaluert? Hva kom i så fall fram der?</p> <p>Program: Funn i eventuelle programsensorrapporter sist år.</p>	<p>Two student evaluations were carried out. Evaluation sheets halfway through the semester were returned by 47 students while an online evaluation at the end of the semester had 24 respondents. Generally the students are very satisfied with the course, including the HelpDesk sessions and the video-feedback on the non-obligatory assignments. The second survey is attached to the report.</p>
<p>Var det noe som ikke fungerte godt nok? Er det behov for å foreta justeringer eller sette inn tiltak for å forbedre emnet/programmet? Hvilke?</p>	
<p>Andre kommentarer eller innspill</p>	<p>It seems that quite a large number of students registered for the course show very little interest in the course-related activities. They are absent from class, do not submit non-obligatory hand-ins, do not make use of Grammar HelpDesk. They do however tend to take the exam. Quite a significant number of blank exam papers and unanswered questions among the failed exams at least points in this direction. Such a conclusion also accounts for the discrepancy between the students' satisfaction with the course expressed in the evaluations and the 30 percent fail rate on the exam.</p>



Emne/program	ENG118 Selected Topics in English Language Structure and Usage (Introduction to Sociolinguistics: Language Variation in Society)
År	2019
Emneansvarlig/ Programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)	Jalaludeen Ibrahim
Samlet vurdering av gjennomføringen av emnet/programmet	<p>ENG118 is a 5 credit course made up of 12 lectures x 2-hr (a total of 24 hours teaching). The course aims to provide the students with the basic knowledge about sociolinguistics, with a focus on language variation and how such variation constructs and is constructed by identity in a given linguistic environment – examples were drawn from different linguistic communities. The course also equips the students with the basic concepts and terminologies required for linguistic description and analysis.</p> <p>The number of registered students was 97. The lectures were attended regularly by 30 – 40 students. There was one non-obligatory task and 27 students submitted their assignments on mitt.uib. All the students who submitted their assignments received feedback on their performance. Many students appreciated the feedback which they considered as a guide for the exam, especially as there was no record of past questions since this was the first time the course was taught. Towards the end of the semester, there was an additional group task and many students participated. The findings of the task were published on mitt.uib.</p> <p>In the first two lectures, some students complained that the amount of texts on the lecture slides was much. By middle of the semester, midterm evaluation was carried out in the form of questionnaire and 21 students replied. From the responses, most of the students appreciated the adjustment in the amount of texts on the lecture slides which they considered as “a massive improvement”. Few students complained that the accent was difficult for them to understand. Throughout the semester, the students were given various opportunities to come for consultations and further explanations during office-hours and sometimes by appointments and some students utilised such opportunities.</p> <p>School Exam</p> <p>66 students took a 3-hour school exam and the results were as follows:</p> <p>A – 04 = 06%</p>



	B – 14 = 21% C – 21 = 32% D – 11 = 17% E – 06 = 09% F – 10 = 15%
Emne: Er emnet student-evaluert? Hva kom i så fall fram der? Program: Funn i eventuelle programsensorrapporter sist år.	Yes. A majority of the students found the curriculum/syllabus and the lectures very helpful and further commented that with the adjustment in the amount of texts on the lecture slides, the presentation of the course was fine. They also regarded the level of difficulty and progression as adequate and relevant to their studies. Few comments disputing this considered the lectures as difficult to follow. A good number of students demanded for more non-obligatory tasks and more practical information about the school exam. Some comments suggested that the class should be supported with seminars. Some students appreciated the opportunities given for consultations and further explanations during office-hours and by appointments.
Var det noe som ikke fungerte godt nok? Er det behov for å foreta justeringer eller sette inn tiltak for å forbedre emnet/programmet? Hvilke?	In the future repeat of the course, more non-obligatory task can be provided and the lecture plan can be restructured. In addition, past exam questions can be shared with the students.
Andre kommentarer eller innspill	Generally, I was satisfied with the course.



