

Developing Deaf Interpreting in Europe Erasmus+ 2018

Recommendations for a Curriculum for Deaf Interpreters

Curriculum Guide

edited by Liisa Halkosaari & Outi Mäkelä

Contents

Contents.....	2
Introduction	3
Level of Education.....	4
Planning and structuring a program	4
Student Admission and accessibility.....	5
Recognition of Prior Learning	6
Teaching.....	7
Assessment	8
Learning environments.....	8
Internship (work-based learning)	8
Discussion and further possibilities	9
Appendix 1: Educational competencies of Deaf interpreters	12
Appendix 2: A full time 3-year programme visualization	13
Appendix 3: Assessment criteria of a final exam: Interpreting a dialogue	14

Introduction

The curriculum for Deaf interpreters has been developed through European co-operation during 2016-2018 via an Erasmus+ project.

<http://deafinterpreters.eu/>

A report on professions and educational levels of Deaf interpreters (DI) in Europe was completed during the project (see: Sommer Lindsay 2016). According to the report there are very different approaches to the education and profession of Deaf interpreters. There are long traditions for the education of hearing sign language interpreters, but the education of Deaf interpreters is still ad hoc in many countries.

According to the report there is or has been education for Deaf interpreters in 17 countries in Europe. In nine countries this means training with hearing interpreters, and in eight countries there is a separate program. However, only in France and Germany has the program been permanently established. Nowadays, more and more Deaf interpreters are trained, or currently studying. This shows that the field is developing.

The Recommendations for a Curriculum for Deaf Interpreters (including two publications: *Learning Outcomes* and *Curriculum Guide*) is the result of a common understanding of what is relevant in educating Deaf interpreters. For this publication we have compared, reviewed and discussed existing curricula for DI Training. The main sources for our work have been *Deaf Interpreter Curriculum* of NCIEC (National Interpreter Education Center in USA) and *Learning Outcomes for Graduates of a Three Year Programme Sign Language Interpreter Training Programme* of efsli (European Forum of Sign Language Interpreters). Other important sources are listed in *References*.

There has been a rich, diverse background for our work, e.g. the partners within this project have experience of diverse types of trainings: a two-year university training program specifically aimed at training Deaf interpreters (Hamburg University); a four-year training program aimed primarily at training hearing interpreters, but with the possibility of including deaf students into the program (Humak University of Applied Sciences); a training program that offers a degree in sign language, where deaf students are trained to become teachers and interpreters (Coimbra Polytechnic Institute); and a part time training course offered as adult education for deaf to become interpreters (Danish Deaf Association).

This curriculum is competence based. Educational competences of Deaf interpreters are defined in *Appendix 1*. Competences are divided into four categories that form the basis for an interpreter's expertise: Professionalism, interpretation, communication and cooperation, and working languages and cultures. Competences work as a framework for the learning outcomes of different domains and topics.

The purpose of this curriculum is to act as a stimulus and a source of information for schools planning, or are setting in motion, Deaf interpreter education. We also hope that those who have educated Deaf interpreters find new ideas when updating their curricula. With this document we aim to support the recognition of the profession of Deaf interpreters, and to justify the academic level of the education.

In this curriculum we choose to use the term Deaf interpreting even when we see that Deaf interpreters are as justified and qualified interpreters as the hearing. Using this term we want to make the competencies that Deaf people especially bring to interpreting society more visible. With this curriculum we also aim to support the development of the professionalisation of DIs.

This curriculum will be published online with open access.

Level of Education

The interpreting profession is an expert profession and thus the level of education, as well as the levels of teaching and learning, should be appropriate. This curriculum is planned as a BA degree, which in our opinion is the minimum requirement for the educational level of interpreters. The learning outcomes have been set at level 6 of the Common European framework, defined in chart 1 below. Our basic premise is that the education of Deaf interpreters should be on the same level and last as long as the education of hearing interpreters within the same country.

Chart 1 Common European framework, level 6 (European Commission 2017).

	Knowledge	Skills	Competence
Level 6	Advanced knowledge of a field of work or study, involving a critical understanding of theories and principles	Advanced skills, demonstrating mastery and innovation, required to solve complex and unpredictable problems in a specialised field of work or study	Manage complex technical or professional activities or projects, taking responsibility for decision-making in unpredictable work or study contexts; take responsibility for managing professional development of individuals and groups

Planning and structuring a program

The education consists of five domains that we recommend be utilized. Respectfully each domain consists of several topics. The extent and focus of these topics can be modified according to the needs of each educational institution.

