

Summary of End-of-Term Evaluation

Language and Cognition

Students in the course: 34 (+ 1 drop-out)
Responses on evaluation: 32 (8 exchange) = 94.1%

Overall, the out-of-class study groups were a success with regular participation and benefit from the students.

Students did not find it too difficult to schedule and find locations for the group work sessions.

On average they spent 1.35 hours per week on the group work. This is less than the 2 hours set aside for group work plus 3.74 hours for preparation.

Some commented that they felt that there was too much group work, while others said that it was just fine; some commented that a number of other students rarely or never turned up for group work. We need to make it more clear that group work is obligatory and that Mondays are reserved for this.

Student preparation for and contributions during teaching sessions were more or less normally distributed.

The organization of the teaching sessions and the required amount and level of reading material was appropriate. The students agreed that the teachers communicated ideas and knowledge clearly and that the academic level was appropriate. Many commented that the topics were very interesting.

The majority of comments on the fact that there were multiple teachers were positive. They found the teachers good well prepared, and they liked the differences in teaching style, research focus and theoretical background and personal viewpoints. Others found it confusing that there were four teachers.

Ken Ramshøj Christensen
January 11, 2014

Performing Shakespeare Course Evaluation

This course was oversubscribed with 32 students in all. Students were drawn equally from Foreign exchange students from many countries including China, Canada, Brazil and across Europe as well as Danish students from across the faculty. It was clear that students came from a variety of study cultures. The course and all exams were given in English, seven oral and the remaining written, and all students comfortably passed their exams. The course consisted of lectures, a workshop with professional actors (Julia Varley and Tage Larsen) and visit to Odin Teatret and discussion with Eugenio Barba, a seminar with the director of Aarhus Teater, Mick Gordon, and a three-day performance trip to London and Stratford-upon-Avon (self-financed). Students felt the course was an overwhelming success, an eye-opener, giving them living understanding of Shakespearean performance. They especially enjoyed the fact that the course went beyond conventional 'class-room' understanding by adopting an interdisciplinary approach. It enriched everyone's mutual understanding combining the distinct approaches of literary criticism and performance studies. Expectations were high on the students to assimilate and analyse complex and diverse material. Students responded positively to the challenges but highlighted areas where these could be clarified and simplified. Suggestions for improvement were that all instructors teach an aspect of every play rather than individual plays as we did this time. Students expressed an interest in having a session dedicated to reflecting on their experiences on the performance trip. Some disappointment was expressed that we weren't able to include group presentations as originally planned, but students found the mid-term assignment a help in their individual research and preparation for exams. Rivka's session focusing on intercultural adaptation and appropriation of Shakespeare and the ethics of translation was highlighted as an especially brilliant aspect of the course. Some students expressed a desire to actually perform parts of Shakespeare, and we will attempt to realise that next time. The organisation of the trip was highlighted as especially smooth.

Joseph Sterrett

BA *Hum-Fag*: People in Motion: American Popular Music and Cultural Diversity (V/Dale Carter, *Engelsk/LÆK*)

Feedback from students who took the course in the autumn of 2013 suggested that they found its academic level appropriate to its nature and level within their study programs. They also felt that the classroom atmosphere was conducive to learning. Happily, all of the IT equipment – upon which work in the classroom is heavily dependent – worked well, so we could listen to songs, read lyrics, watch videos without any complications or delays in using the facilities. This was a major benefit, both for students and the teacher.

With the assistance of the support materials provided via FirstClass (guidance on the nature of the exam, on formulating topics, on researching scholarly material and so on), as well as the teacher's own suggestions for topics in virtually every class, and one-on-one consultations during the semester, the students believed that the teaching and learning methods were well-suited to the nature of the exam (which is a *hjemmeopgave*).

Students reported that the various other support materials and facilities provided for the course – preparatory readings, First Class seminar outlines and other documents, and Spotify and YouTube playlists – worked well. No one reported IT problems, and everyone was happy with the use of Spotify and YouTube as a source of musical playlists. On the basis of student evaluations in the previous running of the course, greater emphasis was placed in the opening four sessions and the final session on theoretical and analytical readings, and student feedback suggests that this revision worked effectively.

Finally, the assessed work produced by students has overall been of a more than satisfactory quality. Some work has been excellent, most of it good, and only a small number of essays of a modest or unacceptable level.