

# The University of Leeds

## EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2013– 2014

### Part A: General Information

#### Subject area and awards being examined

Faculty / School of:	School of Modern Languages and Cultures/Centre for Translation Studies
Subject(s):	<i>MAAVTS MA Audiovisual Studies</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	MODL5207M Monolingual Subtitling & Text Compression MODL5204M Film Translation and Subtitling MODL5203M Audio-Visual Text Analysis MODL5303M Subtitling Project
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MA

#### Name and home Institution / affiliation of Examiner

#### Completed report

The completed report should be attached to an e-mail and sent as soon as possible, and no later than six weeks after the relevant meeting of the Board of Examiners, to [exexadmin@leeds.ac.uk](mailto:exexadmin@leeds.ac.uk).

Alternatively you can post your report to: **Head of Quality Assurance**  
Room 12:81, EC Stoner Building  
The University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT

### Part B: Comments for the Institution on the Examination Process and Standards

#### **Matters for Urgent Attention**

*If there are any areas which you think require urgent attention before the programme is offered again please note them in this box*

N/A

#### **Only applicable in first year of appointment**

*Were you provided with copies of previous relevant External Examiners' reports and the response of the School to these?*

N/A

#### **For Examiners completing their term of appointment**

*Please comment on your experience of the programme(s) over the period of your appointment, remarking in particular on changes from year to year and the progressive development and enhancement of the learning and teaching provision, on standards achieved, on marking and assessment and the procedures of the School*

N/A

## Standards

### 1. Please indicate the extent to which the programme Aims and Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) were commensurate with the level of the award

- *The appropriateness of the Intended Learning Outcomes for the programme(s)/modules and of the structure and content of the programme(s);*
- *The extent to which standards are appropriate for the award or award element under consideration.*

As noted in last year's report, the programme outcomes are appropriate and correspond to FHEQ Level 7 requirements. The structure and content of the programme has been well thought through combining research and practice in an appropriate manner.

### 2. Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?

- *The comparability of the programme(s) with similar programme(s) at other institutions and against national benchmarks and the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications.*

Yes, the MA programme is clearly comparable with similar programmes at other institutions and is in line with the FHEQ.

### 3. Please comment on the assessment methods and the appropriateness of these to the ILOs

- *The design and structure of the assessment methods, and the arrangements for the marking of modules and the classification of awards;*
- *The quality of teaching, learning and assessment methods that may be indicated by student performance.*

Assessment types are appropriate and map onto the ILOs. In the main module (*Film translation and subtitling*) students did very well indeed with marks in the high sixties or seventies. Looking at the programme as a whole, most grades tend to be in the 60-69% band. Student performance is very good and attainment rates are high.

### 4. Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the Aims and ILOs?

- *The academic standards demonstrated by the students and, where possible, their performance in relation to students on comparable courses;*
- *The strengths and weaknesses of the students as a cohort.*

Another strong cohort of students with only one resitting student. This year there was a joint group with the MA Applied Translation. All students worked on a CAT tool and Subtitling tool, translating parts of website and a subtitling file. There is an appropriate crossover between the two MA programmes and it is good to expose both cohorts to different source texts. There may be slightly different techniques involved but it still a question of working with text and image and allows students to practice a wider range of skills whilst relating these to their specific area of interest.

### 5. For Examiners responsible for programmes that include clinical practice components, please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum

N/A

### 6. Please comment on the nature and effectiveness of enhancements to the programme(s) and modules since the previous year

*It would be particularly helpful if you could also identify areas of good practice which are worthy of wider dissemination.*

There were some amendments to the feedback sheets this year which worked well (please refer to 13.).

### 7. Please comment on the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching

*This may include examples of curriculum design informed by current research in the subject; practice informed by research; students undertaking research.*

An additional permanent member of staff joined the team in 2013-14, with expertise in audiovisual translation. All members of the programme team contribute fully to research within the field and this informs the curriculum and the project work that is carried out by students. The students on the programme are therefore appropriately supported and they are made aware of the links between research and practice throughout. External professional subtitlers are also involved in teaching some of the specific subtitling classes which allows students to benefit directly from practitioners within the industry.

### 8. Where the programme forms part of an Integrated PhD, please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD

N/A

## For Examiners involved in mentoring arrangements

9. If you have acted as a mentor to a new External Examiner or have received mentor support please comment here on the arrangements

N/A

## The Examination/Assessment Process

10. The University and its Schools provide guidance for External Examiners as to their roles, powers and responsibilities. Please indicate whether this material was sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner.

