UNIVERSITETET I BERGEN
Institutt for fremmedspråk (IF)

Fagkoordinatorer
Studentrepresentanter
Studieveiledere

Innkalling og saksliste til møtet i UUI onsdag 14. november 2018

Tid: **12.15 - 14.00**
Sted: **Seminarrom N, Sydneshaugen skole**

Saksliste:

22/18 **Godkjenning av innkalling og saksliste**

23/18 **Godkjenning av referat fra møtet i UUI 5. september 2018** *Vedlegg 1*

24/18 **Orienteringssaker**
1. Endringer på Ex.fac. ved HF
2. Sensorveiledninger høsten 2018
3. Fellesemner for fag ved IF
4. Mentorordning ved UiB fra H-19
5. IF-dagen 2019

25/18 **Programsensorrapporter japansk, arabisk og engelsk lingvistikk** *Vedlegg 2, 3 og 4*

Instituttet har mottatt programsensorrapporter fra programsensor for japansk, arabisk og engelsk lingvistikk. Rapportene har vært behandlet i de respektive programstyrene og legges frem for UUI med fagmiljøets kommentarer.

> **Forslag til vedtak:**
> UUI tar programsensorrapportene og fagmiljøets kommentarer til etterretning og oversender til fakultetet. Studieleder publiserer programsensorrapportene i studiekvalitetsbasen i tråd med instituttets retningslinjer.

26/18 **Studieplanendringer lektorprogrammet**

Det er vedtatt endringer som påvirker studieplanen til lektorprogrammet ved IF (MAHF-LÆFR). Studieplanen vil bli oppdatert i henhold til endringene og gjelder følgende:

1) Tekst og kultur legges ned og fjernes som valgmulighet i førstesemesterstudiet. Språk og Kommunikasjon endrer navn til Språkkunnskap.
2) Engelsk fag I, 6. semester: ENG261 «Semesteroppgåve i engelsk lingvistikk: språkhistorie» går inn som valgfritt emne på 200-nivå i lektorutdanningen. Endring i vurderingsform i ENG223L fra skoleeksamen til veiledet oppgave.

3) Diverse endringer i vurderingsformer i didaktikkemnene som inngår i lektorutdanningen: spansk, tysk, engelsk og fransk.
4) Tysk masternivå: TSAK318 erstattes av UiB-emne i tyskspråklig litteratur

I forslag til opptaksrammer for høsten 2019 er det i tillegg satt av studieplasser til spansk som fag I i MAHF-LÆFR, jf. tidligere sak i UUI.

Forslag til vedtak:
UUI godkjenner endringene i studieplanen for MAHF-LÆFR. Endringene innarbeides i studieplandokumentet for MAHF-LÆFR og saken oversender til fakultetet for endelig vedtak.

27/18 **Forslag til interne retningslinjer for masterkontrakt/veiledningsforhold** *Vedlegg 5*

Det ble tidligere i år oppnevnt en arbeidsgruppe som fikk i oppdrag å utarbeide forslag til interne retningslinjer for veiledningsforholdet på masterprogrammene ved IF. Arbeidsgruppen skulle ta utgangspunkt i dagens masterkontrakt og notat fra diskusjonene på Solstrand-seminaret.

Gruppens anbefalinger er vedlagt og vi ber UUI om innspill til retningslinjene.

Forslag til vedtak:
UUI godkjenner forslag til interne retningslinjer for masterveiledning ved IF og sender saken videre til instituttrådet for endelig vedtak.

28/18 **Henvendelser om praksisopphold ved IF**

Instituttet får i økende grad henvendelser fra internasjonale studenter og andre som ønsker å ha et praksisopphold ved fagene ved IF. Studieadministrasjonen ber om innspill til i hvilken grad fagene ønsker å ta imot personer på praksisopphold, og hvordan vi på en mest mulig hensiktsmessig måte kan håndtere denne typen henvendelser.

Forslag til vedtak:
Studieadministrasjonen tar med seg innspillene fra UUI og innarbeidet dette i våre interne rutiner og standardsvar til personer som henvender seg vedrørende praksisopphold ved IF.

29/18 **Møteplan for våren 2019**

Forslag til møtedatoer for UUI våren 2019 er 6. mars og 5. juni.

Forslag til vedtak:
Møtedatoene for UUI våren 2019 blir 6. mars og 5. juni.

Eventuelt

08.11.18

Synnøve Ones Rosales
undervisningskoordinator   Silje Grønner Stang
                                               studieleder

Referat fra møtet i Utvalget for undervisning og internasjonalisering

Møtedato: onsdag 5. september 2018

Tilstede:

Synnøve Ones Rosales (undervisningskoordinator), Ludmila Ivanova Torlakova (arabisk), Laura Miles (engelsk litteratur), Kevin McCafferty (engelsk lingvistikk) Øyvind Gjerstad (fransk), Marco Gargiulo (italiensk) Benedicte Irgens (japansk*)*, Guowen Shang (kinesisk), Ingunn Lunde (russisk)*,* Jon Askeland (spansk), Birger Solheim (tysk).

Studentrepresentanter: Oda Westad, Maria Alicia Musawu Luabeya og Anders Olderkjær Samland

Fra studieadministrasjonen: Hild Meland Welle, Hanne Svanholm Misje, Anna Polster, Ingvild Nilssen, Gita Pattanaik Rongevær og Silje Grønner Stang

16/18	**Godkjenning av innkalling og saksliste**
	Innkalling og saksliste ble godkjent.
17/18	**Godkjenning av referat fra møte i UUI 6. juni 2018** (sirkulasjon)
	Referat fra UUI 06.06.18 ble endelig godkjent.

18/18   **Orienteringssaker**

1. *Semesterstart H-18*
   Welle meldte at det var rekordstor påmelding til studiestartgruppene i høst. Oppmeldingstallene for høstsemesteret ble lagt frem for UUI i møtet.

2. *Språk- og rekrutteringsarrangement ved IF høsten 2018*
   Instituttet arrangerer språkdag for Nordahl Grieg VGS på den europeiske språkdagen 26. september og vi venter rundt 130 elever. 4. oktober markerer franskfaget 100-års jubileet for fransk-norsk utdanningssamarbeid. I tillegg blir det «Ka vil du bli?»-dager for elever i 9. trinn mot slutten av oktober og fagdag for fremmedspråkslærere 9. november (i samarbeid med fagnettverket i skolen)

3. *Revisjon av Examen Facultatum ved Det humanistiske fakultet*
   Benedicte Irgens, medlem i arbeidsgruppen, orienterte kort om arbeidet så langt. Arbeidsgruppens rapport vil bli klar i høst.

4. *Endringer i universitets- og høyskoleloven*
   Studieleder orienterte om virkningene for eksamensarbeidet ved UiB fra og med høsten 2018, etter endringene i UHL.

5. *Nye rekrutteringstekster til studieprogramsidene*
   Welle orienterte om arbeidet med revisjon av alle studieprogramtekstene på nettsidene ved UIB. Målet er en forbedring av rekrutteringsinformasjonen basert på undersøkelser som er gjort i målgruppene. Masterprogrammene er først ut, deretter øvrige studieprogram. Arbeidet skal etter planen være ferdig i år.

6. *Oppfølging av arbeid med ressursregnskapet*
   Undervisningskoordinator orienterte om arbeidet med ressursregnskapet på hvert av fagene. Det er utarbeidet et ressursoversiktsskjema for hvert av fagene og det vil bli innkalt til møter med fagkoordinatorene i løpet av høsten for å se nærmere på oversiktene og kvalitetssikre tallene.

7. *Prosjekt: Reorganisering av time- og eksamensplanlegging ved HF.*
Studieleder orienterte kort om den nye organiseringen av time- og
eksamensplanleggingen i TP ved fakultetet fra og med i høst.

19/18   Programsensorrapport engelsk

Fagmiljøet i engelsk viste til den skriftlige kommentaren etter behandling i programstyret og hadde
ikke ytterligere kommentarer til rapporten.

Vedtak:
UUI tar programsensorrapportene og fagmiljøets kommentarer til etterretning og
oversender dem til fakultetet. Studieleder publiserer programsensorrapporten i
studiekvalitetsbasen i tråd med instituttets retningslinjer.

20/18   Retningslinjer og frister for studieplansaker ved IF

Undervisningskoordinator gikk gjennom forslaget til retningslinjer og frister og la vekt på at
programstyrene får en enda viktige funksjon enn tidligere. Endring i ressursbruk (nedgang/økning)
skal godkjennes av instituttleder.

Vedtak:
UUI godkjenner retningslinjene og frister for studieplanendringer ved Institutt for
fremmedspråk, gjeldende fra og med høsten 2018.

21/18: Eventuelt: Studiebarometeret 2018.

Undersøkelsen gjennomføres årlig i oktober-november. Resultatene fra undersøkelsen gjøres
tilgjengelige på studiebarometeret.no i begynnelsen av februar hvert påfølgende år. Til nå har kun et
fåtall av studieprogrammene ved IF hatt høy nok svarprosent til at resultat kan vises. De
programmene som har fått positive resultater, som f.eks. engelsk og japansk, blir imidlertid lagt
merke til fra universitetsledelsens side.

