APPENDIX 3: ASSESMENT CRITERIA OF A FINAL EXAM: INTERPRETING A DIALOGUE

Assessment is a critical part of the learning process. Both learning process and the level of competence should be assessed. For the learning process it is important for students to know the level (numerical assessment) and the quality (constructive feedback) of their skills. As a source for this assessment template we have used e.g. following materials: Assessment template for interpreting a dialogue at Humak University of Applied Sciences and efsli's 2013 *Assessment Guidelines for Sign Language Interpreting Training Programme*. This template has been tested with exams of both Deaf and hearing interpreter students. Although planned for Deaf students, the template is easily adopted for hearing students as well. The overall grade of the exam is based on assessments of particular sections.

Preparing and self-assessment

Preparing and self-assessment has either raising, neutral or lowering effect on the total grade of a final exam. Remember to outline the limits of the raising/lowering effect when counting the score; e.g. 5% or 0.25 grade. Here is the assessment scale and definition for each grade:

Grade	Score	Definition
Yes	2	Yes, the described criterion is well mastered
Developing (Dev.)	1	The described criterion is developing and is at the moment partly mastered
No	0	No, the described criterion is not sufficiently mastered

Professionalism, language skills and interpreting skills

Professionalism, language skills and interpreting skills are assessed by using numerical grades. To the total grade the weight of professionalism is 20%, the weight of language skills is 35% and the weight of interpretation skills is 45%. Here is the assessment scale and definition for each grade:

Grade	%	Definition
5	100-90%	Excellent performance (Pass)
4	90 < 75%	Very good performance (Pass)
3	75 < 65%	Good performance (Pass)
2	65 < 50%	Performance of low quality (Fail)
1	50% <	Seriously inadequate performance (Fail)

Matters that prevent passing the exam

Additionally there are a few crucial matters that can prevent the passing of the exam. If student gets a marking in any of named matters the exam is failed. These matters are following:

- The equivalence of core content between source text and interpretation is not sufficient (65%)
- Interpreter does not recognise and rectify errors efficiently
- The register interpreter uses is inappropriate in the situation
- Target language is not grammatically or phonetically correct
- Interpreter does not behave in an ethically sustainable way
- Interpreter does not understand the source text adequately

Preparing

Criterion	Yes	Dev.	No
Gathers information essential to the assignment (information acquisition abilities, source criticism)			
Knows what is the central terminology connected to the assignment.			
Understands the expectations, background, roles, scopes of practice, and goals of participants related to the assignment.			
Understands the assignment and its course as a whole: action, possible challenges, different scenarios, possible environmental factors, temporal dimension (continuum, a one-off situation, etc.)			
In case of relay interpreting: Discusses the effect of relay interpreting to communication.			
In case of relay interpreting: Describes the co-operation and topics discussed with the team.			
Describes the preparation for an assignment clearly and concisely.			
Justifies his/her solutions and actions connected to the preparation.			

Feedback:

Self-assessment

Criterion	Yes	Dev.	No
Evaluates one's own interpretation realistically and in detail (equivalence, grammatical correctness, intelligibility...)			
Identifies and reflects on factors affecting own actions (preparation, concentration, energy, emotions, feeding, team...)			

Identifies one's own strengths

Identifies one's own areas that need improvement

Uses appropriate frame of reference and criteria for self-assessment

Describes and evaluates ethicality of one's own action

Describes and justifies decisions made during assignment

Sets realistic and adequate goals for further development

Feedback:

Professionalism (20%)

Criterion	5	4	3	2	1
Discretion, perceiving and managing the situation (Sensitivity, ability to read interaction dynamics, flexibility, adapts to the changes, ability to inquire needs, has punctual and culturally appropriate manner to ask defining questions)					
Fluency and ease of interaction (Communication function: effect, contact, codes, etc.; the messages of the participants meet, the interpretation promotes interaction, turn takings are fluent, consumers meet genuinely, engages those present to the communication, equal attention to the participants)					
Acts in a professional, ethical and reliable manner (Impartial, natural, polite, positive, sincere, clothing, no disturbing mannerism, greeting)					
Positioning and physical presence during the interaction (Communication with body, positioning and gaze; presence and being/habitus supporting interaction)					
Team work (Feeding, communication with team, support, rhythm during relay interpreting, sees the interpretation as a shared process, respectful attitude in team)					

Feedback:

Language skills (35%)

Both languages/communication methods used during assignment are assessed by using following criteria. One used language during the assignment is the candidate's native language and the other does not have to be an actual language, it can also be an appropriate communication method, such as International Sign, visual signing or plain signing.

Criterion	5	4	3	2	1
Language is natural, lively, expressive (mime, gestures, visuality, rhythm, pauses, timing, emphasis, intonation, role shifting, does not look like interpretation, flow: comfortable to look at)					
Structure and grammar (text and sentence level structure, cohesion, relations between things, interference of source language, correct grammar)					
Clearness and articulation (Clear signing, fluent, correct articulation and prosody)					

Criterion	5	4	3	2	1
Appropriate language and terminology (style, register, idiomaticity, cultural adjustment/s, use of correct terminology with equivalent effect, creative and flexible usage of interchangeable expressions)					
Consumer suitable language/communication (Adapting the language/communication to suit the consumer)					

Feedback:

Interpreting skills (processing) (45%)

Criterion	5	4	3	2	1
Comprehension of source text message and concepts					
Comprehension/production of fingerspelling and numerals					
Conveys interpretation contextually corresponding to the source text at text and concept level (connections between things, point, meaning, affect, information, functionality, nuances, no factual errors)					
Uses interpreting strategies appropriate to the situation (omission, addition, substitution, explanation, dividing, generalisation, simplification, recapitulation, reformulation, explanation, anticipation, use of euphemisms, etc.)					
Modifies his/her interpretation strategy creatively and flexibly according to the situation.					
Functional use of time and delay during the process					
Recognizes and rectifies one's own errors adequately					
Produces understandable and fluent interpretation (Completeness and logical expressions)					

Feedback:

Summary of assessment

Based on the assessment of different criteria above, student will get one overall grade.

Criterion	Score	Raising	Neutral	Lowering
Preparing	/16			
Self-assessment	/16			

Criterion			%	Grade	%-weighted portion of grade
Professionalism			20		
Language skills			35		
Interpreting skills			45		
Total					
Raising or lowering effect (remember to outline the limits of raising/lowering effect; e.g. 5% or 0.25 grade)					
Grade					

Matters that prevent passing the exam

If student gets a marking in any of the following the exam is failed:	
The equivalent of core content between source text and interpretation is not sufficient (> 65%)	
Interpreter does not recognise and rectify errors efficiently	
The register interpreter uses is inappropriate in the situation	
Target language is not grammatically or phonetically correct	
Interpreter does not behave in an ethically sustainable way	

Interpreter does not understand the source text adequately

Feedback:

Overall grade: ___