



NOTAT FRÅ PROGRAMSTYRE KNYTT TIL PROGRAMSENSORRAPPORT I ENG 122/122L FOR HØSTEN 2012

Dato for handsaming i programstyret:

22.01.2014_____

Kommentarar frå programstyret:

Fagmiljøet tar rapporten for 122/122L til følge, og setter særlig pris på kommentar om sammensetning av tekster. Vi vil også tilføye at siden evalueringen ble gjort er vurderingsformer endret til å omfatte en skoleeksamen og en veiledet semesteroppgave. Dette håper vi gir en bedre kontinuitet i kurset.

Fagkoordinator: __Lene M Johannessen_____

Dato: __6.2.2014_____

Sensur og evaluering: Emne Amerikansk litteratur og kultur, Eng122 og Eng122L

15 Studieoeng

Autumn Semester 2012

The presentation of Amerikansk literature og kultur at University of Bergen is clearly laid out on the Web presentation of the course (“Utdanning” document 1-4 pages) and in “Sensur og evaluering” document 1-2 pages. Those lærerutanning students taking Eng 122L follow almost the same schedule of readings and meetings as those in Eng122 with one exception: readings in the course compendium are not required of these students as specified in Eng122L in the “Textbooks and Required Readings” material (Fall semester 2012, 1-2 pages). This material is very clearly laid out for the Eng122 students, in calendar form (Lectures and Seminar, Fall semester 2012, 1-3 pages) and also in a detailing of a division of the course into Periods in the Textbooks and Required Reading hand out. If students in the course use these two tools, they can easily find their way around in both the primary and secondary material as well as in the written course requirements as stated on the web. I find, however, that for the students in Eng122L this might be a little less clear since their requirements are not listed until the end of the Required Readings hand out on the bottom of second page, but are fronted more clearly in the Weekly time table. Also for both sets of students the choice of two handbooks of literary terms seems unnecessary—the teachers should consider using only one. There is a careful detailing of the uses of the *Norton Anthology*, Vols. I and II when it comes to Norton Introductions to literary periods but perhaps not enough detailing of which “literary terms” will be emphasized in each week of the semester so that the students have an incentive to use the literary handbook throughout the semester.

Otherwise I find the historical logic of the course and its thematic presentation and use of readings, very well established and easy for students to follow (as they remark in their evaluations). I find a number of interesting emphasises are made in the course presentation, especially in the case of African American literature in the United States in a number of different periods, and in the newer literatures of Hispanic and Asian culture but not in that of Native American literatures, especially in the early sections of the course nor in the contemporary sections of the course. The combination of readings in the *Compendium*, *Norton*, and *Study Guide* are well balanced in terms of the traditional cannon of American writers in the 18-early 20th centuries. In fact the course is quite “canonical” in its presentation of American literatures, and this is reflected in the school exam questions in Eng122 given on 26 November 2012.

Before moving on to the school exam in Eng122, I would like to suggest that some consideration be given to rethinking this course in two areas: the use of non-canonical texts: cultural texts outside of printed literary texts to be found in *Norton*, and the use of newly formulated thematic ways of reading American literatures against the grain of the march of progress, development of constitutional democracy, the interior and external landscapes of imperial expansion, immigration, etc. For example, many American surveys of American culture now use films, probably America’s greatest single contribution to 20-21st Century global popular culture. For example, a number of first year student surveys taught in various European countries now include a set of films to accompany the course, both documentaries and Hollywood films—not in a effort to teach American film history, but as a way to

involve students in the course using their own entry point to so much American culture. Reading against the grain of traditional American explanations of their own march of progress might include more material from popular culture but also some of the new theoretical approaches to American culture and literature, at least in the contemporary section, and more material that uses graphic and medial refrigeration of different contemporary American “cultures” within both the “American Dream” section and as the course might lay out forms of contemporary disillusionment in the has been called the American “nightmare” of imperial and economic decline.