Det ble diskutert hvilke tiltak som eventuelt kan settes inn for å øke svarprosenten. Flere av fagene
har hatt god erfaring med å sette av 10-12 minutter av undervisningstiden og be studentene om å
svare mens de er på forelesning eller seminar, eventuelt at studiekonsulenten tar med seg
studentene til et pc-rom (ved mindre grupper). Undersøkelsen kan besvares på både datamaskin,
nettbrett og smarttelefon.

Undervisningskoordinator oppfordrer alle til å sette inn tiltak for å øke svarprosenten i høst.

17.09.18

Synnøve Ones Rosales
undervisningskoordinator   Silje Grønner Stang
                                                              studieleder

NOTAT FRA PROGRAMSTYRE KNYTTET TIL PROGRAMSENSORRAPPORT I **JAP252 ,** SAMT PROGRAMSENSORRAPPORT I **JAPANESE SCRIPT TEACHING** FOR VÅREN 2018

Dato for håndtering i programstyret:

_____24.oktober 2018_____

Kommentarer fra programstyret til rapportene om JAP252 og Japanese Script Teaching:

Programstyret har diskutert programsensorrapportene for våren 2018, og mener de tegner et riktig bilde av emnet JAP252 og «Japanese Script Teaching» på japanskfaget.

Programstyret er enig i anbefalingene gitt av programsensor, og har ellers ingen spesielle merknader til rapportene.

Fagkoordinator: Benedicte Mosby Irgens

Dato: 06.november 2018

REPORT FROM PROGRAMSENSOR

Sachiko Shin Halley

Programsensor for the Bachelor Program in Japanese

Department of Foreign Languages

Faculty of Humanities

For the period 2017-2018

REPORT 8: JAP252 (vår 2018)

This is a report on JAP 252, *Bachelor oppgåve i japansk*, the course offered to students of the Bachelor program of Japanese language.

JAP252 is a course for Bachelor thesis writing. Coming back from their two semester long exchange studies at the universities in Japan, the third year students participate in the course which starts in week 10, and write their Bachelor theses. On completion of this course, the students have also completed their studies for the Bachelor program.

The course contents and teaching

JAP 252 is a 10 week long course, and consists of lectures, individual guidance on thesis writing, and students' presentations.

Before the students begin their exchange studies in Japan, they are instructed by the teacher to find themes for theses during their stay in Japan. The students find their themes based on what they learned from classes at Japanese universities, or from experiences while living in Japan. Some students already focus on what they wish to study in Japan before leaving, and prepare for it.

The students find various themes. Many students choose their themes from contemporary and historical social or political issues, or cultural phenomena which interested them through their studies or experiences in Japan. Fewer students choose the Japanese language for their theme. The theme chosen by each student is assessed by the teacher. The teacher may recommend a change to some other theme if in the teacher's opinion it is impractical to write a thesis on the theme chosen. The students write about the theme they have chosen, or changed to, under the supervision of the teacher. They get guidance about the basic procedure of thesis writing, including stating why the theme has been chosen, what is discussed in the thesis, and documenting sources.

In the pensum list, *Vinduer mot Japan*, is suggested as reference. This is a good introductory text on Japanese language and culture written by several authors, most of whom are academics in Norway. The students also make use of other books and websites related to their own themes.

Following this course, each student writes a thesis, of 10-15 pages, which includes a short summary in the Japanese language.

Evaluation and achievement of the Bachelor Program

Theses submitted by the deadline are evaluated. Grading is by the characters A-F, of which F is fail. Completion of the course gives 10 study points.

According to the teacher, the quality and the level of the theses vary, but very few are evaluated to be F. Some students who did not get very good grades for the earlier courses get good grades for their theses, and vice versa. Some students drop out in their earlier semesters of the Bachelor Program, but students who have completed their exchange studies in Japan rarely drop out afterwards. Every semester before the exchange period, there is usually a student or two who receives an F grade and cannot move forward to the next level. This is a relatively low dropout rate, considering that around half of the first year students drop out by their first or second semester at some other universities' Bachelor Programmes in Japanese language and Japanese studies. It is remarkable that so large a percentage of students achieve the intensive Japanese language learning goals of this Programme.

Comments

The thesis is the final achievement of the students' studies. It is, on the other hand, a task which is different from their other studies in the Bachelor Program, involving analysis and theoretical treatments of issues. Students learn some introductory Japanese history, culture and society in the JAP100 course, but the emphasis is firmly on learning Japanese language up to the intermediate level before beginning their exchange studies in Japan. Students further learn the Japanese language and some other Japan-related subjects, or "Japan Studies", at the universities in Japan. Most students however choose their themes from the fields of "Japan Studies". This might be argued to risk some students writing on themes with limited theoretical knowledge, and the theses thus lacking in depth of discussion.

However, in fact this approach is a principal strength of the course, and a strong advantage for the students. It means that they write their theses building on what they learned at Japanese universities, and/or experiences of living in Japanese society, 'unfiltered' through a preconceived framework.

It is not a good, though it is a frequent, approach for students in Europe and North America to study Japanese culture and society through a prior framework of Western theories, acquired before they personally experience Japan. Many Bachelor-level programs in the Japanese language include teaching "Japan Studies" courses consisting of rather detailed theoretical analyses of the society and

culture, to students who have not yet visited the country. There is a risk in this method that students may acquire artificial theoretical frameworks before going to Japan, and/or before conversing with Japanese people for themselves; and cannot escape from looking at Japan through these theories.

These theories not infrequently appear to the Japanese themselves to be odd, even silly - projections of, and really about, western preoccupations/prejudices/narratives of various kinds rather than the product of a real understanding. We, Japanese, often mention it to each other when we encounter it. At best, much may have to be 'unlearned'. At worst, students may come consistently to misunderstand Japan and the Japanese - the opposite of what is, or should be, an important benefit of learning the Japanese language.

It is therefore a strength that the Bachelor Program in Japanese at the University of Bergen dedicates most teaching hours to advancing the students' Japanese language ability to the highest level practicable; then sends them to Japan; and only after that requires analysis, in the thesis section of the degree. Their Japanese language ability significantly enhances the direct experience of Japanese culture and society they gain from living there. This places them in a much better position to begin to analyse it for themselves, and an important 'reality check' on the validity of theoretical treatments they may at that time, or later, encounter.

It is not necessary for students to produce theses of high theoretic complexity. What is important at Bachelor's level is to learn the techniques of writing academic papers and of sound analysis, including avoiding over-interpretation. Presentations by four students in a class of the JAP252 course which I attended all appeared to have grasped the basic techniques of effective academic writing.

The purpose of teaching Japanese language, culture, and society, is presumably to produce people who understand Japan and the Japanese better, can explain that understanding clearly and effectively, and who can communicate with Japanese people with facility. For these purposes the Bachelor Program at the University of Bergen is more effective than most other programs. I consider the approach of this Bachelor Program to be a model from which programs at other institutions could usefully learn.

REPORT FROM PROGRAMSENSOR

Sachiko Shin Halley

Programsensor for the Bachelor Program in Japanese

Department of Foreign Languages

Faculty of Humanities

For the period of 2017-2018

REPORT 7: The methods of teaching Japanese script

Script teaching in the Japanese language education

This is a report on the methods of teaching Japanese script in the Japanese language Bachelor Program at the University of Bergen (UB).

The writing system of Japanese language consists of three kinds of script: hiragana, katakana and kanji. Understanding their use is one of the hardest tasks of learning this language. Its teaching methods are frequently discussed in the field of Japanese language education.

In this report, the teaching methods at the introductory level at UB are examined.

The method of teaching hiragana and katakana

The phonetic scripts, hiragana and katakana, are introduced in the later part of the JAP100 course. In the seventh week of the course, Japanese phonetics and phonology are introduced, and hiragana and katakana are taught in the following five weeks.

The phonetic script is taught on the basis of the linguistic knowledge of sounds of Japanese. It is an advantage for the students to learn the sounds and the phonetic script continuously as part of the same course. This makes it easier for students to connect the sounds and script. The Roman alphabet is only used when the sounds are explained. It is best not to

rewrite the sounds of each hiragana and katakana directly in the Roman alphabet in order to avoid the risk that the learners' pronunciations are influenced by the sound of the alphabet in their mother tongues, although many textbooks including the first two chapters in *Genki 1* which is used for the JAP110 course do this. When hiragana and katakana are introduced, students who have already learned Japanese sounds without the use of Roman script will be able to read hiragana and katakana without their mother tongues' interference.

In the JAP100 course, the phonetic script teaching is allowed plenty of time, which is good to give a solid basis to the students. For example, one whole class of katakana was dedicated to teaching how to write the students' names in katakana. This is very useful to teach an important function of katakana, which is to write words of foreign origins. Writing their own names in katakana, the students can learn how Japanese write sounds which are not included in Japanese language, for example, "ve" or "ti". The students will also learn Japanese sounds and writing system in contrast those of Norwegian.

It is also good that the students complete learning all hiragana and katakana before they start learning grammar, reading and writing. It is then easier for the students to build up further knowledge.

The method of teaching kanji

It is impractical to teach all kanji characters. What is important in kanji education is, therefore, to give the learners good starting point for their kanji learning so that they can continue to learn kanji by themselves in future. In other words, the students should learn how to learn kanji in the classes.