Emne/program	ENG119 Utvalt emne i engelsk språkvariasjon
År	Høst 2019
Emneansvarlig/ Programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)	Bente Hannisdal
Samlet vurdering av gjennomføringen av emnet/programmet	Undervisningen innebar forelesninger kombinert med oppgaveløsning. Opplegget fungerte bra, men det var mange studenter som ikke fulgte forelesningene.
Emne: Er emnet student- evaluert? Hva kom i så fall fram der? Program: Funn i eventuelle programsensorrapporter sist år.	Emnet er studentevaluert. Studentene er generelt svært fornøyde med kurset. Noen ønsker enda mer undervisning og flere innleveringer.
Var det noe som ikke fungerte godt nok? Er det behov for å foreta justeringer eller sette inn tiltak for å forbedre emnet/ programmet? Hvilke?	ENG119 bygger på ENG115, og bruker en del termer og konsepter som introduseres der. Det var flere studenter som ikke hadde tatt ENG115, og noen av dem slet med å forstå alle begrepene.
Andre kommentarer eller innspill	



Emne/program ENG122	Introduction to American Literature and Culture
År	Høst 2019
Emneansvarlig/ Programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)	Lene Johannessen
Samlet vurdering av gjennomføringen av emnet/programmet	Emnet er gjennomført så tilfredsstillende som dette kurs- formatet tillater det (se nedenfor).
Emne: Er emnet student- evaluert? Hva kom i så fall fram der? Program: Funn i eventuelle programsensorrapporter sist år.	<p>1. Midtveisevaluering. Studentene er stort sett fornøyd med kurset men peker på mange av de samme utfordringene som forelesere gjør, nemlig for lite tid med tekstomfanget, altså behov for flere seminarer, evt. styrte studiegrupper, samt en annen vurderingsform enn skoleeksamen.</p> <p>2. Sluttevaluering. Her kommer mange av de samme bekymringene tydeligere fram, nemlig for lite tid med tekstomfang og et ønske om flere seminarer, tydeligere sammenheng mellom forelesning og seminar, obligatoriske innleveringer, og en helt annen eksamensform</p>
Var det noe som ikke fungerte godt nok? Er det behov for å foreta justeringer eller sette inn tiltak for å forbedre emnet/ programmet? Hvilke?	ENG122 er med i Redesign planene for ENG BA, og vi forventer å kunne gjøre endringer som vil utbedre i alle fall noen av de mangler nevnt ovenfor. Endret eksamensform er her helt sentralt. Kursets struktur bør også legges om slik at forelesninger og seminarer har tettere dialog. Her er det nærliggende å tenke moduler med evaluering deretter. Kurset er for øvrig jevnt godt besøkt, og har et stort potensiale.
Andre kommentarer eller innspill	



Emne/program	ENG331 Masteremne i engelskspråklig litteratur/kultur I
År	2019
Emneansvarlig/ Programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)	Helle H. Lapeniene
Samlet vurdering av gjennomføringen av emnet/programmet	Undervisningen ble gjennomført over 8 seminarer à 2 timer. Seminarene besto av kort introduksjon av faglærer (av relevant kontekst) og diskusjon i plenum. I begynnelsen også gruppearbeid, som ble avvirket senere etter hvert som deltakelse i plenumsdiskusjonene økte. Studentene skrev en oppsummering av faget for det siste seminarer som de delte muntlig. Pensum besto av primærtekster og korresponderende teoretiske og kritiske tekster. Sammensetningen av pensum fungerte godt, men det burde legges til en mer generell tekst som introduksjon til perioden for det første seminarer, i tillegg til den valgte teksten da studentene manglet bakgrunnskunnskap om perioden.
Emne: Er emnet student-evaluert? Hva kom i så fall fram der? Program: Funn i eventuelle programsensorrapporter sist år.	Ja, men få respondenter. Reflekterer at det var få som møtte opp på flesteparten av seminarer. Tilbakemelding melder om at flere syntes nivået var vanskelig, men at historisk og kulturell kontekst hjalp. Det ble lagt fokus på det i seminarer da dette også var tilbakemelding på midtveis evaluering. Studentene var ikke vant med kunsthistorisk kontekst og det var en ukjent inngangsvinkel. Det kan vurderes å redusere antall primærtekster og jobbe med tekstene over flere seminarer.
Var det noe som ikke fungerte godt nok? Er det behov for å foreta justeringer eller sette inn tiltak for å forbedre emnet/programmet? Hvilke?	Deltakelsen på seminar var veldig ujevn (med unntak av noen studenter) og det går utover både plenumsdiskusjon og planlegging av undervisningen. Det bør være 80% obligatorisk deltagelse på masterseminar da det direkte påvirker hvor mye studentene får ut av å delta samt kontinuitet i undervisningen (særlig med tanke på bruk av begreper og se sammenhenger/variasjoner mellom tekster).
Andre kommentarer eller innspill	