Implementation and adjusting of the Curriculum

It has been a common aim that higher education degrees in Europe should be of similar extent, even so BA degrees vary between 120 ects and 240 ects. That is why this curriculum is devised in a way where the extent of modules can be modified to fit the respective country's higher education system.

Interpreter training is located in different countries within different formal or informal educational systems, e.g. universities, colleges, vocational schools, national Deaf associations, private programmes, and Deaf community organisations, etc. This curriculum is designed for 180 ects (3 years), but can be modified to fit different educational systems and circumstances from short informal and intensive courses to a five-year-long master's degree.

In *Appendix 2* there is an example on how to schedule and carry out 180 ects (full time 3-year) programme. ECTS credits are based on the learning achievements and workload of a course. ECTS makes study programmes more transparent. The credit system is designed to make it easier for a student to move between different countries. Depending on the country, one ECTS credit point varies between 25 and 30 study hours.

For more information see: http://ec.europa.eu/education/resources/european-credit-transfer-accumulation-system_en

If the education is implemented to fit smaller educational entities/courses there should be careful consideration on what can be left out and what the minimum requirements are. E.g. should a student have prior experience of interpreting, and if they should, how much? What are the expectations related to student's language skills? Regardless of the extent of education we recommend that the following topics always be included in the education: ethics, interpreting process theory, interpreting practice, self-reflection.

This curriculum should not be followed literally, but modified based on need and circumstances. *Appendix 2* presents one example of implementing the education. If there is a significant need for example text to sign language or international sign interpreting, the amount of those studies should be increased. The necessity and extent of some topics, e.g. entrepreneurship and professional expertise depend on how interpreter services are provided in each country. We also encourage educators to add new topics to national curriculums, if needed.

At the end of their studies students specialise in certain domains. The content of Professional expertise depends on the needs of the society or prior knowledge and goals of a student. Options for Professional expertise can include the following:

- conference interpreting
- community interpreting for deafblind people
- community interpreting for consumers with minimal language skills
- text-to-sign interpreting
- interpreting in media
- translation

A training program for Deaf interpreters

The education of Deaf interpreters is organized both in connection with the education of hearing interpreters and as separate entities. For one reason or another in some countries deaf students aren't allowed in sign language interpreter education with hearing students. That might then actually work as a stepping stone to a separate education. On the other hand, financial constraints in smaller countries could make it impossible to have a class only for DIs.

If it is not possible to arrange the education solely for a (national) Deaf interpreter group or in connection with a group of hearing interpreters, there are other possibilities. Education can be implemented e.g. in an international group of Deaf interpreters. In international groups important national topics should also be covered to ensure sufficient competency related to national circumstances (nationally significant domains for DIs e.g. translation, international sign, consumers with minimal language skills etc.).

For more information about the Deaf interpreters in Europe see: <https://www.deaf-interpreters.com/output1>

Student Admission and accessibility

The student admission criteria varies nationally, so it is hard to give comprehensive recommendations. Interpreter educations often measure e.g. language skills, suitable capacity and qualities to work as an interpreter. There are, in our experience, some general issues to address regarding Deaf students, and we will provide some insights to them in the following. The issues range from education politics to defining "Deaf".

It is important to notice that the first language (L1) of Deaf students is in many cases their national sign language. Thus the other working language, i.e. the spoken language of the country, should in the admission process be tested as a second language (L2), not as L1.

Another important thing is to set the level of language skills required: both in admission and when graduating. For an interpreter to whom a written language is merely a tool in preparation and research, we should not set the goal too high. For a graduate translator, or interpreter working from e.g. autocue, the skills required should be higher, C1 or C2 (CEFR).

However, if we look at the general level of L2 that hearing students reach during their education (which in our experience is often no higher than B2), why would we demand more from Deaf Interpreters? Furthermore, there is the question of whether we should set a fixed standard for a young, developing professional field, and for professionals whose work can vary depending on the country? Of course working as an interpreter requires fluency in multiple languages. Even with lower demands of L2 skills the students will need to have access in written communication, texts, researches, etc.

The extent of studying should of course be in line with prior skills, and there might be a greater need for individual planning. Deaf education in general has had its impacts in history. What kind of education do Deaf students have in the country? Have they had possibility to participate in L1 sign language classes during their primary education? Have they had teachers who never required anything from them? If the language education for Deaf students has been inadequate, preparatory courses should be provided to ensure equal access.