Kanji is first introduced in the JAP110 course. In the kanji lessons, Powerpoint presentations which show how to read and write each kanji, including the stroke order, are used. To introduce kanji, the teachers explain its imagery and structure so that the students grasp the idea of what kind of script it is. To practice writing kanji, the students are encouraged to use Japanese manuscript paper *(genkou-youshi)* to write kanji, fitting the characters into its square shape in the correct stroke order.

It is particularly important to explain that many complicated kanji consist of simple parts. This is done at this stage. The pensum list of JAP110 includes some dictionaries and kanji learning books. The students learn how to look up kanji dictionaries in the early stage of learning Japanese, and learn about the radicals of kanji in relation with it. Thus kanji teaching in the introductory level lays the basis for the students to analyse the structure of the script so that they can learn kanji by themselves in future, from simple ones to more complicated ones where simple parts are combined.

The students learn quite a lot of kanji in the early stage. In addition to the ones introduced in the textbook, *Genki 1,* some more kanji selected by the teacher focus on the requirements of the Japanese language proficiency test. It is hard work for the teachers and the students to teach and learn all these kanji. Both the teachers and students wish to have more class time for kanji learning.

Comments

The script teaching in this Program has its basis in Japanese linguistics, in particular, phonetics and phonology. The methods used are well structured. Guidelines for further learning are provided at the introductory level. This has the advantage that some frequent problems among Japanese language learners, such as –

-When reading hiragana and katakana, the influence of the pronunciation of the mother tongue never disappears

-Difficulty in writing properly shaped kanji, leading to writing which is very hard to read and sometimes misleading

- Difficulty in remembering kanji.

will rarely be found among the students of this program.

While there are enough class hours for phonetic script teaching, kanji teaching suffers from a shortage of teaching hours. It would be better if a few more hours a week could be provided for teaching kanji, so that both the teachers and the students spend enough time on the subject to establish a solid basis for future learning.

NOTAT FRA PROGRAMSTYRE KNYTTET TIL PROGRAMSENSORRAPPORT I **ARABISK** FOR VÅREN 2017

Dato for håndtering i programstyret:

_____01.november 2018_____

Kommentarer fra programstyret:

Programstyret har diskutert programsensorrapporten for året 2017. Styret har flere merknader til rapporten:

- Rapporten er generelt lite konstruktiv, noe som gjør det vanskelig for fagmiljøet å bruke den som utgangspunkt for forbedringer av undervisningsopplegget på programmet.
- Forslagene som gjelder økt individuell veiledning og mer faglig fordypning, stiller programstyret seg bak. Med dagens ressurssituasjon er det i praksis ikke mulig å gjennomføre noen av de foreslåtte tiltakene uten økt bemanning.
- Styret lurer på om programsensor har manglet informasjon om gradens oppbygging og læringsutbytte, samt det generelle fagtilbudet ved UiB: Det er for eksempel påpekt at studentene mangler tilbud innen midtøstenhistorie og litteratur, mens flere av de anbefalte emnene er tilgjengelige ved AHKR. Dette står også eksplisitt i dagens studieplan, og studentene får anbefalt disse emnene som frie studiepoeng.
- Rapporten oppgir dårlig studentmiljø, mens emneevalueringer viser at dette ikke lenger er tilfelle for 100-nivået i arabisk.
- Til slutt vil programstyret påpeke at rapporten ikke har tatt hensyn til ny struktur som er innført på bachelorprogram i arabisk, der vi har byttet fra flette til blokkundervisning. Programstyret mener at den nye strukturen vil føre til en vesentlig forbedring av undervisningstilbudet på bachelorprogram i arabisk for kullene høsten 2018 og utover.

Fagkoordinator: Ludmila Torlakova

Dato: 01.11.2018

BAHF-ARAB Bachelor Program in Arabic
University of Bergen

Program Evaluation

Report for the year 2017

Elie Wardini
Prof. in Arabic
Department of Asian, Middle Eastern and Turkish Studies
Stockholm University

Appointment

As of letter, dated 13.03.2015, I have been appointed as *programsensor* for ARABISK, for a period of four years, starting from 01.01.2015, ending 31.12.2018.

I have submitted two reports for 2015 in February 2016 and for 2016 in March 2017. This present report will be my last.

The report is structured as follows:

1. Introduction
2. The Programs: Goals and Structure
3. Students
4. Teachers
5. Tutoring
6. Courses
7. Exams
8. Conclusion

The present report is based on:

• *Information available on the program website* (also provided by the department)*:*
- http://www.uib.no/studieprogram/BAHF-ARAB

• *Previous reports for the same program:*
- report by Prof. Wardini 2015
- report by Prof. Wardini 2016

• Exam questions for:
- ARA100 H17
- ARA112 H17
- ARA211 H17
- ARA301 H17

• *Interviews with teaching staff* Feb. 8h 2018:
- Ludmila Ivanova Torlakova, Førsteamanuensis,
- Esmira Nahhri, Førsteamanuensis.
- Mikkel Ekeland Paulsen (did not materialize)

• Interviews on Feb. 8th 2018 with student representatives for (anonymous in this report):
- ARA100/111
- ARA112/113
- ARA115/211
- ARA301

1. Introduction

The present report takes my reports for 2015 and 2016 as a point of departure (both appended to this document). In addition I have read the material available about the program on the department's website (for 2017/2018). I have received exam questions for 4 courses, all for the Fall of 2017. On Feb. 8th 2018, I have interviewed two teachers. A planned interview with the Tutor Mikkel Ekeland Paulsen, (studieveileder) of the department did not materialize. I have also interviewed 5 students. The three reports complement each other. With the exception of personnel change, no changes have been implemented since the first report for 2015.

This report will do two things:
1. Mark any changes (or lack thereof) compared to my reports from 2016 and 2017;
2. Discuss the state of student tutoring (studieveiledning) that the students of Arabic receive at the department.

During my interviews, I have been informed that changes are going to be implemented in the Arabic program, for example that courses on the Master level will be cancelled and that the teaching of Arabic will be more closely integrated with Middle Eastern Studies at the university. I will not in this report anticipate the changes or comment on the information, waiting for the actual implementation of the changes, though one welcomes the closer integration of Arabic with Middle Eastern Studies.

2. The Programs: Goals and Structure

For the year 2017/2018 no changes were introduced into the program compared to the two previous years. My comments for 2015, and thus also for 2016, stand in anticipation of the changes to come.

- The Goals

There have been no changes in 2017/2018 in the stated goals of the Bachelor and Master Arabic programs at UiB compared to the two previous years.

- The Structure

For the school year 2017/2018 no changes have been implemented to the structure of the program. I was informed that changes will brought to the program in the coming years. I will not here anticipate these changes.

3. Students

The inter-personnel conflicts between the teachers, as mentioned in my previous reports, seem to have subsided in 2017. This is good and the students have taken notice. There is some tension between students and teachers. This, it seems to me, to be within the normal relations between teachers and students.

4. Teachers

The present report in no way claims to evaluate the teachers. Neither does the method nor the documentation used in the report allow for such an evaluation. The focus is rather on the interaction between the teachers and the students and the studying/ teaching environment.

      From my interviews with the students and the teachers, as well as the student evaluations three matters are clear:

1) The teachers are highly motivated, highly regarded, and appreciated as individuals.
2) Inter-personnel conflicts have subsided.
3) There is nevertheless some uncertainty among the teachers about the future plans for the form Arabic teaching will take at UiB. At the time of the interviews, it seemed to me that it was unclear who should take the initiative to make the necessary preparations for the changes to come.

5. Tutoring
Students of Arabic at UiB have access to three types of tutoring:
1. Department wide information
2. Information specific to the students of Arabic
3. Individual appointments with teachers.

All three forms of tutoring are important. Not only given the often complicated rules and regulations that govern university studies as well as the opportunities and choices the university offers, but especially when employability is one of the goals of a university education.

Department wide information is necessary to inform the students of general rules and choices. Information specific to students of Arabic is also very important. This is when schedules, course requirements, and anticipated content of the courses would be presented to the students in preparation for the coming term. In my opinion, though, it is the individual tutoring of students that is the most important of all three. University is a daunting place to be for a student at all levels. Challenges need to be met and choices need to be made. Long term planning and a review of the possibilities in the world of research or on the labor market.

1. The students in general expressed content with the tutoring at the department. The department wide information was useful.
2. The teachers informed me that the Arabic specific information sessions (orienteringsmøter) were intermittent. No reasons were provided. The students did not complain.
3. The teachers also informed me that they have regular meeting hours on their schedules and that the students were always welcome. The students were well aware of this possibility and appreciated it.

When pressed, though, neither the teachers nor the students actively made use of the individual tutoring possibilities. One of the questions I asked students in the interviews was: "*What do you want to use your knowledge of Arabic for?*" They all replied they intended to use Arabic in work opportunities. This is really good. But the students were not sure how, and which choices are available to them on a more individual level. Even on an academic level, it seemed that the students saw themselves as just learning Arabic. This is where individual tutoring plays an important role. Students are individually shown support and guided on an academic level. There is no doubt that more active individual tutoring will help motivate students more, raise the academic level and raise the success rate of students taking exams.