The school exam given on 26 November 2012, at the end of the semester, set a high standard for the students and was carefully composed so that students had to both answer short questions which tested them on specific details of texts on the reading list, as well an essay which had them thinking about issues, themes, ways of reading and writing discussed in the whole course. Also it was very useful to suggest a very specific time allotted to the essay section of the exam. To have one question in the second part of the school exam in which non-fictional texts could be chosen was effective; however, the question itself was a standard one on many introduction to American literature and culture courses and might have been easily prepared for by the students. This is question 1 in the essay section of the exam:

“The American Dream” is one of the major themes that run through the required reading of the course. Offer a definition and discuss its implications by focusing on at least two works on your reading list. You may draw on fictional as well as non-fictional texts”.

Perhaps such questions might be termed a “gift” and lead to overgeneralizations in abundance no matter the request for specific examples? The use of specific texts, reproduced for the students, in the third question for the essay section of the exam was a much more effective choice with its emphasis on environmental issues or historical contextualization “within American literary history”.

The evaluation of the exams presented (5 examples) was both fair in the evaluation of the use of English and in the ways in which each candidate attempted to answer the questions. Only one exam: 204426 could have been, I think, slightly better than the C it was given, but not much so; therefore, I understood why the mark was awarded. These are matters, which need to be arrived at via consensus, within the course, and between internal and external sensor and touch on the difficult grey areas between successful discussion of the course material and the way it is presented. The F exam: 21755 was a good example of unsatisfactory work in all respects. The other exams I think need no comment. The fairness of exam evaluation is also confirmed by the low numbers of students who have challenged their marks in Eng122: since 2010 the numbers have not been over 3 students a semester, which is lower than the numbers at UIT and other Universities I have seen in Norway (see “Klavesaker Eng122 document”).

The two Emneevalueringsrapporter by Zeljka Svriljuga were very clearly presented and I think argued persuasively about the value of the course for the students: especially the number of students sitting the exam, that is the high level of retention of students throughout the semester; the very fair curve in the marks given the students by their evaluators; and the students quite clear commitment to the course demonstrated in their comments about the ways in which the arbeidskrav, or “obligatoriske oppgaver” writing assignments were dealt with both by students and teachers. The promised change in obligatory forms of evaluation mentioned in this report to “en midtsemestereksamen og en hjemmeeksamen” in the written material required of students shows sensitivity to how students learn material in these large first-year courses and also how to help students understand the learning processes required to

pass the school exam at the end of the course. But as this course now stands students are still required to demonstrate their writing and analytical ability but I think this need to make some kind of request for coverage in preparation for the exam and the obligatory course assignments should be stressed.

This also suggests that the emphasis on the seminar/discussion section of the course is very important; the number of students in each seminar/discussion group then needs to be carefully monitored and number of students in each group set in the announced in the course description. In the student evaluations "Evaluering av Eng122": the role of the discussion seminar seems to be central to the effectiveness of the course for most students, as well as their view that the course has a balanced amount of required reading in both "historical" (term used by many of the students), and literary texts.

Generally the evaluations of this course and the requirements for the course are "good", "interesting", and generally positive. The lectures were well thought of and each of the quoted students found them "useful"—in fact a number thought they were "interesting and challenging"—high praise in the evaluation rhetoric of students. The relationship between what the students called "historical" material and the literary texts was seen as clearly presented, but a number of the students asked if the historical material could be presented using other forms than the compendium? This I think implied a desire for the use of more online resources: Youtube mini lectures, photographs, visual blogging, and news clips or film clips. Another comment was "less quotations and more analysis" seems to be directed to different kinds of analysis; the need for more material presented in other forms than the printed word. *The Norton Anthology* of both British and American literature is presenting additional material to students via their own site for free with registration of the course in their computer base, and this may be a way to satisfy some of this demand. Also there are valuable interactive learning sites for students produced by Universities such as Brown and Emory in the United States, and those of national and international museums and research libraries in the UK and Europe. I do not think there is any need to comment upon students who were especially pleased or critical of individual teachers but I did not notice any attempt to single out one person in the team of teachers, who taught Eng122, for special attention.