Emne/program	ENG 322 - Transcendentalism
År	2019
Emneansvarlig/ Programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)	Joseph Tabbi
Samlet vurdering av gjennomføringen av emnet/programmet	The informal mid-term evals written by the seven students who completed the course, were generally favorable.
Emne: Er emnet student- evaluert? Hva kom i så fall fram der? Program: Funn i eventuelle programsensorrappporter sist år.	In these comments, I draw on remarks made by students in their course evaluations. Although students had good things to say about the course content, there were complaints about course structure, and midstream changes not signaled in the syllabus.
Var det noe som ikke fungerte godt nok? Er det behov for å foreta justeringer eller sette inn tiltak for å forbedre emnet/ programmet? Hvilke?	<p>The main problem raised by students was insufficient clarity about expectations.</p> <p>The two hour long in-class discussions (led off most days by a formal presentation from one of the students) generated insights that students sensed but had not yet articulated to themselves prior to the class meeting. To encourage this kind of collaborative, close analysis and sharing of insights I asked each student to revise his or her in-class remarks and submit them to me within a week or two of their presentation.</p> <p>This course structure (combining presentations, revisions, and final papers) was the norm for seminars I have led in the USA. As I now read the student evals submitted at the end of the term, I realize that I should have been much more explicit about the course expectations and formats for the presentation and eventual essay. Indeed, in my 337 seminar this semester I will be handing out, on the first day, a version of the above paragraph along with a list of expectations for both the class presentation and the final paper.</p> <p>Another criticism in the course evals – that the works covered did not match the initial course outline – is for me less compelling. One of the essays we read early in the course concerned the work of Bruno Latour. During the seminar discussion, a student mentioned a new book by</p>



	<p>Latour that she happened to have heard about. After looking over this book, I decided to integrate it into the course. I understand now, after speaking with colleagues that the Norwegian system is rather strict and does not allow such substantive changes, so in future I'll be sure to present such recommendations as suggestions, not requirements.</p>
<p>Andre kommentarer eller innspill</p>	<p>Two of the students from my 322 seminar have enrolled this term (2020) in my 327. One of them hesitated because he would need to miss three sessions – due to his practice as a lector student. We should discuss such conflicts between programs that may prevent students in one specialization from exploring another.</p>



Emne/program	ENG332 – Victorian Gothic
År	2019 HØST
Emneansvarlig/ Programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)	Randi Koppen
Samlet vurdering av gjennomføringen av emnet/programmet	<p><u>Påmelding og gjennomføringstall</u> 12 studenter påmeldt, 11 gjennomførte</p> <p><u>Undervisningsdeltakelse</u> 8-12 studenter deltok jevnlig.</p> <p><u>Resultatfordeling</u> Semesteroppgavene holdt jevnt over meget god kvalitet. Dette ser man også av karakterene som ble gitt: 2 A, 7 B, 2 C</p> <p><u>Utfordringer:</u> -Undervisningen gikk over fire uker, med 2x2 undervisningstimer per uke, dvs rask progresjon og til dels for kort tid til forberedelser for studentene. Ikke alle rakk å lese hele pensumteksten til hvert seminar. Studentene hadde også i liten grad tid til å lese tilleggsmateriale/sekundærlitteratur. Det påfølgende arbeidet med semesteroppgaven gav imidlertid anledning til dette. Det var et krav at oppgaven skulle gjøre aktivt bruk av litteraturhistoriske, -teoretiske og -kritiske tekster, og dette fungerte godt i de fleste besvarelsene. -Lektorstudentene hadde begrenset erfaring med litterær analyse og essayskriving, og måtte få noe ekstra veiledning i dette.</p> <p><u>Samlet vurdering:</u> Til tross for utfordringene er jeg i stor grad tilfreds med gjennomføringen av kurset. Studentene var for det meste motiverte, arbeidet godt og responderte på veiledning.</p>
Emne: Er emnet student-evaluert? Hva kom i så fall fram der? Program: Funn i eventuelle programsensorrapporter sist år.	<p>Jeg hadde to samtaler med studentrepresentantene underveis i kurset. De gav nyttig tilbakemelding på opplegget. Tilbakemeldingen var positiv og konstruktiv. Bare tre studenter deltok i den skriftlige sluttevalueringen. Resultatet av denne var positivt.</p>
Var det noe som ikke fungerte godt nok? Er det behov for å foreta justeringer eller sette inn tiltak for å forbedre emnet/	<p>Det er alltid en utfordring å få alle studentene til å delta aktivt i undervisningen. Undervisningsopplegget var lagt opp slik at hvert seminar begynte med en runde der hver student leste opp et avsnitt de hadde skrevet om den</p>



UNIVERSITY OF BERGEN

Department of Foreign Languages

programmet? Hvilke?	aktuelle teksten. Dette fungerte godt, og viste seg å være nyttig for arbeidet med semesteroppgaven. I den øvrige diskusjonen var det ikke like lett å få alle med. Det kunne kanskje rettes på ved hjelp av flere studentpresentasjoner og/eller arbeid med konkrete spørsmål i mindre grupper.
Andre kommentarer eller innspill	