6. Courses
No changes have been implemented in the courses. The course literature is more or less the same as for 2016.

7. Exams

I have received the questions to the following exams:

     - ARA100 H17
     - ARA112 H17
     - ARA211 H17
     - ARA301 H17

No noteworthy changes have been implemented in the form or content of exams. My criticism from my last report is still applicable.

8. Conclusion

There are plans to introduce changes to the Arabic program at UiB. In this report, I will not comment on the information I have received on the proposed changes. I will wait till they are implemented. Nevertheless, a meaningful closer coordination between Arabic and Middle Eastern Studies is welcome.

The present report compares the year 2015 with 2016. The report for 2015 is appended to the present one. Very little has changed. This is regrettable. The present report has gone a bit deeper into tutoring. While the structure for tutoring is in place, very little effort is made to actively take advantage of individual tutoring. This is a tool that is worth exploiting.

As a last note in my reports, I will emphasize that UiB has enough students of Arabic. They are motivated and want to make use of this language as a tool in their future employment. UiB has competent teachers of Arabic and a recognized milieux for Middle Eastern Studies. The potential is there. The closer coordination and cooperation between Arabic and Middle Eastern Studies is welcome. Yet, I repeat that in order to achieve a higher standard of teaching/ learning Arabic at UiB, the staff need to discuss and resolve two central and related questions:

• Why should UiB offer Arabic?
• Why should students study Arabic at UiB?

Stockholm, March 3rd, 2018

Elie Wardini

BAHF-ARAB Bachelor Program in Arabic
University of Bergen

Program Evaluation

Report for the year 2016

Elie Wardini
Prof. in Arabic
Department of Asian, Middle Eastern and Turkish Studies
Stockholm University

Appointment

As of letter, dated 13.03.2015, I have been appointed as *programsensor* for ARABISK, for a period of four years, starting from 01.01.2015, ending 31.12.2018.

I have submitted my first report for 2015 in February 2016.

The report is structured as follows:

1. Introduction
2. The Programs: Goals and Structure
3. Students
4. Teachers
5. Tutoring
6. Courses
7. Exams
8. Conclusion

The present report is based on:

• *Information available on the program website* (also provided by the department)*:*
- http://www.uib.no/studieprogram/BAHF-ARAB

• *Previous reports for the same program:*
- reports by Prof. Wardini 2015

• Exam questions for:
- ARA100 H16
- ARA112 H16
- ARA211 H16
- ARA301 H16

• *Exam results* (exam protokoll):
- ARA100 V16
- ARA100 H16
- ARA111 V16
- ARA112 V16
- ARA112 H16
- ARA113 V16
- ARA211 H16
- ARA252 V16
- ARA301 H16
- ARA302 H16
- ARA303 H16
- Master's Thesis H16

• *Interviews with teaching staff* Feb. 9h 2017 (NB: Professorship is vacant):
- Ludmila Ivanova Torlakova, Førsteamanuensis,
- Esmira Nahhri, Førsteamanuensis,
- Frank Weigelt, Førsteamanuensis (temporary)

• Interviews on Feb. 9th 2017 with student representatives for (anonymous in this report):
- ARA100/111
- ARA113
- ARA211/252

1. Introduction

The present report takes my report for 2015 as a point of departure (appended to this document). In addition I have read the material available about the program on the department's website (for 2016/2017). I have received exam questions for 4 courses, and the results (protokoll) for more, all for 2016. On Feb. 9th 2017, I have interviewed three teachers as well as had a short, impromptu interview with the head of the department. I have also interviewed 4 students.

This report will do two things:
1. Mark any changes (or lack thereof) compared to my report from 2016;
2. Discuss the exam questions of the tests that I have been provided with.

During my interviews, I have been informed that changes are going to be implemented in the Arabic program, for example that courses on the Master level are cancelled and that the teaching of Arabic will be more closely integrated with Middle Eastern Studies at the university. I will not in this report anticipate the changes or comment on the information, waiting for the actual implementation of the changes, though one welcomes the closer integration of Arabic with Middle Eastern Studies.

2. The Programs: Goals and Structure

For the year 2016/2017 no changes were introduced into the program. My comments for 2015 stand in anticipation of the changes to come. I will nevertheless reiterate the following:

> There are many reasons for learning languages. Not all require courses at university. If someone were to study Arabic, for example, for primarily communicative purposes, then it would be much more efficient, and probably cheaper, to spend longer periods of time in Arabic speaking countries and taking language courses there. University courses would be an overkill and achieve fewer results. Though important, communication is not and cannot be the only purpose for studying language, especially at university.

> Studying language at university implies much more than communicative skills. A student at university acquires more than just linguistics. University studies in a certain language involve acquiring three types of skills:
> 1) linguistic;
> 2) specialist knowledge of a region (area studies); and
> 3) analytical skills.

> Thus a university education in Arabic is not only important to train students and researchers to be skilled linguists, more importantly for society at large, the university is the ideal place to train students in the combination of deeper knowledge of language, regional expertise and analytical skills.

- The Goals

There have been no changes in 201672017 in the stated goals of the Bachelor and Master Arabic programs at UiB.

- The Structure

For the school year 2016/2017 no changes have been implemented to the structure of the program. I was informed that changes will brought to the program in the coming years. I will not here anticipate these changes.

3. Students

For this section I refer the reader to my report for 2015. My comments for that report are still applicable to 2016.

What is disturbing from my interviews with the students is that inter-personnel conflicts are spilling into the classrooms and among the students. One cannot emphasize enough the detrimental effects of this issue.

4. Teachers

In this section, I repeat what I have said in my previous report:

> The present report in no way claims to evaluate the teachers. Neither does the method nor the documentation used in the report allow for such an evaluation. The focus is rather on the interaction between the teachers and the students and the studying/ teaching environment.
>
> From my interviews with the students and the teachers, as well as the student evaluations two matters are clear:
>
> 1) The teachers are highly motivated, highly regarded, and appreciated as individuals.
> 2) As a team, there seems to be a break down in communication, coordination and planing.
> [...]
> This contrasts with the frustration students have expressed, in the interviews as well as in the student evaluations, towards the lack of coordination, cooperation and planing among the teachers. This is a serious problem.

5. Tutoring

I have not been informed of any changes with regards to tutoring compared to my report of 2016. This will be a matter of focus for the report in 2017.

6. Courses

No changes have been implemented in the courses. The course literature is more or less the same, with slight changes in ARA100.

This gives rise to concern, given the evaluation of 2016. In this report, I will concentrate on the exams, as part of the courses. This is done in the next section.

7. Exams

I have received the questions to the following exams:

- ARA100 H16
- ARA112 H16
- ARA211 H16
- ARA301 H16

All the exams have more or less the exact same structure:
- Translate to Norwegian known Arabic text(s):
  ARA100, ARA112, ARA211, ARA301
- Translate to Norwegian unknown Arabic text(s):
  ARA211, ARA301
- Comprehensions questions concerning a text: (answer questions about understanding the text(s)):
  ARA211
- Add vowels to an unvowelled Arabic text:
  ARA112, ARA301
- Provide the correct morphological form adding the vowels of a word in a certain conjugation:
  ARA100, ARA112
- Exercise in Syntax (verbal nouns and passive, negation, definiteness, nominal sentences, prepositions, numerals):
  ARA100, ARA112
- Translate to Arabic
  ARA100, ARA301
- Insert the correct Arabic word and form in the blanks of an Arabic text:
  ARA100, ARA211, ARA301
- Questions on the Arabic language and History:
  ARA100
- Provide 4 Arabic greeting expressions:
  ARA100

One can argue that exams at university are a necessary evil. There is no general consensus on what constitute the best methods and and strategies to test the skills of students. One could question the very notion that exams indeed do test skills, at least the required skills in students. And yet, no one, or very few, would argue that exams at university need to be eliminated.

Rather, exams should be seen as part and parcel of the whole pedagogical process. A course starts with defining its intent and ends with propelling the students to higher levels. Every part of a course, including the testing process and the exam questions, is part of the learning/ teaching experience as a whole. All aspects of a course should be coordinated and reflect the intention of the course. One could argue in this respect, and at least from a student perspective, that the exam gives indications of what the teachers consider to be the most essential information/ skills to be achieved by taking a certain course. In most universities, including UiB, this is reflected in the course plans which include variants of: *expected outcomes*. These are not measured in points or grades, but in skills/ knowledge acquired as a result of taking a certain course. This is essential.

Therefore, both for the evaluator as for students, previous exam questions give strong indications of the intention of the course. "What will I be tested on", "what will we get on the exam" are very familiar questions to any teacher. The response to these questions is crucial. Previous exams then are a strong tool in this respect.

In my evaluation of the exam questions provided to me for Arabic in H2016, I would conclude that the intent of the courses on all levels is rather very limited. The scope of the questions could be restricted to:

a. Understanding of words and combination of words in Arabic texts,
b. Ability to produce some well written Arabic texts,
c. Have a basic knowledge of Arabic grammar.

Note that I did not use the term "understand" Arabic texts. Texts are more complicated than the combination of words into morphologically correct forms and grammatically correct sentences. Texts are worlds in their own rights, non-literary texts just as much as literary ones. One would expect that studying a language at the university level would enable a student to explore the world(s) of texts. This is not reflected in the exam questions that are under review. To my understanding, this is not reflected in the teaching either. It is definitely not reflected in the course literature that is bare minimum and lacking essential and central works.