Finally, there was a general consensus among the students that there might be more need in the seminars/discussion groups to spend time on the longer texts in the course, even if lectures seem to be taken up with those texts. I think this might suggest a need to focus seminar time with questions arising out of the lectures, and the examples discussed in those lectures. The value of using short texts is that this is the way many Norwegian students have been taught cultural texts in "school" but the patience and persistence to read the longer, often more complex texts, both fictional and non-fictional, is a skill students are seeking more practice in.

It was a pleasure to write this report and learn how effective this course is for students and teachers alike, even if some fine-tuning of readings, requirements, and resources might be in order in the future.

Stephen Wolfe



NOTAT FRÅ PROGRAMSTYRE KNYTT TIL PROGRAMSENSORRAPPORT I ENG125 FOR VÅREN 2013

Dato for handsaming i programstyret:

22.01.2014_____

Kommentarar frå programstyret:

Programstyret for Engelsk har ikke spesifikke kommentarer til evalueringsrapporten, idet synspunktene som kommer fram her i stor grad stemmer overens med egne inntrykk. Rapporten blir særlig verdifull for den gjennomgangen av emnet som skal gjøres for våren 2015.

Fagkoordinator: __Lene M Johannessen_____

Dato: __6.2.2014_____

Sensor og evaluering: Emne Amerikansk litteratur og kultur, Eng125

15 Studiepoeng

Spring 2013

The presentation of Eng 125 University of Bergen is clearly laid out on the Web presentation of the course ("Utdanning" document) and in "Sensor og evaluering" documents. The reading list and pensum list are also clearly laid out for the Eng125 students, in calendar form (Schedule, Spring semester 2013, 1-6 pages). The detailing of a division of the course into Periods and "Approaches" and Required Reading is well presented. The course begins with a focus on how to approach literary and culture texts in both the lectures and seminars, as well as the use of a secondary text by Poplawski. This seems a good strategy when combined with other sections of the course that include a library and writing seminar. The requirements are clearly spelled out for the student, and given the demanding level of the readings in British literature and culture there is ample time for students to grasp the material if they keep up with the readings. I only note that as with all British surveys there do not seem to be enough weeks in the semester, especially as this is a 15 studiepoeng course, for attention to be paid to the later 20th and early 21 centuries. I find a very clear logic to the structuring of the assignments in the course, with the shorter "arbeidskrav" or required essay leading to the essay exam at the end of the course. Also the wording of the first assignment asking for a comparison of two texts leading to the comparison of three in the final course essay exam is a compelling idea. Often, as we frame the expectations of these survey courses and their dispensing of the knowledge of literature, cultural and history to the indifferent as well as the responsive, we forget to examine our students for "coverage" of the reading list. Such a need is realized in this organizational model.

I was not provided with a list of compendium readings so I have no idea how they might relate to the major texts on the course, but the coverage of genres is thoughtful: 4 plays, 7 prose pieces, and seemingly enough poetry. The use of the Poplawski text is consistent but I think it might be valuable in the schedule to detail which "literary terms" will be emphasized in each week of the semester so that the students have an incentive to use the literary handbook throughout the semester.

Before moving on to samples of writing and marking in Eng125, I would like to comment on the uses of images and films in the section of the course "Approaching Drama: A Midsummer Night's Dream" and hope that such an approach was also used to stimulate discussion and interest in the Wilde and Becket dramas. Also the "emneevaluering" of Randi Koppen was very clearly presented, descriptive as well as evaluative. I found her report very useful, and I hope passed around so that the challenges of teaching writing, analytical thinking and textual/historical analysis might be recognized. However, one cannot say that the 18 student evaluations were not of much help, though they were generally positive. There were so few evaluations as to be statistically irrelevant given the number of students in this course.

The required essay and the essay exam given on 22 May 2013, at the end of the semester set high standards for the students and both, and as I mentioned

above were carefully written. I thought, however, that the questions for the required short paper might have been more specific by suggesting a particular passage/or passages that would be usefully employed to answer the questions. I thought the "report from Eng-125" on past essay exams would be an interesting document to give students and one would hope they read with care. However, it might be shortened and used with an evaluated exam to indicate marking expectations to even better result. Recently I have been doing this in a writing seminar for first year students and it has cut in half the number of challenges at UIT in the British survey course.