Another issue is if we should presume that Deaf students already have more than one language to work with? If not, how much time and effort must be put to learning another sign language or International Sign? The first Deaf interpreters in a country must often cover “all” areas where DIs are needed, which also sets the demands quite high. Later with more DIs, there is the capacity for DIs to specialise.

To summarise: there needs to be criteria for both admission and graduation, but admissions criteria should not disadvantage Deaf students from taking part in training. The organiser of the education should be well aware of the status of the Deaf applicants as members of a minority. It should be the education that bends and makes changes in order to be accessible for a student from a minority group. Training thus requires constant discussion on the boundaries of being flexible and at the same time keeping the quality and standards high.

Recognition of Prior Learning

The system of recognition of prior learning (RPL) is used in varied ways in different European countries. With the help of the RPL-system the students can utilize previously acquired learning and skills as part of their degree. The learning could have been acquired in informal or formal (i.e. institutional) surroundings. The RPL-system enables the students to move forward with their studies without having to study things they already master.

We recommend the utilization of RPL-system when possible. Many Deaf people who seek education may already be skilled professional interpreters and it would be sensible to recognize prior learning especially in competences of language and interpretation.

When taking into account prior learning, education should be individually and carefully tailored. Tailoring should be based on recognized and validated know-how. Competences and experiences that a DI has before (or during) applying to the programme should be recognize and validated e.g. by making a portfolio, by carrying out a competence and language evaluation, or with some other evidence. An adult education training program (program for students who already possess some of the required skills and qualifications) is also one possibility.

Teaching

There are some specific issues to consider when teaching Deaf interpreters: training deaf and hearing together, professional identity, assessment, language politics, and qualifications for teachers. We will cover some of these issues in the following.

When deaf and hearing students are trained together training must be equal. Deaf students should not become the study objects of hearing students, and The majority of the subjects studied and skills honed are similar. Only one or two DIs in class wouldn't be optimum but it is possible. With regard to different backgrounds it would be good to separate the groups at certain times. For example in an integrated group with hearing interpreters there are certain topics that should be discussed by the Deaf interpreters as a group, such as ethical considerations and internship.

One major issue in the discussions during our project has been professional identity. Building professional identity needs integrated (deaf and hearing) teaching but also safe within group (deaf only) consolidation. Deaf students need the space to share thoughts with each other, and with DI mentors. Their role as insiders of a minority has its effects on building a professional identity and discussing ethics, which differs greatly from the experiences of most hearing interpreters. It might also be worthwhile to enable discussions with coda interpreters.

Language background is in a critical role in many ways. Education of hearing interpreters often pays great attention to learning an L2 of new modality, while most Deaf interpreter students will have a languages in several modalities (signed, written, etc.). Assessment and teaching of language skills should be based on L1 and L2, not written, spoken or signed languages. The depth, width, and content of teaching should depend on whether the language taught is the L1/L2 of the student.

As the Deaf students have a sign language as L1, it should be possible to access signed (translated) texts, articles and books about e.g. study of interpreting, Deaf Studies and linguistic in their L1. And when hearing students show their skills by writing an analysis in their L1, Deaf students should have the equal possibility to use their L1. If there is a rule that some exams have to be written, could that be changed? This policy aims to give equal status to written and signed texts and does not mean written language skills should be ignored. Developing academic (but also professional) skills requires reading skills. A Deaf interpreter must be a "good L2 reader", well educated in the national working language, but also (ever increasingly) in English. The school should support Deaf students fulfil their academic potential.

For many of the subjects the teacher can be deaf or hearing, but there should be both present in the programs. Co-teaching should be considered, because role models are needed in teaching teams. We recommend a qualified Deaf teacher (and mentor) especially for studies in ethics and professional identity. Students also need a qualified, fluent Deaf teacher in sign language – taking into account that it is their L1. The trainer should be familiar with various research done on Deaf interpreters, their training and learning, Deaf Studies, Disability studies, interpreting and linguistics. In summary: Deaf interpreters also also a Deaf trainer.

Teaching is an interactive, multidimensional phenomenon. Students and teachers learn from each other. Learning needs mutual trust, respect and equality.

Assessment

The primary meaning of assessment is to give tools for the students to develop their know-how. Students need to get feedback (“feedforward”) about their strengths and areas of development. The students also need guidelines for their development.

The learning outcomes of this curriculum are competence based. It is possible to analyse and assess the students’ performances based on defined learning outcomes. The evaluation criteria can and should be devised according to the respective system of evaluation of the country and/or educational institution in question.