1. Even if one were to concentrate on grammar, the questions are always on a basic level, not getting to the point where students would acquire skills in linguistics.
2. The literary and socio-political content and context of the texts are not covered, with the exception of ARA100 with very basic questions on language and history, let alone in a critical manner.
3. The exams do not approach the subject of Arabic at university from an analytical angle.

The argument of limited time and difficulty of teaching Arabic are not to be ignored. While one could argue for the method and structure of the exam questions as described above for the first two terms in the program, there is no reason why these should continue all the way to the later stages of the Bachelor degree and even up to the Master level. Fill in the blanks does not belong at the Master level.

8. Conclusion
There are plans to introduce changes to the Arabic program at UiB. In this report, I will not comment on the information I have received on the proposed changes. I will wait till they are implemented. Nevertheless, a meaningful closer coordination between Arabic and Middle Eastern Studies is welcome.

The present report compares the year 2015 with 2016. The report for 2015 is appended to the present one. Very little has changed. This is regrettable. The present report has gone a bit deeper into the exam questions for 4 courses from H16. These are the exam questions that were presented to me. It is our conclusion that the exam methods, structure and intent should be looked at more carefully and revised.

We believe that in order to achieve a higher standard of teaching/ learning Arabic at UiB, the staff need to discuss and resolve two central and related questions:

• Why should UiB offer Arabic?
• Why should students study Arabic at UiB?

Stockholm, March 24th, 2017

Elie Wardini

BAHF-ARAB Bachelor Program in Arabic
University of Bergen

Program Evaluation

Report for the year 2015
(Addendum: Exams, Feb. 23rd 2016)

Elie Wardini
Prof. in Arabic
Department of Asian, Middle Eastern and Turkish Studies
Stockholm University

Appointment
As of letter, dated 13.03.2015, I have been appointed as *programsensor* for ARABISK, for a period of four years, starting from 01.01.2015, ending 31.12.2018.

The report is structured as follows:
     1. Introduction
     2. The Programs: Goals and Structure
     3. Students
     4. Teachers
     5. Tutoring
     6. Courses
     7. Conclusion

The present report is based on:
• *Information available on the program website* (also provided by the department)*:*
     - http://www.uib.no/studieprogram/BAHF-ARAB

• *Previous reports for the same program:*
     - reports by Prof. Lutz 2014 and 2015

• *Previous report for French (for comparison):*
     - report by Gundersen and Helland 2013

• *Teaching material:*
     - Textbooks
     - Material provided by the teachers

• *Student evaluations:*
     - ARA100 H15 (4 respondents)
     - ARA112 H15 (2 respondents)

• *Exam results:*
     - ARA100 H15
     - ARA112 H15
     - ARA115 H15
     - ARA210 H15
     - ARA301 H15
     - ARA302 H15

• *Interviews with teaching staff* 24-25th Nov. 2015 (NB: Professorship is vacant):
     - Ludmila Ivanova Torlakova, Førsteamanuensis,
     - Pernille Myrvold , Universitetslektor
     - Esmira Nahhri, Førsteamanuensis,
     - Frank Weigelt, PhD student

• Interviews with student representatives for 24-25th Nov. 2015 (anonymous in this report):
     - ARA100
     - ARA112
     - ARA115
     - ARA211
     - ARA301
     - ARA350

1. Introduction

The present report being my first for Arabic at UiB, I will concentrate on issues that, in my opinion, are a priority and the most in need of attention.

I have read two previous reports and all the available documentation. I have also had interviews with students and teachers. One miss, which ones hope to remedy in 2016, is that I have not talked to the leadership at the department.

I have looked at the exam results. These in themselves do not say much. I have not seen the actual exam questions nor sample student responses. I have nonetheless enquired about them in my interviews with the teachers and students. Exams and exam results are important. Nevertheless, I have deemed that there are other matters that are more in need of attention at this point.

Thus the report for 2015 will concentrate on the "*vision*" of the program, i.e. profile and structure of the program, and the "*implementation*" of the program, i.e. the teaching and the content and syllabi of the courses. As can be seen, special mention of tutoring is included, since it is deemed a priority.

2. The Programs: Goals and Structure

There is no doubt that Arabic is an important language, not only due to the sad situation in the Middle East and its implications for the world and Europe more generally, but also for Norway specifically. Arabic is one of the major languages represented by over 300 million speakers. There are great financial and cultural benefits from interaction with the Arabic speaking world. Therefore, it is of utmost importance that many Norwegian students get a chance to learn Arabic.

There are many reasons for learning languages. Not all require courses at university. If someone were to study Arabic, for example, for primarily communicative purposes, then it would be much more efficient, and probably cheaper, to spend longer periods of time in Arabic speaking countries and taking language courses there. University courses would be an overkill and achieve fewer results. Though important, communication is not and cannot be the only purpose for studying language, especially at university.

Studying language at university implies much more than communicative skills. A student at university acquires more than just linguistics. University studies in a certain language involve acquiring three types of skills:
> 1) linguistic;
> 2) specialist knowledge of a region (area studies); and
> 3) analytical skills.

Thus a university education in Arabic is not only important to train students and researchers to be skilled linguists, more importantly for society at large, the university is the ideal place to train students in the combination of deeper knowledge of language, regional expertise and analytical skills.

My evaluation of the program rests on this premise. I have therefore posed the following question: *Do the programs have clear goals and a structure that are aimed at achieving the skills presented above?*

- The Goals

The Bachelor and Master Arabic programs at UiB state the following as their goals:

Bachelor Program
Læringsutbyte
Kandidaten skal ved avslutta program ha følgjande læringsutbyte definert i kunnskapar,
dugleikar/ferdigheiter og generell kompetanse:
Kunnskapar:
Kandidaten
- Har god dugleik i lesing og skriftleg omsetjing
- Er kjend med eit breitt utval av fagprosa og skjønnlitteraturtekstar
- Har grunnleggjande dugleik i lesing og forståing av arabisk pressespråk, til dømes i
  nettaviser
- Har grunnleggjande dugleik i bruk av nokre arabiske ordbøker
- Har god kompetanse i moderne arabisk grammatikk
Dugleikar/ferdigheiter:
Kandidaten
- Har moderate skrive- og taleferdigheiter i lesing og forståing av arabisk pressespråk
- Har lesedugleik i klassisk arabisk
- Har moderat skrive- og taledugleik i moderne standardarabisk
Generell kompetanse:
Kandidaten
- Kan bruke sine kunnskapar om språket på ein kritisk og sjølvstendig måte
- Kan nytta sin kombinasjon av fag i spesialiseringen og frie studiepoeng i vidare utdanning
  eller yrkesplanar
http://www.uib.no/studieprogram/BAHF-ARAB#uib-tabs-laringsutbyte
Jan 25th 2016

Master Program
Presentasjon
Mål og innhald
Mastergraden i arabisk skal gi studentane djupare fagleg og metodisk innsyn, dels gjennom eit
utvida studium av språket og dels gjennom eit djupare studium av eit avgrensa område, der
studentane får rettleiing. Det problemet som masteroppgåva konsentrerer seg om, kan til
dømes vere språkvitskapleg, litteraturvitskapleg, historisk, religionshistorisk,
resepsjonshistorisk, osb. Det kan òg liggja innanfor andre disiplinar som til dømes økonomi,
politikk, jus, utviklingsstudiar, sosionomi, med meir, når studenten kan presentera gode
grunnar for det. I slike høve vil studenten kunna få ein siderettleiar frå eit relevant institutt
eller senter. I oppgåva skal en vise at en har førstehandskjennskap til kjeldematerialet, kritisk
overblikk over tidlegare forsking og evne til å bruke vitskapleg synsmåte og metode.
Opplegget skal både kontrollera og utdjupa dei allmenne språkkunnskapane og teoretiske
kunnskapane som studentane vil trenga for å bruka arabisk som forskingsreiskap. Oppgåva
skal vise at studentane har førstehandskjennskap til kjeldematerialet, kritisk overblikk over
tidlegare forsking og evne til å bruke vitskapleg synsmåte og metode.

http://www.uib.no/studieprogram/MAHF-ARAB
Jan 25th 2016

It is clear that the programs focus essentially on language learning, grammar and to a lesser extent literature. Only exceptionally does the Master program accept themes in other disciplines.

From my interview with students, there is no doubt that their main goal for studying Arabic is to use it at the workplace. A key for job opportunities. Knowledge of Arabic grammar and literature alone, do not prepare students for the needs of society. More on this in section 6. Courses.

- The Structure

I have evaluated the structure of the program based in the available documents, the web-pages mentioned below, as well as my interviews with students and teachers.

Bachelorprogram i arabisk (krav 180 SP)
Studieplan:
http://www.uib.no/studieprogram/BAHF-ARAB/plan
Studiesløp:
http://www.uib.no/studieprogram/BAHF-ARAB (Nov. 10th 2015)

Masterprogram i arabisk (krav 120 SP)
Studieplan:
http://www.uib.no/nb/studieprogram/MAHF-ARAB/plan
Studieløp:
http://www.uib.no/studieprogram/MAHF-ARAB#uib-tabs-construction (Nov. 22nd 2015)

The main feature of the Bachelor programs is that Arabic takes up roughly 15 credits of a total of 30 per term. Half of a student's courses per term over a period of three years. The whole Master program is dedicated to Arabic. The last year of the Master program is dedicated fully to the Master Thesis (60 credits).