The evaluation of the papers presented (4 on the required essays, and 5 on the Final Exam) appeared both fair in the evaluation of the use of English and in the ways in which each candidate attempted to answer the questions. Only one exam: 227467 could have been, I think, slightly less than the B it was given, but not much so; therefore, I understood why the mark was awarded. While the essay was very well organized and responded to the question thoughtfully, the overblown rhetorical phrasing of this candidate, and the opening over generalizations about Clare made me, if not buzzy with its pretention, a little uneasy about sources. The F exam: 46182 is a good example of unsatisfactory work. The other exams need no comment.

Like in the American survey, Eng-122 the written material required of students within the course shows sensitivity to how students learn material in these large first-year courses and also how to provide assistance that enable students to understand the learning processes required to pass the essay requirements of the course. This also suggests that the emphasis on the seminar/discussion sections of the course is very important given the obligatory requirement; and the number of students in each seminar/discussion group then needs to be carefully monitored. 30 students in discussion groups might be appropriate but 20-25 would be better when it comes both to language learning and developing essay writing skills.

Generally the 18 evaluations of this course are positive. Some students thought there a need to spend more time with the required essay, both preparing for it and discussing their essay after it was returned.

Finally, there was a general consensus among the students that there might be more need in the seminars/discussion groups to spend more time on the longer texts in the course, even if lectures seem to be taken up with those texts. I think this might suggest a need to focus seminar time with questions arising out of the lectures, and prepare examples of passages discussed in those lectures.

It was a pleasure to write this report and learn how effective this course is.

Stephen Wolfe



NOTAT FRÅ PROGRAMSTYRE KNYTT TIL PROGRAMSENSORRAPPORT I ENG251/211 FOR VÅREN 2013

Dato for handsaming i programstyret:

22.01.2014_____

Kommentarar frå programstyret:

I evalueringen av eng251/211 er det mange nyttige observasjonar som fagmiljøet tar med seg i sitt vidare arbeid med kurset. Fagmiljøet vil for øvrig gjerne poengtere at strykprosent på "Cognitive Grammar"- delen av kurset er identisk med den på språkhistorie. Grunnen til at dette ikkje kommer fram i evalueringen er at programsensor ikkje har hatt tilgang på delkarakterene. Strykprosenten er med andre ord høy i begge delemner, noe som dessverre ikkje kan forklaras ut fra vanskelighetsgraden på Cognitive Grammar. Fagmiljøet er takknemlig for sensors kommentarar til de uoverensstemmelser som finnes i emnebeskrivelsene, og retter det opp til neste gang 251/211 tilbys.

Fagkoordinator: _Lene M Johannessen_____

Dato: _6.2.2014_____

ENG211/251 – evalueringsrapport

Kristin Killie, programsensor for engelsk språk (5. september 2013)

Nedenfor refererer jeg en del ganger til studentevalueringa, men det bør understrekes at antallet svar på denne ikke er veldig høyt slik at en ikke vet om vurderingene som gis her, er representative for studentgruppa som helhet. Ellers kunne det vært kjekt å ha tilgang til alle svaralternativene på studentevalueringa, ikke bare få oppgitt **hva** studentene har svart. Ved neste anledning kunne en kanskje legge ved spørreskjemaet?

1. Pensum og innhold

Omfanget av pensum virker helt rimelig. Jeg skjønner imidlertid studentene, som synes Cognitive Grammar ble for komplisert på dette nivået. Cognitive Grammar **er** et veldig teknisk felt, med mange (for studentene) ukjente termer og ikke minst uvante måter å nærme seg språk på. Dette er nok i hvert fall en del av forklaringa på at strykprosenten gikk opp da en inkluderte denne komponenten i emnet. En faglærer som skal undervise andre års engelskstudenter i dette emnet, har ei utfordring, og en høy strykprosent er ikke veldig overraskende her. Nå kan en si at de studentene som har svart på evalueringa, ikke brukte særlig mye tid på dette emnet, men slik var det nok i semesteret før også. Det kan kanskje være bedre å ha et slikt emne på 300-nivå?