*Whether External Examiners have sufficient access to the material needed to make the required judgements and whether they are encouraged to request additional information.*

I received the University's 2013-14 External Examiner Handbook which clearly presents guidance to External Examiners. This is supplemented by programme and course documentation provided by the Programme Leader.

11. Did you receive appropriate documentation relating to the programmes and/or parts of programmes for which you have responsibility, e.g. programme specifications or module handbooks, marking criteria?

*The coherence of the policies and procedures relating to External Examiners and whether they match the explicit roles they are asked to perform.*

Yes, I received appropriate documentation to cover the range of assessments on the MA programme. This included the team project, subtitling and commentary, monolingual subtitling and commentary and the subtitling project. Communication with the Programme Leader is excellent.

12. Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments? Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate? If not, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

The assessment for the MA programme is through coursework and there are no examinations. The nature and level of the questions and the topics for the project work and commentaries, were certainly appropriate.

13. Was sufficient assessed / examined work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work? Were the scripts clearly marked/annotated?

I received a range of work, including all borderlines, a distinction and failing work for the single resitting student. I found the marking to be fair and thorough as usual. I liked the amendments to the feedback sheets which is introduced by the following headings: "What you should continue doing; "What you should improve upon". It is helpful to signpost strengths and weaknesses to students in this way. Feedback is typed and provided electronically, allowing students to maintain a clear record. First and second marking procedures were clearly evidenced and feedback continues to be relevant and constructive.

14. Was the choice of subjects for dissertations appropriate? Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

Students complete a Subtitling Project rather than a dissertation and the topics for the projects were most certainly appropriate and at the correct level.

15. Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Board of Examiners? Were you able to attend the meeting? Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board?

I attended the Board where awards were confirmed. All student profiles were carefully considered with discussion of borderline cases and the regulations where necessary. External Examiners provided verbal commentary at the meeting and my own comments are included in the current report. As usual, administrative arrangements were excellent, the Board ran smoothly and the live recording of student results as grades and awards were confirmed, works extremely well.

16. Were appropriate procedures in place to give due consideration to mitigating circumstances and medical evidence?

Yes, all procedures were appropriate and students with mitigating circumstances were duly considered.

## Other comments

Please use this box if you wish to make any further comments not covered elsewhere on the form

N/A

# The University of Leeds

## EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2013– 2014

### Part A: General Information

#### Subject area and awards being examined

Faculty / School of:	Languages, Cultures and Societies
Subject(s):	Spanish/English and English/Spanish Translation
Programme(s) / Module(s):	MODL5302M MODL5119M MODL5129M
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MA

#### Name and home Institution / affiliation of Examiner

#### Completed report

The completed report should be attached to an e-mail and sent as soon as possible, and no later than six weeks after the relevant meeting of the Board of Examiners, to [exexadmin@leeds.ac.uk](mailto:exexadmin@leeds.ac.uk).

Alternatively you can post your report to: **Head of Quality Assurance**  
Room 12:81, EC Stoner Building  
The University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT

### Part B: Comments for the Institution on the Examination Process and Standards

#### **Matters for Urgent Attention**

*If there are any areas which you think require urgent attention before the programme is offered again please note them in this box*

n/a

#### **Only applicable in first year of appointment**

*Were you provided with copies of previous relevant External Examiners' reports and the response of the School to these?*

#### **For Examiners completing their term of appointment**

*Please comment on your experience of the programme(s) over the period of your appointment, remarking in particular on changes from year to year and the progressive development and enhancement of the learning and teaching provision, on standards achieved, on marking and assessment and the procedures of the School*

## Standards

1. **Please indicate the extent to which the programme Aims and Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) were commensurate with the level of the award**
- *The appropriateness of the Intended Learning Outcomes for the programme(s)/modules and of the structure and content of the programme(s);*
  - *The extent to which standards are appropriate for the award or award element under consideration.*

The Aims and ILO are very appropriate for the modules and standards are also appropriate.

2. **Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?**
- *The comparability of the programme(s) with similar programme(s) at other institutions and against national benchmarks and the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications.*

The modules compares with to those provided by similar institutions.