On the Bachelor level, only ARA100 (10 credits, thus 1/3 of a term) lays claim to train the students in "cultural", non-linguistic/ literary skills. Otherwise it is up to the student to get this type of knowledge at other departments.

On the Master level, it seems that ARA302, 303 and 304 can offer an opening for cross departmental training. This though, seems to be more the exception than the rule.

Experience and my interviews with the students show that such a structure is rather a hindrance than a help. One could argue that the present structure presents the student with choice and freedom. Yet this freedom and the choices are not always easy to deal with as a student. Nor are they always clear. More on this theme under 3. Students and 5. Tutoring.

The combination of subjects and disciplines in an education is an essential element for broadening the scope and strengthening one's knowledge and analytical skills. So the question is rather of structure and organization as well as course content.

3. Students

Universities have several functions: education, research and outreach to state the more classical ones. The present report is concerned with the education part. In this context, it is necessary to put the students first.

As mentioned above one of the main goals for students to learn Arabic is to gain a special tool in their arsenal when applying for and conducting their work in society.

They want to be able to speak Arabic, use Arabic, understand Arabic, etc. But they also want to apply this knowledge to their concrete work situations.

Thus the frustration is high among the students. The argument is that they study grammar for three years and are still not able to use Arabic in any meaningful way. This is clearly seen in the high degree of dropouts in Arabic. A high degree of dropout is expected when offering courses in Arabic. Many underestimate the amount of effort needed to learn a language as Arabic. Clearly, some of these students would benefit much more from taking evening classes, or traveling to an Arabic speaking country.

Experience shows that, on the other hand, clearer and relevant goals, a balanced structure and well thought through and planned courses, could help the students maintain focus and sustain them through the hardships of learning Arabic, not only on the Bachelor level, but also aiming for a Master degree. Clearly, a strict focus on grammar and literature is not enough to sustain the students through their education. More on this in section 6. Courses.

4. Teachers

The present report in no way claims to evaluate the teachers. Neither does the method nor the documentation used in the report allow for such an evaluation. The focus is rather on the interaction between the teachers and the students and the studying/ teaching environment.

From my interviews with the students and the teachers, as well as the student evaluations two matters are clear:

1) The teachers are highly motivated, highly regarded, and appreciated as individuals.
2) As a team, there seems to be a break down in communication, coordination and planing.

The students have given each teacher individually high marks for their efforts, care and helpfulness as well as their expertise in their field. The teaching profession is very often unforgiving. In our case, the teachers are highly valued by the students.

This contrasts with the frustration students have expressed, in the interviews as well as in the student evaluations, towards the lack of coordination, cooperation and planing among the teachers. This is a serious problem.

5. Tutoring

As mentioned above the structure of the programs, especially the Bachelor program, leave 50% room for students to choose from other relevant disciplines and subjects. While this surely has its benefits, it also has its drawbacks.

Students, even if adults, are not always knowledgeable or do not have the necessary resources to make good, long term choices for their education. From my interviews with the students, it

was clear that they were not sure which combinations were optimal, and in which sequence. It seemed also that there was very little coordination between the relevant departments.

There is clearly a need for focused tutoring (*veiledning*). The students stated that they are generally advised to take courses on the Middle East. Experience shows that this is not enough. Coordination and cooperation can be achieved in different ways. These should be explored. Moreover, tutoring should also be rather concrete and conducted by persons with close knowledge of Arabic and the Middle East as well as the system at UiB.

6. Courses
The discussion here will concentrate on the courses on the Bachelor level. I will discuss the Master level shortly towards the end of this section, since there is at present only one student enrolled.

Among the courses on the Bachelor level ARA100 (10 credits) and ARA115 and ARA252 (15 credits each) stand out.
ARA111, ARA112, ARA113 are all *Grunnkurs i moderne standardarabisk* (I-III; 15 credits each)
ARA211 *Tekststudier i klassisk og moderne standardarabisk* (15 credits).

As stated above, I have not seen the exam questions, nor the student responses. I have nevertheless enquired in my interviews with the students and the teachers about the content of the courses. I have also consulted the syllabi (*pensumlister*).

- The Textbook
The Textbook used is: Schulz, E. *Standard Arabic: An Elementary-Intermediate Course*; current edition as well as E-Book.

The question of textbooks in education is always an issue. No book in itself is perfect.

While many have gone the communicative path, using relevant books, to my knowledge nearly all universities that keep to teaching Arabic at university level, in the spirit mentioned above, use Schulz. The Schulz textbook has its strengths and weaknesses. The alternatives, on the other hand, are few and far between. They too have strengths and weaknesses. At issue here is the way the book is used in the teaching. Following Schulz chapter by chapter, with no complimentary material is hardly optimal. Every textbook needs to be used with deliberate planing and adapted, taking into consideration the circumstances of each teaching milieux. Some parts of Schulz are better than others, so some complementary material is needed. Moreover, the texts of Schulz as well as the exercises are not always good or relevant to students. These may be adjusted, complemented or replaced.

- The Content of the Courses
The syllabi for ARA111-113 contain only one reference: Schulz. A dictionary (Wehr) is only introduced in ARA113.

It is only in ARA211, 5th term, that students read genuine texts. A total of some 30-35 pages distributed as follows: 4 Classical, 18-25? Modern Standard, 11 modern poetry and 5 media, of which only 2 are current.

The content of the courses needs to be reviewed in light of the principles stated above. The syllabus should be complemented with books/ articles on the history and analysis Arabic literary and media prose, as well as relevant theoretical approaches to different types of texts.

The texts should also be more central and relevant in context of the Arabic literary scene as well as the media, the socio-religious-political-etc. landscape.

- The Examination
I have not seen any exam questions nor student responses. I have nevertheless enquired about them from students and the teachers.

The impression I have gotten was that for all the courses (except ARA115 and ARA252), the focus is on grammar, transcription and translation. This including ARA211 and the Master level. While grammar and translation are essential parts of learning any language, unless one wishes to become a linguist they are not an end in themselves. They are essential means to understand the texts. But the aim is to be able to apply analytical principles so the texts get their meaning in their social, religious, political, etc. context. These elements are not only essential for understanding the text, but also to train the students to apply the same analytical principles later in their work.

- ARA100
ARA100 *Innføring i arabisk språk og kultur* (10 credits) seems to be a mixed basket. On the one hand it is the first introduction to Arabic, script and language, and on the other it is the only course in the program dedicated to "Arabic culture". While the language part follows the same pattern as ARA111-113, the culture part does not seem to be thought through well. The syllabus is larger and heavier than nearly any other course in the program. As an example, one could argue that it is somewhat premature to read about Arabic-Norwegian contrastive grammar already the first term, while they are learning the alphabet.

ARA100 could well be reviewed, and here is a clear case where cooperation and coordination with other departments could yield better results.

- ARA115 and ARA252
ARA115 *Innføring i arabisk språkvitenskap og dialektologi* and ARA252 *Arabisk språk og samfunn* (15 credits each) are the only courses where relevant theory is applied to Arabic studies in the program on the Bachelor level.

- Master Level
Having one student on the Master level, makes it difficult to evaluate. The structure of the program seems to allow for both theory and analysis. It also, in principle, also allows for a wider scope of themes than just linguistic and literary.

7. Conclusion
Language is an essential part of society. Ignoring language would be a great loss. But then, language does not exist in a world by itself, disconnected from the people who speak and use it. The relationship between language and society is complex. The study of language and the world that uses it, should then be placed in the relevant theoretical and methodological frameworks. Language can indeed be studied as an end in itself. But the majority of students today study the Arabic language as a tool. Students should be trained to think and write analytically.

Concluding, one would first like to stress the necessity of filling the vacant professor position. Then, one would draw attention to the goals of the programs in Arabic as well as their structure. Students need help to navigate the complicated freedom and choices they have to make in their education. Teachers should work as a team as well as cooperate and coordinate

more with other departments. The content of the courses needs to be more relevant. The Arabic milieux at UiB could do well to consult with other comparable universities to exchange ideas on how to solve many of the issues touched upon.

Bergen seems to have enough students wanting to study Arabic. Norwegian society has a clear need for people who not only master Arabic, but who also have a solid expertise on the Middle East. The motivation is there. UiB has the resources, both in Arabic and Middle Eastern studies to fulfill a good portion of this need.

Stockholm, February 5th 2016

Elie Wardini

8. Exams (addendum)

On the 15th of February 2016 I received copies of 6 exam questions for 6 courses. These are:

ARA100 - 3rd December 2015
ARA111 - 27th May 2015
ARA112 - 18th February 2015
ARA113 - 27th May 2015
ARA 211 - 3rd December 2015
ARA 301 - 3rd December 2015

In the report I came to the conclusion, based on my interviews with the students and teachers that "[t]he impression I have gotten was that for all the courses (except ARA115 and ARA252), the focus is on grammar, transcription and translation. This including ARA211 and the Master level."

Now that I have seen the exam questions, my impression was confirmed. The exams mentioned above, for ARA100 and ARA301 see below, focus on translation from and to Arabic and grammar: parsing, vocalization, conjugation, etc., words in their right context.