Emne/program	ENG333
År	2019 høst
Emneansvarlig/ Programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)	Sara Spurgeon
Samlet vurdering av gjennomføringen av emnet/programmet	<p>In this class, students developed critical thinking, reading, and writing skills through close examination and analysis of a variety of texts both fiction and non-fiction, including novels, a memoir, short stories, essays, and films, as well as a wide variety of scholarly and theoretical texts engaging with the topics of literary theory, social justice theory, and ecocritical theory.</p>
Emne: Er emnet student- evaluert? Hva kom i så fall fram der?	<p>Students were evaluated on their writing for the school exam over the works of literature and film dealing with the topic of Literature, Social Justice, and Environment. At one point in class, students asked if I would teach a future course focused specifically on oil, oil culture, oil production, and literatures that engage with that.</p>
Program: Funn i eventuelle programsensorrapporter sist år.	<p>Several students have emailed or spoken to me, saying they felt the course went very well, and that they believe they learned a great deal. Some comments from the course evaluation include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• I really enjoyed the course. The texts were really relevant and really interesting to read. Thank you!• It was such an interesting course, and I have learned so much from it! Sara did a great job as our lecturer, I really learned a lot and I felt that she, throughout the course, helped prep us for the exam.• Best subject so far at the University of Bergen!• An exciting topic and a great professor!• Lectures. Sara was very good at explaining at our level and always making the content interesting and relevant.• Interesting scholarly readings and useful lectures + discussion questions• She made a safe learning environment. Whatever answer was given was approved of in one way or another, she tried to pull out what was good. <p>We also switched between professor- and student oriented learning in the seminars.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• She began sessions by summarizing the scholarly readings. Thereafter we saw them in connection with the primary texts that we read. She has immense knowledge about the topic and has an inspiring appearance• Well structured lectures, and relevant critical readings for each text.



<p>Var det noe som ikke fungerte godt nok? Er det behov for å foreta justeringer eller sette inn tiltak for å forbedre emnet/programmet? Hvilke?</p>	<p>I felt there were too many students in the class (28) which made it difficult sometimes to engage in class discussions and activities, such as having students take turns coming to the front of the class and analyzing a scene from one of the films. Just too many students to get through everyone. Students who were teaching students had to miss many classes and were not happy about that, also on the course evaluation a number of students wished for a take home exam. Comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• it was an unfortunate choice to have a school exam in the course as it prevented us students from delving deeper into one of the works/ themes explored during the course• Nothing with the course. I wish we did not have our practice this term, as I would love to spend more time on this subject.• Nothing wrong with the classes, but didn't have as much time as we had our school practice this term.
<p>Andre kommentarer eller innspill</p>	<p>Students seemed very interested in the topic (social justice and the environment) and mentioned several times during the semester that they would also be interested in future classes that were more narrowly focused, such as a class on queer literature and the environment, or native american/indigenous literature and the environment.</p>

Egenvurdering på emne- og programnivå

Emnenivå: Fylles ut av emneansvarlig

Programnivå: Fylles ut av programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)

Emne/program	ENG339/ENG339L Selected topic in English linguistics I: English as a Lingua Franca in the Multilingual World
År	2019
Emneansvarlig/ Programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)	Kaisa Sofia Pietikäinen / (Dagmar Haumann)
Samlet vurdering av gjennomføringen av emnet/programmet	<p>The course was developed by K. Pietikäinen and taught for the first time. The course was aimed both at teacher training students who received 5 cr for the course and attended 6 lectures, and regular master's students who attended 8 lectures and received 10 cr. The assessment was based on a school exam of 3 (339L) or 4 (339) hours.</p> <p>The intended learning outcomes (in addition to those stipulated on the course website by the faculty) were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Upon completion of the course, you will be able to demonstrate familiarity with the most common research domains in ELF and the most current developments in the field concerning e.g., ELF communities, ELF and multilingualism, pragmatic issues such as understanding and misunderstanding in spoken ELF interaction, as well as ELF and English language teaching.• Students taking the full-length course will also gain insights on issues on language identity and ELF, and be able to develop a feasible research plan outlining one or several common research methodologies in ELF. <p>The module was an intensive course lasting for four (339L) or six (339) weeks due to the teacher training students' practical training which commenced right after the first four weeks.</p> <p>The lectures were two hours long and structured thematically:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Introduction to English as a Lingua Franca (ELF)2. Domains of ELF research3. ELF in communities and groupings4. Problems of understanding and their pre-emption5. Multilingualism and ELF6. ELF and English teaching7. ELF and identity8. Research methods in ELF <p>Each lecture contained a section of theoretical background explained by the course instructor as well as different kinds of student activation methods such as pair/group discussions, group presentations, analysis of actual data extracts & discussions of these, and discussions/sharing of further resources for research and teaching (videos, links to corpora and teaching materials,</p>

