

**The University of Leeds**  
**EXTERNAL EXAMINER'S REPORT**

ACADEMIC YEAR: 2016-17

QAT Received 15/03/2018

**Part A: General Information**

**Subject area and awards being examined**

Faculty / School of:	School of Languages, Cultures and Societies – Centre for Translation Studies
Subject(s):	<i>MODL5042M Interpreting Skills: Spanish</i> <i>MODL5716M Simultaneous Interpreting: Spanish</i> <i>MODL5766M Consecutive and Bilateral Interpreting: Spanish</i> <i>MODL5119M Specialised Spanish-English Translation A</i> <i>MODL5129M Specialised Spanish-English Translation B</i> <i>MODL5302M Extended Translations (Spanish)</i> <i>MODL5046M English as Retour Interpreting Language (Spanish)</i>
Programme(s) / Module(s):	MACITS, MATSI, MAATS
Awards (e.g. BA/BSc/MSc etc):	MA

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

**Points of innovation and/or good practice**

*Please highlight areas of innovation or good practice within the programmes or processes you have been involved with in this box.*  
 All processes for scrutiny of samples have been conducted very effectively in terms of the information and documentation provided and the time framework to confirm the marks.

All aspects of good practices that I praised last year have been kept in the programmes.

**Enhancements made from the previous year**

*Please highlight any enhancements made to the programme(s) or processes over the past year in this box.*  
 The moderation process was easier for me this year, particularly because the process in place to be able to listen to the interpreting recordings worked much more effectively (no buffering issues) and I was able to moderate the relevant samples easily.

**Matters for Urgent Attention**

*No areas or matters for urgent attention*

**For Examiners in the first year of appointment**

1.	Were you provided with an External Examiner Handbook?	Y / N
2.	Were you provided with copies of previous External Examiners' reports and the School's responses to these?	Y / N
3.	Were you provided with a External Examiner Mentor?	Y / N

**For Examiners completing their term of appointment**

4.	Have you observed improvements in the programme(s) over the period of your appointment?	Y / N
5.	Has the school responded to comments and recommendations you have made?	Y / N

6.	Where recommendations have not been implemented, did the school provide clear reasons for this?	Y / N N/A
7.	Have you acted as an External Examiner Mentor?	Y / N

*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*

The learning and teaching provision seems to maintain the level of quality I observed in the previous year. The level of the pieces of assignments, including exams, was appropriate and intellectually stimulating. The range of marks obtained by students in different modules showed good performances overall, some of them particularly good, with some students achieving a mark in the mid-70s and 80 for one individual piece of assessment. This reflects not only students' capabilities but also the quality of teaching. There were also some fails, particularly in the interpreting-related modules, but these were all well justified by the comments from tutors.

## Standards

8.	Is the overall programme structure coherent and appropriate for the level of study?	Y / N
9.	Does the programme structure allow the programme aims and intended learning outcomes to be met?	Y / N
10.	Are the programme aims and intended learning outcomes commensurate with the level of award?	Y / N
11.	Did the Aims and ILOs meet the expectations of the national subject benchmark (where relevant)?	Y / N
12.	Is the programme(s) comparable with similar programmes at other institutions?	Y / N

*Please use this box to explain your overall impression of the programme structure, design, aims and intended learning outcomes.*

I have worked for several institutions and have been involved in various translation and interpreting programmes throughout the last ten years and I believe the programme structure, design and ILOs are of similar standard as in peer institutions and national benchmarks.

13.	Is the influence of research on the curriculum and learning and teaching clear?	Y / N
-----	---	-------

*Please explain how this is/could be achieved (examples might include: curriculum design informed by current research in the subject; practice informed by research; students undertaking research)*

The curriculum seems to be in line with current research on the subject. The research by \_\_\_\_\_ seems to also inform curriculum design.