Concerning ARA100, I wrote in the report:

ARA100 *Innføring i arabisk språk og kultur* (10 credits) seems to be a mixed basket. On the one hand it is the first introduction to Arabic, script and language, and on the other it is the only course in the program dedicated to "Arabic culture". While the language part follows the same pattern as ARA111-113, the culture part does not seem to be thought through well. The syllabus is larger and heavier than nearly any other course in the program.

ARA100 is the only course that includes "*Realia - kultur og samfunn*" questions. These are:
1. Give the names of five most important regional Arabic dialects (5/100p);
2. Give the correct name of the country or the capital of 8 countries (4/100p);
3. Give the Norwegian title and date of publication, the name and country of origin of the author, as well as the name of the translator to Norwegian of the chosen novel (3/100p).

My conclusions concerning ARA100 still hold:

ARA100 could well be reviewed [...]

ARA301, on the Master level follows exactly the same pattern.

My comments concerning the courses and their content still hold. These are clearly reflected in the exam questions. While one could argue for such an approach for ARA100-113, all exams even those on higher levels lack any questions involving critical and analytical discussions of the content of the texts read.

Stockholm, February 23rd 2016

Elie Wardini

Comment on
Report from *programsensor* for linguistics at the University of Bergen, May 2018

I note the following recommendations made in the report relating to ENG223/223L/263:

1. Make attendance compulsory for all courses above the 100 level.

2. Make qualifying assignments obligatory, so the students get some practice (1) expressing themselves in academic English, and (2) solving relevant exercises, before the exam. Qualifying tests have reduced the number of F's in the exams at the University of Oslo, in all our courses.

3. Make the course titles and aims identical for ENG223, ENG223L and ENG263 in (1) the online course descriptions and (2) the handouts distributed in class.

4. Solve the problem of trying to teach a 10-credit course (ENG223/ENG263) and a 5-credit course (ENG223L) simultaneously.

My responses to these points are:

1. I can see the point of making attendance compulsory and would personally welcome it. However, this should ideally be done as part of a wider move towards compulsory attendance at all courses at the Department of Foreign Languages, or even the Faculty of Humanities as a whole.

2. Obligatory qualifying assignments is a good idea. Ideally, students should write and receive feedback on their writing in all courses. This is time-consuming, however, and obviously requires teaching resources.

    At the end of 2017, English linguistics at IF lost one member of staff (Karol Janicki) to retirement, and there seems to be little prospect of that post being filled soon. Some of the remaining members of staff in English linguistics already have large amounts of 'overtime' on their teaching and administration accounts. This shows that, in the five years since IF wiped out accrued overtime in 2013, the department has simply continued the practice of relying on using large amounts of research time to cover teaching. The need to do so is an indication that English linguistics has been understaffed even with six members, and this is further underscored by the fact that even relatively new staff have accumulated large research time deficits in just a few years. This understaffing/overteaching undoubtedly contributes to the decline in research production at the department and the faculty as a whole.

    It is impossible to include obligatory writing assignments in these courses without a considerable expansion of teaching resources beyond those currently available to us, i.e. not only filling the existing vacancy in English linguistics, but also avoiding further attrition and acquiring new positions.

    (The department might also consider streamlining administration to reduce the amount of time used on management and coordination at various levels, board and committee meetings, and administrative tasks like multiple rounds of reading, writing and replying to evaluations and reports, etc.)

3. This is an administrative task: the ENG223 description can be pasted into the pages for 223L nd 263, with necessary adjustments regarding credits, course requirements, exam types, etc.

4. If only… It is some ten years since the staff in English linguistics and literature/culture unanimously signed a letter asking IF and those responsible for *Lektorutdanningen* at the Faculty of Psychology to adjust this integrated programme so that we might avoid having to offer amputated versions of literature/culture and linguistics courses to students on the teacher training

programme. To date, there has been no serious attempt to amend the structures that make it necessary to teach five- and 10-point versions of some courses. I note, however, rumours that those preparing the latest revision of the *Lektorutdanning* may be considering models that would in effect go some way towards doing what we were requesting in 2008 by organising the programme in a way that takes account of the needs of the other disciplines. This will be a welcome development.

Bergen, 13.09.2018

Kevin McCafferty

Report from *programsensor* for linguistics at the University of Bergen
May 2018

Programsensor: Gjertrud Flermoen Stenbrenden, Associate Professor of English Language, University of Oslo
Courses evaluated: ENG221/ENG261, ENG223/ENG223L/ENG263
Scope of evaluation: spring semester of 2017

1. Introduction
I received the documents pertaining to the courses evaluated in April 2018. The documents submitted for each course were: online and written course descriptions, the exam questions, the course report written by the teachers, and the student evaluations.

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). I will treat ENG221 and ENG261 together, and ENG223, ENG223L and ENG263 together.

2. ENG221 and ENG261 History of English
These courses are 200-level courses in the history of the English language; they are essentially the same courses, with the same teacher resources and lectures, but with different final exams. ENG261 seems to be chosen by those who need to write a term paper, which is a requirement for a BA degree ("Semesteroppgåva fyller kravet til det sjølvstendige arbeidet som skal gå inn i ein bachelorgrad", accprdomg tp the online course description).

The courses aim to provide students with an introduction to the history and changes which have affected the English language, from the Old English to (and including) the early Modern English periods, on various linguistic levels – phonology, morphology, syntax, lexicon, orthography. The skills acquired are identical to those formulated for most courses in English, i.e., that the students are able to analyse linguistic material using the appropriate terminology, but from a historical perspective. Additionally, the students will of course have gained knowledge of the three major historical periods/stages of English.

Course description, syllabus, structure, teaching and special circumstances
The textbook is Barber, Beal & Shaw 2009, and the pensum consists of extracts from this textbook, as well as a short compendium on historical phonology (Rydland 2016) and some primary texts.

Instruction is given in the form of lectures and seminars, up to 24 hours over 12 weeks. Attendance seems to be optional. There are no obligatory assignments, but the students are given the opportunity to hand in papers and are recommended to do so. The final assessment is a four-hour written school exam for ENG221, and a term paper in combination with an oral exam for ENG261.

Assessment
The course descriptions are clearly formulated and precise. The pensum is well-chosen, and there are no negative comments on the students' part that suggest it is too difficult, though the courses themselves are deemed to be a bit challenging.

In the spring semester of 2017, instruction was given as a mix of lectures and seminars, over 12 weeks. The course report written by the teacher is very good and comprehensive and points to the familiar difficulties of teaching the history of the English language, and of student attendance and commitment. The students clearly want seminars rather than lectures, according to the student evaluation, but it should be kept in mind that some topics must be taught as lectures, so the teacher's decision to have lectures mixed with seminars seems wise. The quality of the instruction appears to be excellent, as the students' comments strongly indicate.

The students were indeed given the opportunity to hand in written work, but only about half the students chose to make use of this offer, according to the teacher's report. I strongly recommend that the qualifying paper be made obligatory, as it gives students the opportunity to practise expressing themselves in proper academic English, cf. the explicit goal of the course, as formulated in the course description regarding "general competence". I also recommend that attendance be made compulsory.

The choice of a school exam as the final assessment seems natural for ENG221, as the course covers a range of topics. The amount of work required (in the spring of 2017) was quite comprehensive, but not overly so, for four hours, and the various tasks tested a range of relevant topics. 34 students sat the final written exam, so there was a pre-exam drop-out rate of *c*. 31% (49 students registered for the course). Of those who sat the final exam, 10% failed, 33.4% received an E or a D, 25 % got a C, whereas 29.2% and 12.5% were awarded with a B and an A, respectively. A failure rate of 10% is quite normal, and the teacher thinks that the relatively high number of students who received an A or a B may be attributed to the fact that a number of students were consistent in attending and participating actively in class. Five students chose ENG261 and wrote a term paper, and they received the grades B, C, and D.

The teacher's practice of providing students with a list of suggested topics for the term paper is sound; I do that myself for my course in the history of the English language at the University of Oslo.

In sum, ENG221 and ENG261 appear to work well in terms of the topics covered, teaching, syllabus and exams. I do, however, recommend that both attendance and submission of written work be made obligatory.

3. ENG223/ENG223L/ENG263 Modern English Linguistics

According to the online course descriptions in Norwegian, these courses aim to give students insights into central topics in modern English linguistics and to introduce the students to linguistic theories and/or methods which may be used to describe modern English (my translation from Norwegian). Upon completing the course, students should have gained a critical and independent attitude towards linguistics problems and be able to express themselves in correct academic English.

However, the title of the courses online and the title given in the written handout (probably distributed in class) are very different; the latter has "Studying twentieth-century English" as its title, not "Modern English Linguistics", and the course aims are radically different from those specified online. In the written handout, the course is said to be "an introduction to corpus approaches to the study of the English language in use"; variation, change and the corpus method are highlighted.

Course description, syllabus, structure, teaching and special circumstances
ENG223 and ENG263 give 10 credits; ENG223L (for students at the *Lektorprogrammet* only) gives 5 credits. The reading list was identical for the three courses at the outset, but as a result of student complaints, the pensum was reduced for ENG223L.