	<p>reading materials, blogs etc.). Each lecture was also followed by homework in small groups or individually. The homework was either related to the current lecture topic or to the following week's topic, and it aimed at developing the students' academic reading skills, their information seeking and assessment skills as well as their critical thinking skills. The assignments included tasks such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • outlining some major characteristics of ELF in different contexts (from three articles) and then discussing and sharing notes collaboratively at the next lecture – these notes were then included in the slides shared on MittUiB (lecture 3), • collaborative creation of a glossary of terms related to multilingualism on MittUiB (lecture 5), and • comparing and assessing the current and the forthcoming curriculum in English studies (læreplan i engelsk, plan 18/03/2019) from the perspective of ELF (lecture 6). <p>The students seemed to participate in and follow the lectures quite actively, but after the few first homework assignments, their participation in homework activities deteriorated. I was under the impression that the teacher training students' preparation for the practical training created a lot of pressure which resulted in less focus on the course. The regular master's students seemed a little frustrated that they had mostly prepared for the lectures while the teacher training students hadn't, which affected their ability to participate in collaborative activities during the lectures.</p> <p>Concerning the assessment method chosen for the course (school exam), I would have preferred a research proposal and a small-scale empirical assignment or an essay, because these would prepare the students for their MA thesis projects and would therefore be more constructively aligned toward their studies. As this was not possible due to course restrictions, I prepared an exam where the majority of questions related to topics addressed and discussed during class, requiring analytical thinking and a critical approach. The teacher training students could also answer a question where they were to design two ELF-aware tasks for high school level English classes in Norway and discuss the theoretical premises of these tasks and their assessment. The regular master's students, on the other hand, analysed an actual data extract from an interview concerning speaker identities and argued for/against a methodological approach. Considering the development of students' independent learning skills, in the future I would consider allowing the students to use the reading materials or online resources during the exam. Instead of memorizing detailed information, this would simulate the actual work of an academic and allow them to demonstrate their ability to search and evaluate information, combine and critically discuss relevant theories, and practice and demonstrate their academic writing skills.</p>
<p>Emne: Er emnet student-evaluert? Hva kom i så fall fram der?</p>	<p>The student evaluation was completed by 71% of students (17 students out of 24). Approx. 15–20 students actually attended the lectures regularly.</p> <p>According to the evaluation, information about the course was easily available; 78% answered this question positively while 22% answered 'no'. We had some issues with Leganto in the</p>

<p>Program: Funn i eventuelle programsensorrapporter sist år.</p>	<p>beginning: some of the course literature was not available during the first couple of lectures. The majority of the students (83%) agreed, however, that there was sufficient information available about the course.</p> <p>The level of difficulty was assessed as adequate by 65% of the respondents, while 35% said it was too high. A similar tendency is seen in the progression, which was adequate according to 71% of respondents, while 29% said it was too fast. My own reflection is that these answers relate to fact that the course schedule was intensive and there was homework/reading material for every lecture.</p> <p>The question of overlap with other courses was interpreted in different ways (concerning content or schedule), which is revealed in the comments of those three who answered that the course overlapped with other courses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slightly regarding English didactics, however the perspectives/focus differed so it was a welcome overlap. • It definitely overlaps somewhat in terms of topics with "varieties of English", and also "English as a global language". This is an advantage in my opinion, as it gives more nuances to the issues dealt with. • HIDID112 but this was adjusted after several mails from the students of HIDID112 <p>The majority (82%) experienced no overlap, however.</p> <p>Regarding the syllabus of the course, 100% agreed that it was relevant for their overall studies. However, while 59% considered it adequate in relation to the number of credits assigned, 41% thought that there was too much reading for the 339L students taking the 5-credit course, which is reflected in their comments; see e.g. this comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not for the L students only receiving 5 points. The students receiving 10 points do not have a much bigger syllabus but still receive double the credit <p>The great majority (82%) felt that they had achieved the learning outcomes. Of the three students who disagreed, one criticised the teacher training programme on the whole for being too "compressed in time", while the two others mentioned that the learning outcomes were not obvious (despite the fact that they were distributed through MittUiB and Inspira, and explained during the first lecture).</p> <p>The quality of teaching was assessed mostly positively: 59% rated it with 4/5 or 5/5, 24% were neutral, while only three students gave it the rating 2/5. The lectures received mainly positive comments in the open-ended question on what helped the students learn:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good lecturer. If facing difficult learning material, she provided lots of examples to help us learn. Many of the articles was difficult to grasp as they were research articles, but she helped us through them. • Good resources, engaging talk, clearly communicated info • The lectures and homework, which helped gain perspective on our readings. <p>Reading the articles and working with other students were also mentioned as helping the students learn.</p> <p>The students were also asked to rate some of the assignments individually, and although not all the students participated in all the activities, generally the task of analysing a policy document</p>
---	--