3. **Please comment on the assessment methods and the appropriateness of these to the ILOs**
- *The design and structure of the assessment methods, and the arrangements for the marking of modules and the classification of awards;*
  - *The quality of teaching, learning and assessment methods that may be indicated by student performance.*

Appropriate assessment methods are used, reflecting a realistic level of difficulty, student performance keeps reflecting good teaching practice.

4. **Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the Aims and ILOs?**
- *The academic standards demonstrated by the students and, where possible, their performance in relation to students on comparable courses;*
  - *The strengths and weaknesses of the students as a cohort.*

Students produce good quality work at MA level and their performance is comparable and on occasion superior to that of students on similar courses across the country.

5. **For Examiners responsible for programmes that include clinical practice components, please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum**

n/a

6. **Please comment on the nature and effectiveness of enhancements to the programme(s) and modules since the previous year**

*It would be particularly helpful if you could also identify areas of good practice which are worthy of wider dissemination.*

There have been no significant changes.

7. **Please comment on the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching**
- This may include examples of curriculum design informed by current research in the subject; practice informed by research; students undertaking research.*

There is evidence that teaching is informed by up to date research.

8. **Where the programme forms part of an Integrated PhD, please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD**

**For Examiners involved in mentoring arrangements**

9. If you have acted as a mentor to a new External Examiner or have received mentor support please comment here on the arrangements

n/a

**The Examination/Assessment Process**

10. The University and its Schools provide guidance for External Examiners as to their roles, powers and responsibilities. Please indicate whether this material was sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner.

*Whether External Examiners have sufficient access to the material needed to make the required judgements and whether they are encouraged to request additional information.*

Yes

11. Did you receive appropriate documentation relating to the programmes and/or parts of programmes for which you have responsibility, e.g. programme specifications or module handbooks, marking criteria?

*The coherence of the policies and procedures relating to External Examiners and whether they match the explicit roles they are asked to perform.*

Yes

12. Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments? Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate? If not, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

No draft papers/assessments were submitted but the nature and level of questions was consistently appropriate.

13. Was sufficient assessed / examined work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work? Were the scripts clearly marked/annotated?

Yes, I felt confident evaluating the standard of student work. I have mentioned to markers and programme leaders that handwritten comments are not always very legible.

14. Was the choice of subjects for dissertations appropriate? Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

Yes, I enjoyed reading the dissertations and thought the marks had been carefully considered.

15. Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Board of Examiners? Were you able to attend the meeting? Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board?

Yes.

16. Were appropriate procedures in place to give due consideration to mitigating circumstances and medical evidence?

Yes.

**Other comments**

Please use this box if you wish to make any further comments not covered elsewhere on the form

**The University of Leeds**  
**EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT**  
**ACADEMIC YEAR: 2013– 2014**

**Part A: General Information****Subject area and awards being examined**

Faculty / School of:	School of Languages, Cultures and Societies
Subject(s):	<i>Translation Studies (German)</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	MODL 5114M Specialised German-English Translation A MODL 5124M Specialised German-English Translation B MODL 5302M Extended Translations
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MA

**Name and home Institution / affiliation of Examiner****Completed report**

The completed report should be attached to an e-mail and sent as soon as possible, and no later than six weeks after the relevant meeting of the Board of Examiners, to [exexadmin@leeds.ac.uk](mailto:exexadmin@leeds.ac.uk).

Alternatively you can post your report to: **Head of Quality Assurance**  
Room 12:81, EC Stoner Building  
The University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT

**Part B: Comments for the Institution on the Examination Process and Standards****Matters for Urgent Attention**

*If there are any areas which you think require urgent attention before the programme is offered again please note them in this box*

N/A

**Only applicable in first year of appointment**

*Were you provided with copies of previous relevant External Examiners' reports and the response of the School to these?*

N/A

**For Examiners completing their term of appointment**

*Please comment on your experience of the programme(s) over the period of your appointment, remarking in particular on changes from year to year and the progressive development and enhancement of the learning and teaching provision, on standards achieved, on marking and assessment and the procedures of the School*

I have been very happy with what I have seen of the MATS at Leeds. Students are tested rigorously and will graduate from the programme with a range of skills which will make them very employable in the current market. Both written and oral/aural skills in the field of translation are addressed. I have been particularly impressed with the way in which students are encouraged to engage with the theoretical aspect of the discipline while at the same time applying that to the more practical side. Marking procedures have been consistent throughout with very little to pick up on.