During the education students demonstrate their achievements related to learning outcomes in various ways. At the end of the education students must show their expertise e.g. in a final interpreting exam. In *Appendix 3* you will find an example of an assessment template for a final exam of interpreting a dialogue.

For more information about the general assessment recommendations and assessment see eflis 2013 publication *Assessment Guidelines for Sign Language Training Programme*.

Learning environments

Education can be realized in different learning environments. The learning environments should be considered with care to find an appropriate environment for each entity. Some alternatives for learning environments:

- traditional classroom teaching
- classroom teaching complemented with language laboratory technology
- virtual learning environments
- practical training environments
- projects
- workshops

Virtual environments are still not very widely used in sign language and interpreter training. There have been, however, a few pilots, e.g. teaching Catalan Sign Language in a massive open-access course by Universitat Pompeu Fabra (www.futurelearn.com/courses/lsc). As the video-conference software is constantly developing, it is worth having a look at some solutions that could provide quality video-meetings with multiple participants. When using sign language in virtual environments the picture quality, accessibility and usability of software, and the capacity of data storage should be secured. Virtual environments enable not only teaching online, but also students having reflective discussions and sharing documents and videos online.

Internship (work-based learning)

The aim of internships is to develop students’ abilities to apply their theoretical know-how to different real-world tasks and situations. The intent of practical training is that during the internship the theoretical knowledge combined with practical experience yield learning, know-how and expertise. It is always recommendable to connect literature and other materials with internships.

In the beginning of studies students observe and familiarise themselves with the working life professional field. From merely observing, the students gradually proceed to doing. At the end of studies they should be able to operate in the professional field, and they should also be able to evaluate and develop their own functions and the field.

It is important to remember that an internship also includes activities other than interpreting. In the beginning of studies, besides monitoring interpreters work, Deaf students can also observe: consumers, communication, languages, environments, protocols, scopes of practices of other professionals, psychological factors and ethical aspects related to interpreters work, etc. During the practical phase students will interpret in real life situations under supervision and they are also involved in preparation, assessment, discussions, meetings, reporting, developing, supervision of work, and all the other everyday responsibilities and practices of an interpreter.

The duration of an internship varies as a result of variation in the aims, tasks and the nature of the job. When planning the internship students should take into account the learning outcomes, the phase of their own professional growth, their know-how, and the need for development. Deaf students should also think about forming professional connections and about their future employment. An internship can be realised as an intensive full-time internship during a certain period, or it can be divided into passages covering certain timespan or field. If students are working in the field of sign language, their work can be related to the studies, where applicable. This requires careful planning and reflection.

For each internship the student should make a plan and set personal learning outcomes (aims). Afterwards students should reflect and report their experiences in an agreed manner. Supervision during the internship is essential.

An internship can be carried out in different environments related to the purpose of the internship. Below is a list of some of the environments where an internship could be realised:

- Educational institutions (primary schools, vocational schools, etc.)
- Deaf community (e.g. Deaf clubs)
- Health care (Nursing homes, assisted living facilities, hospitals, etc.)
- Institutions (e.g. Churches)
- Offices (e.g. social and legal)
- Associations/federations (e.g. WFD, efsli, EUD, ...)
- Cultural services (e.g. Museums)
- Work place of a Deaf/deafblind consumer (where there is interpreting)
- Projects
- Sign language interpreting companies

The extent of internship varies depending on the national educational system and programme design. It is important to remember that Deaf interpreters are members of Deaf community and that is why ethical issues and the sensitive nature of DI work situations demand mentoring from experienced DIs.

For further reading we recommend efsli's 2013 publication *Assessment Guidelines for Sign Language Training Programme*.

Discussion and further possibilities

Deaf interpreters are typically used as interpreters between two sign languages or between one sign language and International Sign, or as interpreters who modify language for consumers with distinct linguistic needs. These consumers could be deaf people with mental, or cognitive disabilities, deaf immigrants, deaf seniors, or deafblind people. Those groups are among the most marginalized within the Deaf communities, and their limited access to interpreting services greatly impedes their integration into society. The long-term objective of this project has also been for those groups to receive better access to interpreting services and thereby to enhance their quality of life.