The instruction is given in the form of seminars, up to 24 hours in total, over 12 weeks, according to the course description. In the course report for the spring semester of 2017, it is specified that instruction was given as 10 x 2 hours of lectures, and 2 x 2 hours of *dugnad*, which involved the students more actively in studying grammatical features of the texts in the CORIECOR corpus and in extracting and analysing corpus material. The students were given the opportunity to hand in a written paper, but there are no qualifying obligatory assignments for ENG223 or ENG223L. For ENG263, the students are required to receive supervision and feedback on a draft of their term paper (2 sessions).

The textbooks are Lindquist 2009 and Mair 2006. The final assessments are school exams of 4 and 3 hours respectively for ENG223 and ENG223L, and a term paper combined with an oral exam for ENG263.

Assessment
Both the online course descriptions and the description in the written handout are precise, and the learning outcomes are formulated clearly, but they should be identical. The fact that there are three course codes may be confusing, as pointed out by the teacher in the course report.

The textbooks seem well-chosen, and the students do not seem to have found them difficult. The teacher laments the fact that the *Lektorprogram* students lacked academic curiosity and complained that the reading list was the same for them as for ENG223 and ENG263. It is easy

to agree, but at the same time, ENG233L gives only 5 credits, so having a reduced reading list would be perfectly normal.

The teaching seems to have been of high quality. The teacher is reasonably content with the course, but states that the students were passive and more interested in the questions of the final assessment than in learning something new. The *dugnad* seminars worked surprisingly well and the students are reported to have provided good solutions to their team projects. I take this as an indication that a course of this kind probably works better taught as seminars than as lectures, i.e. with a lot of time spent on hands-on problem-solving and practical exercises. The student answers in the evaluation support this. It is difficult to find a balance between theory and practice in this type of course, especially when the students are so diverse and have very different objectives with their studies.

The choice of traditional school exams for ENG223 and ENG223L seems natural, given the nature and level of the course. The questions posed are good and do indeed test the contents of the course; i.e., the pass marks A-E reflect the extent to which the learning outcomes have been achieved. The students have no complaints about the length of the exams, but the teacher notes that a 2-hour exam would be sufficient for the ENG223L students. It is unclear whether any students sat the final exam for ENG263.

The grades obtained in the spring semester of 2017 are fairly normally distributed, at least for ENG223. 16 students sat the final ENG223 exam, with the following marks: A 7%, B 25%, C 12%, D 30%, E 7%, F 19%. 13 students sat the final ENG223L exam, with the following marks: B 8%, C 46%, D 31%, F 15%. The marks are thus considerably lower for ENG223L, which may be linked to the students' lack of enthusiasm for the course (cf. the student evaluation and the teacher's report). As the teacher points out, the students seem to be unaware that knowledge of linguistics and English language constitutes one of the pillars of their education and is going to be crucial in their work as teachers. This might be pointed out to them at the beginning of the course: knowledge *of* English and knowledge of *how* to teach it are both required in a good teacher.

Otherwise, the teacher expresses some frustration at the number of course codes and the fact that he has to upload course materials in three different places. I recommend that his request to link the course codes be followed up.

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 sets of courses evaluated here seem to have worked satisfactorily, both at their intended level and as part of the totality of courses taught on English language and linguistics. Challenges with the ENG221/ENG261 courses are related to the general difficulty of the subject matter; in other words, there is a lot to learn, there are many dates to remember, some of the topics are difficult, etc. The challenges faced by the ENG223/ENG223L/ENG263 courses are of a different nature: Trying to amalgamate three different courses and giving the students of these courses identical instruction is a considerable problem, for both the teacher and the students. The teacher suggests as a solution that in the future, students of ENG223L may have to attend only the first 5-6 lectures. But even this is not unproblematic, even if it is possible: A course normally has natural progression, and later lectures build on earlier lectures, or topics are treated more than once, more superficially at first, then in-depth, etc. Attending the first 5-6 lectures out of a series of 12 would not necessarily solve the issue, as the students might miss out on crucial information. Perhaps the solution is to make ENG223L a 10-credit course as well? The teachers show a very high awareness of the challenges and weaknesses of their courses, so I am convinced they will address the problems on their own accord.

I have a few suggestions for improvement:

- Make attendance compulsory for all courses above the 100 level.
- Make qualifying assignments obligatory, so the students get some practice (1) expressing themselves in academic English, and (2) solving relevant exercises, *before* the exam. Qualifying tests have reduced the number of F's in the exams at the University of Osly, in all our courses.
- Make the course titles and aims identical for ENG223, ENG223L and ENG263 in (1) the online course descriptions and (2) the handouts distributed in class.
- Solve the problem of trying to teach a 10-credit course (ENG223/ENG263) and a 5-credit course (ENG223L) simultaneously.

Oslo, 28 May 2018

Sincerely,

[sign.]
Gjertrud Flermoen Stenbrenden

Interne retningslinjer for masterveiledning

Hva inngår i en veileders oppgaver?

- ha en samtale på et tidlig tidspunkt der forventninger blir avklart
- signere veilederkontrakt, forsikre seg om at studenten kjenner innholdet i den og få ham/henne raskt i gang med masteroppgaven
- lage en tidsplan sammen med studenten, gjerne med datoer og flere delmål
- stille presis og godt forberedt til veiledningen
- sørge for at det blir gjort tydelige avtaler og at disse følges opp av begge parter
- bistå studenten i valg av tema, formulering av problemstilling(er) og utforming av prosjektskisse
- gi råd om mulige kilder, metoder og teoretiske innfallsvinkler i en tidlig fase av arbeidet
- sette i gang prosesser som fremmer skrivingen, f.eks. gjennom samarbeid med andre veiledere om interne eller tverrfaglig oppgaveseminarer
- la studentens tekst danne utgangspunkt for veiledning knyttet til oppgavens innhold og struktur og, særlig i begynnelsen, også stil og språklig utforming
- sørge for raske og tydelige tilbakemeldinger, først og fremst skriftlig i form av kommentarer i/til teksten, men også gjennom jevnlige veiledningssamtaler
- stille krav og lose studenten gjennom prosessen, men ikke ta over styringen
- være ekstra tilgjengelig i innspurten

Hva er *ikke* veileders oppgaver?

- tenke *for* studenten – tenk heller *sammen med* studenten
- skrive for studenten
- levere studenten en ferdig utarbeidet liste med faglitteratur
- korrekturlese teksten

Hvordan er god veiledning?

- dialogisk, lyttende, åpen og engasjert
- bygget på gjensidig tillit
- kunnskapsrik, tydelig, strukturert
- løsningsorientert
- egnet til å gi studenten oversikt over emnet som er tema for oppgaven
- en møteplass der man kan diskutere alle sider av masteroppgaven, reflektere over skriveprosessen, og studenten kan få hjelp til å avklare problematiske aspekter ved arbeidet sitt

Hvilke utfordringer kan man møte på som veileder? Hvordan kan utfordringene løses?

- student og veileder greier ikke å samarbeide → studenten tildeles en ny veileder
- avtaler blir ikke overholdt, eller endres i siste øyeblikk → studenten oppfordres til å endre framferd, eventuelt kan kontrakten oppheves
- konkrete råd om oppgaven/teksten blir ikke fulgt opp → studenten gjøres oppmerksom på at oppgaven trolig ikke har godt av at råd ikke følges opp
- studenten mener veiledning er unødvendig og vil kjøre sitt eget løp → studenten gjøres oppmerksom på at veiledning er obligatorisk

- studenten har ikke-faglige problemer som veileder ikke er kvalifisert til å løse → henvise studenten til studieveileder som kan veilede videre (til studentprest, psykolog)

Andre tips
- ha en samtale der det legges premisser for veiledningsforholdet og -prosessen *før* man går i gang, bli enige om ansvarsfordeling og tidsfrister, avklar hvilken type veiledning studenten mener gir størst utbytte og bli enige om eventuelle grenser for involvering/inngripen i skriveprosessen fra veileders side
- både student og veileder bør notere hva som har vært diskutert i veiledningen, og studenten kan i tillegg føre «fredagslogg»: Hva har blitt gjort og hva skal gjøres?
- oppfordre studentene til kollokvieaktivitet (lese- og skrivegrupper) der de kan lese hverandres tekster og gi tilbakemeldinger til hverandre (i studentregi eller under ledelse av undervisningsassistenter)
- oppfordre studentene til å organisere møter for å snakke med «likesinnede» (en medstudent, en tidligere masterstudent, en Ph.d.-student, en undervisningsassistent) om skriveprosessen
- veileder kan innhente gode råd fra erfarne veiledere for studenter som skriver henholdsvis litterære, språkvitenskapelige og didaktiske masteroppgaver
- oppfordre til å bruke fagreferentene ved UB
- gi studenten opplevelsen av å være forsker og dele egne erfaringer om det å være forsker.
- være villig til å veilede om emner man ikke er ekspert på

Hva er instituttets ansvar?
- følge opp signering av veiledningskontrakt tidlig i prosessen
- bidra til at alle parter raskt blir opplyst om eventuelle endringer i kontraktsforholdet, for eksempel ved sykmelding
- gi god informasjon om kontrakten og ta tak i eventuell manglende oppfølging av den fra studentens eller veileders side
- sørge for at det oppnevnes ny veileder om nødvendig