Studieopplegg

Antall undervisningstimer synes å være godt tilpassa pensum og det faktum at det dreier seg om et 15 stp kurs.

Det virker som om de studentene som besvarte evalueringa, er fornøyd med lærerne, men at de savnet mer tid til diskusjoner/seminarer i Cognitive Grammar. Dersom en velger å beholde Cognitive Grammar som en komponent i emnet, bør man kanskje vurdere å ta bort noen temaer innfor emnet, som faglærer også foreslår. Det er i hvert fall, etter min erfaring, sjelden en god situasjon når man ender med å fjerne arenaer for diskusjon for å klare å komme gjennom alt stoffet. Seminarformen er nok også generelt en langt bedre løsning i denne typen emner, som faglærer påpeker. Men her forstår jeg at man har valgt kun forelesninger pga studentgruppens størrelse, dvs av økonomiske årsaker, stikk i strid med faglærers ønske. Det er derfor ikke rettfærdig å legge ansvaret for resultatene på faglærer. Men her er nok løsninga enten å ikke ha med Cognitive Grammar i dette emnet i det hele tatt eller å bruke seminarformen istedenfor eller i tillegg til forelesninger. Uansett bør man kanskje ta bort noen kompliserte temaer fra pensum. Alternativet å øke antallet undervisningstimer er sikkert ikke realistisk.

Ellers er det sikkert en god idé med ei innlevering i løpet av semesteret, spesielt når stoffet er såpass komplisert, men dette finnes det kanskje ikke ressurser til?

Prøveordning/eksamen

Det er positivt at studentene har muligheten til å velge å skrive BA-oppgave istedenfor kun skoleeksamen, da BA-oppgaveformatet gir anledning til fordypning og selvstendig

tenkning. Det virker også som om de studentene som valgte denne varianten i språkhistorien, var mer engasjert i faget enn de som valgte skoleeksamen.

2. Studie- og eksamenskrav og generelt om studentane sine prestasjoner

Som nevnt ovenfor, så tror jeg den høye strykprosenten i ENG151 våren 2013 skyldes at Cognitive Grammar er et for komplisert felt å ta for seg på dette nivået. I tillegg er jo ikke oppmøtet all verden, og faglærer i språkhistorie påviser jo en sammenheng mellom oppmøte og stryk. Det er også interessant å merke seg at karaktersnittet faktisk gikk *opp* mellom 2012 og 2013 (fra D til C). Kan hende er dette fordi vanskelighetsgraden i emnet i 2013 fikk noen av studentene til å ta seg sammen, og at de som gjorde dette, faktisk klarte å tilegne seg stoffet på en god måte? Jeg har ikke hatt tilgang til data om karakterfordelinga, men økninga i karaktersnitt fra D til C kan vel tyde på at det er større spredning i karakterer i 2013 enn det var i 2012, så kanskje var det flere studenter som bestod i 2012, men med svakere resultater enn i 2013?

Dersom en relativt høy andel av studentene har fått A og B, kan jo dette tyde på at forholdene ligger til rette for læring dersom man bare benytter seg av tilbudet.

3. Vurderingsprosessen som blir nytta i studiet og praktiseringa av karakterskalaen A-F og ev. bestått/ikkje bestått

Jeg har ingen innvendinger mot vurderingsprosessene som benyttes ved UiB. Den møter alle lovens krav om upartiskhet og faglig kvalifisert bedømming.

4. I kva grad har du som programsensor deltatt i drøftingar i fagmiljøet om struktur og innhald i studieprogrammet og om dei vurderingsmetodane som blir nytta

Jeg har ikke deltatt i slike drøftinger.

5. Ev. særlege forhold ved gjennomføringa av studieprogrammet i perioden

Jeg kjenner ikke til noen særlige forhold som kan nevnes her.

6. Rolla og oppgåvene som programsensor

Programsensorordninga synes å være et fornuftig tiltak. Det er viktig å få et eksternt blikk på det man holder på med, og ordninga kan føre til fruktbar erfaringsutveksling mellom lærestedene.