The desired impact of the project is an increased awareness and understanding of Deaf interpreting both at local level (at local public agencies such as municipalities), regional level (at regional public agencies such as counties, provincial or state agencies) and national level – such as the respective ministries responsible for the funding of interpreting services for deaf people within various fields (especially interpreting for deafblind people, deaf immigrants, and deaf people with mental illness or intellectual disability). It is our ambition that the outcomes of this project will influence the provision of DI training in countries across Europe – at any level and at any institution where it might take place. We aim at enhancing the provision of basic interpreter training for Deaf people (up to BA level). If training options for Deaf interpreters were better, more Deaf people would be able to qualify for this kind of advanced training at MA level.

As mentioned earlier in this guide the implementation of this curriculum depends on the national educational system. Possible implementations could be: a two-year training including core-elements; or a comprehensive three-year programme (associate professional); or a four-year full education (full professional). We recommend thorough discussion about the minimum duration of the education: what is the minimum qualification that would ensure a competent Deaf interpreter?

There are possibilities for further education, e.g. MA-degree in interpreting, and post qualifying specialisms for interpreting in legal settings (as outlined by the JUSTISIGNS Project, www.justisigns.com). We should also keep in mind to set the bar on a reasonable level. Although it seems that DIs are needed in so many areas, there is a limit on how much one student can learn during a single BA education. There should be ongoing possibilities to undertake supplementary studies and develop know-how, to qualify or specialise in new domains. In order to ensure a steady income, it is worthwhile to have professional expertise in several areas.

The education of Deaf interpreters is organized both in connection with the education of hearing interpreters and as separate entities. In many countries the numbers are too small and education is too expensive for a Deaf student group. We hope for future projects and more permanent co-work on a European level to ensure global discussions with DI students. This of course requires funding and lobbying for the importance and crucial role of DIs. Virtual environments and distance learning offer a lot of additional possibilities, which should keep the costs down. If education is organized for a Deaf student cohort, co-operation with hearing interpreter(-student)s must also be enabled. This is required when aiming to work as equals in multilingual interpreting teams.

It should also be considered whether codas are categorised as hearing or Deaf interpreters, or as something in between. Is it really the deafness that determines the role of the interpreter, or should we talk more about what the interpreter's first language (L1) is? Should this be tested? When starting a DI education, will codas be allowed to participate? What is essential for a DI? Is it being deaf, having sign language as L1, or both?

Education systems often favour written language skills. Academic thinking doesn't have to be expressed in writing – it can be signed or spoken. But as long as written language is preferred there should be an adequate amount of training on the national written language for the Deaf students ensuring their access to academic discourse. The level and quality of education for Deaf people might vary in different regions and nations. Thus it should be ensured through preparation studies that Deaf applicants have an equal possibility to reach the criteria for admittance. Would now also be the time to discuss changing the rules (educational policy) and thus making linguistic access possible?

Along with varying linguistic backgrounds students will also have other differences. Study groups might often be mixed, with both deaf and hearing students. The trainers need to be aware of, and also inform the students about, the different paths to reach same goals and competencies. This

requires an open mind, patience and sensitivity – from everyone. This is something we hope to see in all of the interpreting education field.

This curriculum, as with all curricula, should be continuously evaluated: are the outcomes of the education desired? Are the intended objectives achieved? Should the programme (objectives and outcomes) be redesigned, and how? Research related to curricula should be carried out to develop the interpreter training, to develop the interpreter profession, and to develop the profession of Deaf interpreters.

The profession of Deaf interpreters is still young and developing. The role of a Deaf interpreter might be very different 20 years from now. Technology and software development might create new possibilities for remote interpreting, use of mobile devices, speech-to-text software, and interpreter work in multimodal media. But technology will probably not change the need to have a DI with translingual skills and language plasticity to communicate with, e.g. refugees who don't know IS. DI's also need to know older variations of their own sign language to work with elderly people with dementia. Both Deaf interpreters and their trainers need to keep up to date with new inventions, but at the same time hold on to good practices.