**Standards****1. Please indicate the extent to which the programme Aims and Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) were commensurate with the level of the award**

- *The appropriateness of the Intended Learning Outcomes for the programme(s)/modules and of the structure and content of the programme(s);*
- *The extent to which standards are appropriate for the award or award element under consideration.*

As in previous years, the programme aims and the intended learning outcomes are fully commensurate with the level of award. They are in keeping with practice across the sector and in line with other institutions with which I am familiar.

**2. Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?**

- *The comparability of the programme(s) with similar programme(s) at other institutions and against national benchmarks and the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications.*

Yes

**3. Please comment on the assessment methods and the appropriateness of these to the ILOs**

- *The design and structure of the assessment methods, and the arrangements for the marking of modules and the classification of awards;*
- *The quality of teaching, learning and assessment methods that may be indicated by student performance.*

The assessment methods remain challenging. Students are tested and encouraged to show the full range of their abilities. The work produced in many cases attains professional standard. Marking methods and feedback are appropriate. Students appear well-prepared and engaged with the course.

**4. Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the Aims and ILOs?**

- *The academic standards demonstrated by the students and, where possible, their performance in relation to students on comparable courses;*
- *The strengths and weaknesses of the students as a cohort.*

The students have generally attained a high level of achievement in keeping with national standard, some attaining professional standard. Once again, the marks covered a broad range with both exceptional and lower marks, although the lower range was less apparent.

**5. For Examiners responsible for programmes that include clinical practice components, please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum**

N/A

**6. Please comment on the nature and effectiveness of enhancements to the programme(s) and modules since the previous year**

*It would be particularly helpful if you could also identify areas of good practice which are worthy of wider dissemination.*

As in previous years, the programme was largely unaltered. It is currently of a very high standard so I see no need for any changes to be made.

**7. Please comment on the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching**

*This may include examples of curriculum design informed by current research in the subject; practice informed by research; students undertaking research.*

Students are engaging with high-level translation theory as well as complex target texts of a complex nature, thus enabling progression to both PhD and career level translation.

**8. Where the programme forms part of an Integrated PhD, please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD**

N/A

**For Examiners involved in mentoring arrangements**



9. If you have acted as a mentor to a new External Examiner or have received mentor support please comment here on the arrangements

N/A

#### The Examination/Assessment Process

10. The University and its Schools provide guidance for External Examiners as to their roles, powers and responsibilities. Please indicate whether this material was sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner.

*Whether External Examiners have sufficient access to the material needed to make the required judgements and whether they are encouraged to request additional information.*

Dialogue with the school has been very effective and I was given access to the full range of material.

11. Did you receive appropriate documentation relating to the programmes and/or parts of programmes for which you have responsibility, e.g. programme specifications or module handbooks, marking criteria?

*The coherence of the policies and procedures relating to External Examiners and whether they match the explicit roles they are asked to perform.*

Yes.

12. Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments? Was the nature and level of the questions appropriate? If not, were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments?

Yes.

13. Was sufficient assessed / examined work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work? Were the scripts clearly marked/annotated?

Yes.

14. Was the choice of subjects for dissertations appropriate? Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate?

The choice of material for Extended Translation (equivalent to dissertation in this case) was entirely appropriate and challenging.

15. Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Board of Examiners? Were you able to attend the meeting? Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Board?

Procedures seem appropriate and efficient. I was not required to attend the Board.

16. Were appropriate procedures in place to give due consideration to mitigating circumstances and medical evidence?

Yes.

#### Other comments

**Please use this box if you wish to make any further comments not covered elsewhere on the form**

As in previous years, I was very impressed by the level of attainment. Students taking this course are being well-prepared for the world of work and those intending to go onto further study are also well-served. I have no criticisms to raise.

# School of Languages, Cultures and Societies

FACULTY OF ARTS



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

---

02 March 2015

Dear

Many thanks for your report on our postgraduate modules in translation and interpreting with German for 2013-14.

I am glad to hear that, while fully commensurate with the level of award, you found our assessment methods to be both rigorous and challenging, and that marking was consistent. I am delighted that you note that our graduates are equipped with skills for employment in the current market, with some students attaining professional standards. I am also very pleased to read that you find that our programmes also provide adequate theoretical preparation to enable students to progress to PhD. It is particularly heartening to read that you found the material chosen by students for their Extended Translation projects to be appropriate and challenging.

Finally, I wish to thank you once again for your ongoing support in ensuring the quality of our programmes and the assessment of our students.

With kind regards,

Exams Tutor  
Translation Studies