7. Annet

Jeg synes UiB bør jobbe med disse emnebeskrivelsene for å gjøre forholdet mellom ENG211 og ENG251 tydeligere. Så vidt jeg forstår, dreier seg om nøyaktig samme emne,

bare med ulik prøveform, men man må jobbe litt for å forstå dette. Spesielt de to dokumentene med "Utdanning" på toppen var forvirrende. Der er også læringsutbyttet gjengitt to ganger, først som "Læringsutbyte", siden som "Læringsutbyte/resultat". Det kan da ikke være nødvendig?

Et annet spørsmål er om dere virkelig trenger to emnebeskrivelser hvis det i all hovedsak dreier seg om samme emne. Det virker forvirrende med to emnebeskrivelser som er nesten helt like. Og når de først er såpass like, stusser man over små forskjeller og lurer på om de avspeiler en virkelig forskjell, eller om de bare er et resultat av tilfeldigheter.

For å ta et eksempel, hvis emnet er identisk, men med to forskjellige prøveformer, hvorfor opererer man med anbefalte forkunnskapskrav i emnebeskrivelsen for ENG251, men ikke i beskrivelsen for EGN211? Og hvorfor gjør man i emnebeskrivelsen for ENG211 oppmerksom på at "Personar utan studierett kan søkje Studieadministrativ avdeling om å få gå opp til einskild eksamen", men ikke i emnebeskrivelsen for ENG251? Ønsker man ikke slike studenter i ENG251, eller er det helt tilfeldig om dette punktet tas med?

I tillegg står det under "Tilrådde forkunnskapar" for ENG251 at "Ein vi òg rå til at studentane har fullført EXFAC00SK Språk og kommunikasjon og ENG101 Engelsk 1 eller har tilsvarende kunnskapar". Hvorfor finner man ikke samme anbefalinga i emnebeskrivelsen for ENG211?

Videre står det i emnebeskrivelsen for ENG211 kun at det er skoleeksamen i dette emnet (som det jo er), mens det i emnebeskrivelsen for ENG251 står følgende:

"I engelsk språk på 200-nivå tek studentane det same kurset som anten ENG251 (skoleeksamen) eller ENG211 (semesteroppgåve).

I engelsk språk på 200-nivå tek studentane det same kurset som anten ENG211 (skoleeksamen) eller ENG251 (semesteroppgåve)"

Hvordan kan den første setninga her stemme når man ellers sier at ENG211 kun har skoleeksamen??? Da jeg leste dette, begynte jeg å lure på om jeg likevel ikke hadde forstått hva ENG211 og ENG251 er...

Jeg ville ha valgt å kun ha én emnebeskrivelse for ENG211/ENG251 med en felles beskrivelse av anbefalte forkunnskapskrav, krav til studierett, mål og innhold, læringsmål osv, og der man gjør oppmerksom på de to forskjellige prøveordningene. Så kan man heller spesifisere de få forskjellene som finns, som ekstra læringsutbytter man oppnår ved å skrive BA-oppgave osv. **Det er selvsagt langt utenfor mitt mandat å uttale meg om hvordan UiB utformer emnebeskrivelsene sine.** Jeg ville bare gjøre dere oppmerksomme på at de virker forvirrende for meg, som har vært i bransjen i et utall år, og da vil de sikkert virke minst like forvirrende for studentene.

Kristin Killie



Mal for NOTAT FRÅ PROGRAMSTYRE KNYTT TIL PROGRAMSENSORRAPPORT I ENG212/252 FOR VÅREN 2012

Dato for handsaming i programstyret:

22.01.2014 _____

Kommentarar frå programstyret:

Programstyret for Engelsk tar rapporten for 212/252 til følge, men vil presisere at obligatorisk oppmøte ikke kreves på disse kursene, slik det går fram av rapporten. Teoridelen av kurset er siden rapporten ble skrevet lagt inn som integrert del av 212/252, med redusert variant for 212L.

Programstyret merker seg særlig kommentar om bruk av karakterskala, og tar dette med seg i videre arbeid med forbedring av kursene.