Appendix 1: Educational competencies of Deaf interpreters

<p>Professionalism The student</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. (Has adopted and) enforces the principles of quality/high standards in interpreting practice. 2. Acts professionally and in an ethically justified manner in different work communities and consumer contacts, and is able to make responsible decisions. 3. Can develop their skills and knowledge by self-reflection and self-assessment. 4. Knows the foundations and employment opportunities of interpreting services in the society, and can act as an entrepreneur (in the field of interpreting and translation). 5. Can maintain and improve their own wellbeing at work. 6. Understands the scope of practice of an interpreter. 7. Can analyse their role and profession (as a Deaf Interpreter) in relation to the Deaf community. 8. Can describe and justify a Deaf Interpreter's profession. 9. Develops and updates their skills and knowledge of interpreting and working languages and -cultures. 	<p>Communication & co-operation The student</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Understands the main factors in effective interaction and communication. 2. Can act in multilingual contexts. 3. Recognizes and can solve challenges in interaction attributable to cultural- and status differences. 4. Can utilize multiprofessional collaboration and can engage customers to take part in the interpreting. 5. Is able to work in different teams with customers and colleagues. 6. Strives for equal and confidential communication by adapting their actions and communication to accommodate (the communication of) those present. 7. Can use communications technology in the manner and level called for by assignments. 8. Can develop their work community by giving and receiving feedback.
<p>Working languages & cultures The student</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is able to choose appropriate language and communication method suitable for the customer and can adapt their own communication. 2. Can work flexibly across a range of registers, genres and variations of working languages. 3. Can analyse and apply different culturally characteristic manners, norms and language forms in different environments. 4. Can analyse and take into account the impact of culture, identity and status on the interpreting situation (power relationships, minority vs majority). 5. Recognizes the linguistic and cultural diversity of Deaf communities. 6. Can analyse language and communication as a multimodal phenomenon from the perspective of interaction and meaning. 7. Is familiar with and can utilize the latest research on their working languages. 8. Can analyse and use their working languages flexibly and creatively in different contexts. 	<p>Interpretation The student</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Understands the outlines of interpreting assignments and can prepare for them appropriately. 2. Knows the theoretical premises of interpreting/translating and can apply them in their work. 3. Masters the techniques, methods and strategies central to their work and can apply them according to customer, situation, and environment. 4. Can keep the focus of interpretation on the information relevant to discourse. 5. Can interpret effectively, promoting the interaction. 6. Is able to monitor (evaluate and correct) interpreting-/translation processes in detail.

Appendix 2: A full time 3-year programme visualization

Academic year Domain	First year 60 ects	Second year 60 ects	Third year 60 ects
Domain 1: Academic skills (30 ects)	Topic 1.1 Learning, reflection and development 5 ects	Topic 1.2 Entrepreneurship 5 ects Topic 1.3 Research and methodology 5/20 ects	Topic 1.3 Research and methodology 15/20 ects
Domain 2: Professionalism (25 ects)	Topic 2.1 Interpreter, society and professionalization 5 ects Topic 2.2 Deaf studies 5 ects	Topic 2.3 Ethics and decision making 5 ects Topic 2.4 Deaf Interpreters and cooperation 5 ects Topic 2.5 Well-being and ergonomics at work 5 ects	
Domain 3: Communication, languages and cultures (45 ects)	Topic 3.1 Multimodal communication 5 ects Topic 3.2 Cultural and linguistic diversity 5/10 ects Topic 3.3 Sign language/s and linguistics 5/10 ects Topic 3.4 Written/spoken language/s 5/15 ects Topic 3.5 International Sign 5 ects	Topic 3.2 Cultural and linguistic diversity 5/10 ects Topic 3.3 Sign language/s and linguistics 5/10 ects Topic 3.4 Written/spoken language/s 5/15 ects	Topic 3.4 Written/spoken language/s 5/15 ects
Domain 4: Interpreting (55 ects)	Topic 4.1 Introduction to interpreting 5 ects Topic 4.2 Translation 10 ects Topic 4.3 Interpreting theory and practice 5/15 ects	Topic 4.3 Interpreting theory and practice 10/15 ects Topic 4.4 Preparation and evaluation 5 ects Topic 4.5 Consumer assessment 5 ects	Topic 4.6 Interpreting skills in specific settings 15 ects
Domain 5:* Professional expertise (25 ects)			Professional expertise 25 ects

* Content of Professional expertise is dependent on e.g. needs of the society or prior knowledge and goals of the student. In this curriculum some general learning outcomes that can be applied to all options are defined. In addition to general learning outcomes, an example of an idea for additional learning outcomes related to Community interpreting to Deafblind people is also given. Similar additional learning outcomes should be designed for each available option. Options for Professional expertise can be e.g. following

- conference interpreting
- community interpreting for Deafblind people
- community interpreting for consumers with minimal language skills
- text-to-sign interpreting
- interpreting in media
- translation.

Appendix 3: Assessment 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, viscosity, 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)					
Cleanness and articulation (Clear signing, fluent, correct articulation and prosody)					

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 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	

Feedback:

--

Overall grade: ____