	<p>received the highest ratings, and the data workshop and creating a glossary on MittUiB were also rated positively. The students did not, however, report enjoying the mini group presentations in class.</p> <p>All except one of the students assessed that they had attended 75-100% of the lectures while the attendance records of the lecturer show that attendance varied between 15-20 students per lecture except during the two last lectures where attendance was considerably lower. Interestingly, nearly half of the students (47%) claimed that the total workload was not adequate in relation to the credits, while 53% reported that they used only 2 hours per week for independent study – this would equal only 8 hours of independent work during the course for the 339L students, which is drastically lower than the 5 x 27 h of assigned workload for their course. It seems that the students' expectations of how much independent work is expected should be adjusted, or perhaps some of the coursework/reading should be made compulsory. However, 53% were happy with the workload, and 47% claimed to use 5 hours or more per week for independent study.</p> <p>Judging by the open comments for improvement, some students complained of the difficulty and amount of reading materials, while two students mentioned that the questions I asked in class were daunting. One student mentioned criticism toward not having more concrete instructions for exam preparation (as there were no previous exam questions to show) – this matter was also discussed in class. One student also specifically mentioned the small number of contact hours in their feedback: "16 hours for one semester is too little!"</p> <p>Other comments the students left were related to the course content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I thought the inclusion of ELF relative to education was exceptionally interesting and motivating, and also made the topics more grounded in the "real world". • I am happy we were offered a course in ELF, though relative low participation from classmates did not allow for the full potential that this course could have. For example some of the group activities where if only half of the group had read the articles we could not make a great presentation. Overall I enjoyed it and I wish there was more!
<p>Var det noe som ikke fungerte godt nok?</p> <p>Er det behov for å foreta justeringer eller sette inn tiltak for å forbedre emnet/ programmet? Hvilke?</p>	<p>As can be seen from the students' comments, there are some points that could be used to develop the course further:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Overall: The students were hoping for more contact hours, which I think is justified for both student groups and for the course content, or at least the lectures could be distributed more evenly (as the first four lectures were twice a week and thereafter once a week). Perhaps some workshops could be added to allow the students to focus on working on the assignments given in class. - The distribution of content/credits between the 339/339L students: It was stipulated that the regular master's students had only two more lectures than the teacher training students and only one more hour to answer the exam. This made it challenging to develop the course content so that the regular master's students' workload would be twice as much as the 339L students' – especially without any compulsory

	<p>assignments. In the future, I would recommend assessed assignments during the course at least for the 339 students (who gain 10 cr). This would also reduce some pressure from the exam, while the students would gain mid-course feedback that would help them focus on aspects that still need improvement. I would also replace the exam with an essay or a research/teaching plan or at least allow the students to use reading materials in the exam. This would likely result in less focus on “Is this going to be in the exam?” (a regular question I received toward the end of the course) and more focus on deep learning of theoretical knowledge, information seeking and assessment, critical thinking, and academic presentation/writing skills.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Distribution of the curriculum: It was difficult to choose which topics to leave out from the teacher training students’ curriculum – I think that the topic on identity work (lecture 7) would have benefited them in their teaching, while lecture 6 (on teaching) is perhaps less relevant for regular master’s students. It may therefore be justifiable to separate the courses in the future, and have more than 6 lectures for the 339L group. - Amount of reading: It can be considered whether the teacher training students should have fewer reading materials (albeit 350 pages is very a very modest amount in my opinion), or whether in fact they would benefit from clearer instructions from the teaching staff on the number of independent study hours that they should use for reading. Of course, their overall capacity should be taken into consideration when designing their course schedule.
<p>Andre kommentarer eller innspill</p>	<p>Regarding my own teaching, I will make a mental note to remind students recurrently about the independent study expectations for the course. I will also consider whether group presentations to the whole class are a meaningful way to work with Norwegian students, being that some experienced them as uncomfortable. At the same time, I think that university studies provide a rare opportunity to practice presentation skills that the students will need in the future (especially if they aim to become language teachers!), so this dilemma is certainly something that I will reflect upon in the future. I will also try to focus on asking questions that rather relate to the students’ own experiences rather than test their knowledge.</p> <p>Overall, I am very pleased with the feedback, particularly that everyone thought the course to be relevant for their studies, and that 82% felt that they achieved the intended learning outcomes. I enjoyed teaching these students very much and would like to teach the course again.</p>