Fagkoordinator: __ Lene M Johannessen _____

Dato: __ 6.2.2014 _____

Sensur og evaluering: Emne Amerikansk litteratur og kultur, Eng212/2121L/252

15 Studiepoeng Eng 212/2121L

15 Studiepoeng Eng 252

Spring Semester 2012

The presentation of these courses at University of Bergen is clearly laid out in the Web presentation of the courses ("Utdanning" document) and in "Sensur og evaluering" documents. Those lærerutanning students taking Eng 2121L follow the same schedule of readings and meetings as those in Eng212/252 with one exception: the students take a 5 hour school exam over the "theory component (ten week course for all students). I expect this is a complicated course to administer, to teach, and to be enrolled in for some students. It was clear in the schedule set out by Zeljka Svrljuga that the theory component (10 weeks) and the three alternative versions or seminars with a focus on literary and culture texts would be scheduled and taught in an ordered manner but I was not quite so sure where the lektor students might fit into this mix? Their part in the scheduling did not seem so clearly laid out, and since they had no "obligatoriske arbeidskrav" their progress could only be tracked as their thesis developed over the semester. Perhaps just a little clearer statement of lektor requirements (I know it is already three pages long on the web), both on the web and in a hand out might solve what I thought was a confusion, but it may be my error.

Otherwise I find the logic within a whole curriculum of undergraduate literature/teacher training education and the need for these kinds of alternatives important and well thought out. Also the statement of obligatory attendance at "each and every class" for Eng212/252 seems necessary. I am not going into detail on the three alternatives available for each student to choose from during the semester, except to say they looked interesting and well balanced, but perhaps overly optimistic in scope given the challenging nature of theory in the "required" theory component, the secondary material in each alternative, and the primary texts in each alternative.

I would like to also point to a small problem I see in the interrelationship of the theory component for all students and the theory material in each alternative: there seemed in at least one alternative (Wallace) that had no consistent interconnection between the readings for seminar theory and theory course which is promised by both Myklebost and Svrljuga. I think this should be made clearer in each seminar or "alternative" offered.

The school exam at the 200 level and the bachelor paper do not seem to be in any way comparable, but the student can "choose for your 200-level module (school exam or bachelor paper)". In terms of quality of thought and level of engagement with theory, the literature, and the quality of writing I have read for these courses the two perhaps may not really be "a choice". While it may not be true that every student in English studies wants or needs a bachelor paper, I think, preferring not to have such a paper may be short changing this excellent set of seminar and theory courses.

Randi Koppen's clearly stated Emneevaluering helped me understand the challenges of teaching in these courses, the demands made on faculty and students, and of course faculty resources devoted to them. The course obviously from evaluations is of great value for some students found intellectual challenge and enjoyment. But there is a need for limits to be set: first class size should be set below 28; thesis preparation for a group of students is different from reviewing with students

for a school exam and should be acknowledged as such, and teaching these courses must be rewarded appropriately in terms of adjustments of teaching load.

I read two very different sets of bachelor papers, and one set of school exams. First the school exams: they were very fairly marked perhaps generously so in the case of the C and B papers. The F paper of 217580 was obviously so. I thought the two sets school exam questions were challenging and extremely fair given that each student was to have worked with the Bennett and Royle text throughout the ten-week course. The 8 bachelor papers were also very fairly marked and used the entire grading system to respond. I enjoyed reading the papers even the E papers since each candidate displayed their knowledge in different ways but my question would be why not fail the two E papers and have the students rewrite?

I think the value of these courses is demonstrated in the papers from C-A. The writing and presentation of the A papers was consistently strong and all these writers use of both primary and secondary material was sophisticated and at times took an independent line. The candidates who were able to move from literary to visual texts to create their arguments successfully especially impressed me. As did those two students who took on the themes of ideology and citizenship in the modernist period in such thoughtful ways. However at the end of Randi's report I did note 5 E marks and wonder what the teachers of these courses might suggest is the reason?

It was a pleasure to write this report and learn how effective this course is for some students even if some fine-tuning of the readings, requirements, and resources might be in order in the future.

Stephen Wolfe