

Egenvurdering på emne- og programnivå

Emnenivå: Fylles ut av emneansvarlig

Programnivå: Fylles ut av programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)

Emne/program	SAS2A (Scandinavian literature – 19th century- Scandinavian area studies)
År	Høst 2024
Emneansvarlig/ Programstyreleder (fagkoordinator)	Anders M. Gullestad
Samlet vurdering av gjennomføringen av emnet/programmet	Emnet var vellykket. 22 av 26 oppmeldte studenter gjennomførte eksamen.
Emne: Er emnet student- evaluert? Hva kom i så fall fram der? Program: Funn i eventuelle programsensorrappporter sist år.	Ja. Evalueringene viste at studentene stort sett var svært fornøyde. Dette samsvarte med mitt eget inntrykk.
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?	Studentevalueringene avdekket et forbedringspotensial på enkelte mindre områder. Dette vil bli grepet fatt i ved planlegging og gjennomføring av emnet i fremtiden.
Andre kommentarer eller innspill	Nei

Evaluation report: 2024, Fall

Course code and name: SAS2A (Scandinavian Literature - 19th Century - Scandinavian Area Studies)

About the course:

The course, which is worth 15 ECTS credits, deals with 19th century Scandinavian literature, with a special focus on the period 1870-1900. It is intended for foreign exchange students at the undergraduate level (however, this semester there were a few MA-students, as well). All texts are read in English translation and the course is taught in English. The course consisted of two two-hour lectures and seven three-hour lectures, which were divided between me, as primary course coordinator, and two other lecturers. Ahead of most of the lectures, preparation questions were sent to the students, so that they knew what to focus on in their readings.

This fall, 26 students were enrolled in the course, which is a new record for the class. As is usual for the SAS courses, with students coming from all over the world, the student group was quite homogenous, both in terms of language skills and scholarly background. Whereas several of the students were either native English speakers or nearly fluent, others were at a lower level. In addition, while several students were working on a BA or MA degree in Scandinavian studies or comparative literature, others had their backgrounds from very different fields, often from outside the humanities.

While attendance is not mandatory, most of the students have been following the lectures regularly. In addition, some of the students were also quite active and willing to discuss the literary texts in class. While this was great, there were – as always – also students that were afraid or unwilling to speak in public. Since most of the lectures were three hours, this meant that there was enough time for the students to regularly work together in smaller groups, prior to discussing the questions together in class. My impression is that this helped at least some of those that would otherwise have remained silent to take part in the discussions. Also, it helped ensure that the students did not lose concentration during the three-hour sessions.

Of the 26 enrolled students, 22 completed the oral exam. Overall, the results were really good: This semester, 7 students received an A, 7 a B, 6 a C, 2 a D.

How the course was evaluated:

During the last lecture, an evaluation form was handed out in class. All 18 students present filled out the forms. The evaluations were anonymous.

Course coordinator's comments:

For the most part, the submitted evaluation forms gave the impression that the students were quite happy with SAS2A: Four students answered that they were “very satisfied”, 11 that they were “satisfied”, three that they were “neither satisfied nor dissatisfied”, and none that they were “dissatisfied” with the class. Also, a large majority said that the amount of reading required was fine, while only four indicated that they thought there was too much to read. While the total number of pages included on the reading list thus seems about right, two students mentioned that some weeks there was more to read than others, and that this perhaps could have been balanced better. This is something I will take into consideration when planning SAS2A in 2025.

When it came to the three-hour sessions, most of the students indicated that they liked this format. While there were a few students that said that they would have preferred one two-hour lecture every week, there were also some that explicitly pointed out that the chosen format suited them much better than more, but shorter lectures. For this reason, I plan to stick with the same three-hour format in the future, but since some students said that they would have preferred even more group work/student activity to help vary the lectures, I will try to accommodate this wish.

Several students indicated that they found the preparation questions very helpful when getting ready for the lectures, but there was one who said that sometimes there were too many questions. This is a good point, and something I will take into consideration. A few students also mentioned that in some of the lectures, too much time was spent on summarizing the plots of the literary works, leaving too little time for close reading and in-depth analysis. This, too, is something that should be rectified in the future.

In addition, three students mentioned that they would have liked to read more works by women, and one claimed that (s)he found Knut Hamsun problematic, due to his political views and his sexism. While I will try to include more female authors in addition to the two we read this semester (Skram and Benedictsson), Hamsun's enormous importance makes it almost impossible to omit him (his problematical aspects notwithstanding).

In summary, then, the students made several suggestions that are worth listening to – the most important being more time for group work etc. to ensure that they do not lose concentration during the three-hour lectures, as well as less summary and more close-reading/analysis. While there are thus things that can be improved, this does not mean that the

students were not happy about the class, as evident from the many positive comments included in the evaluations, such as the following: “I found this course really interesting, thanks!” and “Really enjoyed it, would love to do a follow-up-course in Spring! Tried to dive into this country head first, this was a very valuable addition!”.

Bergen, December 16, 2024

Anders M. Gullestad