Emne/program	ENG341 Selected topic in English linguistics II
	Researching Irish English
År	2019
Emneansvarlig/ Programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)	Kevin McCafferty (emneansvarlig)
Samlet vurdering av gjennomføringen av emnet/programmet	<p>The course was taught as a series of 8 x 2-hr lectures/seminars. Following a general introduction, the weekly topics were related to term paper topics chosen by students by the first week of the semester; some time was set aside most weeks to discuss students' progress with the term papers. Students were also obliged to attend a one-hour supervision session on their term papers which took place approx. four weeks before the deadline.</p> <p>This worked fairly well for students who attended classes – problems in accessing, handling and analysing both literature and data were dealt with along the way for these students. However, many of registered students were on the lektor programme and chose this course rather than the one that was scheduled to avoid clashes with their teaching practice. As a result, three students, who were hardly ever present in class and only contacted the teacher once or twice for advice on the term paper, turned up for supervision with only very short, sketchy drafts. These students did not in the end submit papers. The remaining three (two who were present at just about every class, one who attended irregularly) submitted studies that represent in one case an original use of an existing dataset (recordings available in <i>A sound atlas of Irish English</i>, ed. R. Hickey, 2005) or self-compiled datasets gathered from published novels in one case and from online newspaper columns in the other.</p> <p>Of the three who submitted, one received a B and two got Cs.</p>
Emne: Er emnet student- evaluert? Hva kom i så fall fram der?	<p>Ja</p> <p>Lite – kun én student vurderte emnet.</p>



Program: Funn i eventuelle programsensorrapporter sist år.	Nei
<p>Var det noe som ikke fungerte godt nok?</p> <p>Er det behov for å foreta justeringer eller sette inn tiltak for å forbedre emnet/programmet? Hvilke?</p>	<p>The course has been taught before, allowing students to choose between suggested topics, using data from sources that I know but also allowing free choice of topics and datasets. This requires a level of commitment that most of our students are not willing to make; some see the topics as irrelevant to their own interests and potential MA topics, and for some reason it seems to be difficult to impress on them the usefulness of a 'dry run' like this, which provides practice in dealing with real data and other 'transferable skills'.</p> <p>If I teach this course again, I would consider choosing one or two topics at the outset and turning the course into a collaborative research project, which might motivate students to pull their weight to help a joint project along.</p>
Andre kommentarer eller innspill	Lektor students should not be able to register for a course they can't follow due to teaching practice commitments.



Emne/program	ENG343 Masteremne i engelsk lingvistikk III
År	Høst 2019
Emneansvarlig/ Programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)	Bente Hannisdal
Samlet vurdering av gjennomføringen av emnet/programmet	Alt gikk svært bra, bortsett fra at mange L-studenter ikke kunne følge undervisningen pga. praksis.
Emne: Er emnet student- evaluert? Hva kom i så fall fram der? Program: Funn i eventuelle programsensorrapporter sist år.	Emnet er studentevaluert. Studentene er generelt svært fornøyde med kurset, men L-studentene er misfornøyde med at undervisningen overlapper med deres praksisperiode.
Var det noe som ikke fungerte godt nok? Er det behov for å foreta justeringer eller sette inn tiltak for å forbedre emnet/ programmet? Hvilke?	Det er uheldig at undervisningen overlapper med L-studentenes praksisperiode. Praksisperioden bør flyttes.
Andre kommentarer eller innspill	



