

Periodisk evaluering av ENG2323: Women Writing: Feminist Fiction in English

Kursleder: Erika Kvistad

This is a heisemne taught alongside ENG4363, hence the overlap in parts of the two evaluations.

12 out of 29 students responded to the questionnaire.

1. Gi en vurdering av:

Pensum (innhold, omfang): Based on my experience in the classroom as well as student feedback in class, in the anonymous midway evaluation, and in the questionnaire, the primary-text syllabus seems to have worked extremely well. It covered a usefully wide range of feminist writing from different viewpoints, and each text seemed to present students with genuinely new ideas and perspectives, which they responded to well. Obviously not every student took with equal enthusiasm to every text, but this is the only class I've ever taught where every text has drawn such a powerful positive response. Student feedback on the questionnaire supports this: 'utrolig bra og inspirerende pensumtekster', 'kjempefornøyd med pensum', 'interessant pensum'.

Though secondary criticism was not part of the official syllabus for the term, we did cover a small set of theoretical texts in some detail in the class. The structure was that we spent two weeks on each novel (one on the single short story), and, in the second week, introduced a relevant feminist theory text alongside the novel, which was distributed to students a week ahead of the class. Some of these worked very well, but others were a little over-complex and thus tended to be confusing. If I were to teach this class again, I would want to use a more introductory-level companion to feminist theory in class as well as pointing students towards the theoretical texts themselves, to help everyone gain a solid grounding in the basics of what can often be complicated concepts. A couple of students request this approach in the questionnaire, and I agree that it would be a good idea.

Undervisning (undervisningsformer, timeantall, spredning over semesteret, obligatoriske aktiviteter, kvalifiseringsoppgaver): This class was taught through 14 two-hour seminars, with an obligatory qualification essay (with feedback provided on an optional first draft). This structure worked well in combination with a relatively short syllabus, allowing us to study each text in detail.

Questionnaire feedback on seminar teaching was largely very positive, with 83% of students agreeing or strongly agreeing that they were happy with seminar teaching, and no students disagreeing or strongly disagreeing, and many written questionnaire comments support this enthusiastically. However, some questionnaire comments

also request a more strongly teacher-led seminar structure, with more lecture elements. Some students also requested this in the midway evaluation, and I took this on board by creating a more defined seminar structure and including brief introductory 'lectures'. I was happy to see in one student comment that this worked well. While I believe that seminars (especially at this level) should primarily work through student discussion, the generous number of hours allotted to this course allow for both. If I were to teach this class again, I would include more elements of structure, lecturing and teacher-leading in seminars, while still keeping time for student discussion.

Qualification essays: Student feedback on 'oppfølging, veiledning og relevante tilbakemeldinger' was still largely positive, but more mixed, with 66% agreeing or strongly agreeing that they were happy with it. As in all ENG classes, feedback on qualification essays is given once, for the first draft only, and some student comments reflect dissatisfaction with this and a desire for more support. I think it would be worth considering on an ENG-wide basis whether this should be changed, since the current system means that some students can go a whole course without receiving writing feedback.

Ressurser og infrastruktur (undervisningsrom, audiovisuelle hjelpemidler, bibliotek-ressurser m.m.): No specific problems to report. In general, I would prefer classroom seating to be set up in a circle by default – this would be more conducive to discussion than the current front-facing setup.

- **Eksamen (eksamensordning, vurderingsform):** Students were evaluated by a three-day home exam, in which they wrote a single essay on one of a range of questions. The students's work was largely very strong, with 24% receiving A, 31% B, 34% C, 7% D and 3% E. Most essays showed thoughtful reflection on the ideas we dealt with in the course. I would want to use this exam form again.

2. Gir læringsutbytteformuleringene i emnebeskrivelsen en god beskrivelse av hva studentene skal kunne etter avlagt eksamen? Yes, the learning outcomes are accurate and informative.

3. Fungerer emnebeskrivelsen tilfredsstillende?

The great majority of students answering the questionnaire agree or strongly agree that the course description works well, and no complaints about this have been received at any point. No changes seem needed here.

4. Har du gjort noen endringer siden forrige periodiske evaluering? Hvilke? This is the first time I've taught this course.

5. Forslag til forbedringer To sum up the suggested changes mentioned above, if I were to teach this class again, I would:

- Use a more introductory-level companion to feminist theory in class.

- Include more elements of structure, lecturing and teacher-leading in seminars, while still keeping time for student discussion.
- Consider whether student feedback could be given in two rounds, and if not, encourage all students even more strongly to hand in a first draft.