Emne/program	ENGDI101
År	H2019
Emneansvarlig/ Programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)	Hild Elisabeth Hoff
Samlet vurdering av gjennomføringen av emnet/programmet	<p>Det ble innført 80% oppmøte fra og med dette semesteret, og dette har hatt en god effekt i forhold til å kunne fasilitere diskusjoner under forelesingene. Likevel er det forelesers inntrykk (og det fremkommer også av studentevalueringen) at studentene nedprioriterer emnet til fordel for større emner med flere studiepoeng.</p> <p>Det er noe uheldig at studentene har hatt kun to forelesninger i engelskdidaktikk før kortpraksisperioden i september. De har da et veldig tynt teoretisk grunnlag å jobbe ut i fra. Det kan være et alternativ å legge flere forelesninger før KOPRA-perioden, men i og med at det kun er totalt 6 forelesninger på emnet og eksamen må legges til november (se under), er ikke dette nødvendigvis noen god løsning heller.</p>
Emne: Er emnet student- evaluert? Hva kom i så fall fram der? Program: Funn i eventuelle programsensorrapporter sist år.	<p>Studentene påpeker at det er uheldig at eksamen i emnet er lagt to dager før eksamen i ENG122.</p> <p>Enkelte uttrykker også et ønske om en mer intensiv undervisningsperiode og at eksamen legges til oktober siden det er relativt få forelesninger på kurset. Dette er imidlertid vanskelig å få til pga. at kortpraksis for 5.semesterstudentene (KOPRA103) ikke avsluttes før i slutten av oktober. Denne må være godkjent for at studentene skal kunne gå opp til eksamen i ENG1101.</p>
Var det noe som ikke fungerte godt nok? Er det behov for å foreta justeringer eller sette inn tiltak for å forbedre emnet/ programmet? Hvilke?	<p>Emneplan bør oppdateres slik at det blir tillatt å bruke dictionary på eksamen.</p> <p>Om mulig bør eksamen ikke legges for tett opptil eksamen i andre emner.</p>
Andre kommentarer eller innspill	



Emne/program	ENGDI111
År	2019
Emneansvarlig/ Programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)	Raes Calafato, Irina Tiurikova
Samlet vurdering av gjennomføringen av emnet/programmet	Alt i alt ble kurset godt gjennomført og temaer som ble diskutert i seminarene innholdt mye som studentene kunne bruke på en praktisk måte i deres daglig undervisning.
Emne: Er emnet student- evaluert? Hva kom i så fall fram der? Program: Funn i eventuelle programsensorrappporter sist år.	Studentene mente at kurset var godt organisert og relevant for deres studie selv om de ville at det skulle inneholde flere seminarer. De ville gjerne hatt sjansen til å ha en mer detaljert diskusjon om undervisningsmaterieell som brukes på skolen. They felt that the course literature was very clear, although the ENGDI111 webpage could be better organized to more accurately reflect the course.
Var det noe som ikke fungerte godt nok? Er det behov for å foreta justeringer eller sette inn tiltak for å forbedre emnet/ programmet? Hvilke?	Det var litt vanskelig å ta opp all emnene på en mer omfattende måte fordi vi ikke hadde nok tid til å gjøre dette. By adding an extra seminar to the three seminars + one presentation format, we could better help students prepare for the final exam and also provide them with more detailed feedback regarding any questions they might have about the content covered during the seminars and its implications for their teaching, etc.
Andre kommentarer eller innspill	Next year the course will be taught as ENGDI111 and XXXDI111 (French, Spanish, German), which might help make things clearer with respect to course structure and final exam format.



Emne/program	DIDAENG1
År	Fall 2019
Emneansvarlig/ Programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)	Kim Idar Krogsethagen
Samlet vurdering av gjennomføringen av emnet/programmet	I hovudsak har det gått veldig fint. Studentane har møtt, og vore interesserte, stilt spørsmål og vore svært villige til å delta i diskusjonar.
Emne: Er emnet student- evaluert? Hva kom i så fall fram der? Program: Funn i eventuelle programsensorrappporter sist år.	<p>Etter mitt syn så viser den at studentane har vore veldig nøgde med kurset.</p> <p>Éin student har svart at informasjonen om kurset ikkje har vore lett tilgjengeleg. Dei andre seks respondentane har svar at den har vore lett tilgjengeleg, så det er litt vanskeleg å vite kvifor den eine har svart «nei». Det er mogeleg at det er den same studenten som har etterlyst enkelttekster/-kapittel i «Litteraturkiosken».</p> <p>På spørsmål om «supervision» er det litt sprikande svar. 4 respondentar har svart «not applicable». Grunnen kan vere at dei har svart før individuell rettleiing, medan dei andre har tolka spørsmålet annleis.</p>
Var det noe som ikke fungerte godt nok? Er det behov for å foreta justeringer eller sette inn tiltak for å forbedre emnet/ programmet? Hvilke?	Eg tenkjer at praksis i utgangspunktet kjem litt tidleg med tanke på kor mykje didaktikk dei har hatt på dette tidspunktet. Eg ser samtidig at dette er utfordrande å gjere noko med, av ulike årsakar. Når det er sagt, så har nok innføring av masterkrav gjort at dette er studentar som skjønner kva som krevst, spesielt når det gjeld forståing av det teoretiske. Slik sett vil eg anta at dette nok «bøter på» utfordringa med at praksis kjem såpass raskt. Dette var òg opplevinga mi når eg var på praksisbesøk hos desse studentane.
Andre kommentarer eller innspill	