14.	Does the programme form part of an Integrated PhD?	Y / N N/A
-----	--	--------------

*Please comment on the appropriateness of the programme as training for a PhD:*

15.	Does the programme include clinical practice components?	Y / N N/A
-----	--	--------------

*Please comment on the learning and assessment of practice components of the curriculum here:*

16.	Is the programme accredited by a Professional or Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB)?	Y / N Unsure
-----	--	-----------------

*Please comment on the value of, and the programme's ability to meet, PSRB requirements here:*  
The fact that the program has received EMT accreditation shows it meets the PSRB requirements

## Assessment and Feedback

17.	Does the programme design clearly align intended learning outcomes with assessment?	Y / N
<p><i>Please comment on the assessment methods and the appropriateness of these to the ILOs, in particular: 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.</i></p> <p>The design and structure of the assessment methods are appropriate to measure the ILOs.</p> <p>The marks were consistent across the whole cohort in each module and the feedback provided by the markers was generally detailed and constructive. The samples I scrutinised were first- and second-marked. Overall performance was of similar standard as the previous year, although on this occasion a few more students failed interpreting-related assignments which is not surprising given the complexity of interpreting. Satisfactory overall marks, including some outstanding performances in several cases is a clear indicator of the quality of teaching.</p>		
18.	Is the design and structure of the assessment methods appropriate to the level of award?	Y / N
19.	Were students given adequate opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the programme aims and intended learning outcomes?	Y / N
<p><i>Please comment on 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:</i></p> <p>Please see refer to the comments I have provided for question 12 and 17.</p>		
<p><i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make in relation to assessment and feedback:</i></p> <p>Tutors could be encouraged to be more consistent in how much feedback they provide students with. While feedback is clear and highlights both areas strengths and areas for improvement, sometimes there are discrepancies with some tutors providing very detailed feedback and other tutors providing more concise feedback (a couple of sentences).</p>		

## The Progression and Awards Process

20.	Were you provided with guidance relating to the External Examiner's role, powers and responsibilities in the examination process?	Y / N
21.	Was the progression and award guidance provided sufficient for you to act effectively as an External Examiner?	Y / N
22.	Did you receive appropriate programme documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / N
23.	Did you receive appropriate module documentation for your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / N
24.	Did you receive full details of marking criteria applicable to your area(s) of responsibility?	Y / N
25.	Were you provided with all draft examination papers/assessments?	Y / N
26.	Was the nature and level of the assessment questions appropriate?	Y / N
27.	Were suitable arrangements made to consider your comments on assessment questions?	Y / N
28.	Was sufficient assessed work made available to enable you to have confidence in your evaluation of the standard of student work?	Y / N
29.	Were the examination scripts clearly marked/annotated?	Y / N
30.	Was the choice of subjects for final year projects and/or dissertations appropriate?	Y / N
31.	Was the method and standard of assessment appropriate for the final year projects and/or dissertations?	Y / N

32.	Were the administrative arrangements satisfactory for the whole process, including the operation of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y / N
33.	Were you able to attend the Progression and Awards Board meeting?	Y / N
34.	Were you satisfied with the recommendations of the Progression and Awards Board?	Y / N
35.	Were you satisfied with the way decisions from the School Special Circumstances meeting were communicated to the Progression and Awards Board?	Y / N
<i>Please use this box to provide any additional comments you would like to make on the questions above:</i>		

#### Other comments

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

I would like to thank \_\_\_\_\_ for their efficiency and professionalism throughout the whole year. They both have been very helpful and have always answered my queries in a very prompt manner.

As regards the **Specialised Translation modules**, I was pleased to see to see that the suggestion I made last year about including a module proforma/outline of the module was incorporated this year. This made my work easier as I had a wide picture of the module, the assessment tasks, the time when they took place, the percentage allocated, etc. The take-home test was clearly first and second-marked, a clear sample of the work of 8 student was sent to me and the marks were consistent and fair across the cohort. In a few occasions, the crosses in the feedback sheet did not fully correspond with the final mark, sometimes they seemed to indicate a lower mark than the agreed mark given but I think this is just because they were not adjusted after agreeing the final mark. Perhaps more emphasis can be put on this to ensure there is a correspondence. Regarding the timed-test, again all the material was very clear and it was good to see a scanned copy with the original marked scripts. The feedback was clear and to the point and always using a positive approach. Marks higher in Sem 2, which shows student's progression

Regarding the **interpreting modules** the topics were current and challenging. This year I did not have any problems with the video or the recording so that was very positive. I really welcome the videos since it gives the EE the opportunity to see body language. In my opinion marking was transparent and fair across the whole cohort. In terms of feedback, it was detailed and constructive and I particularly like that way the feedback was provided, with one column in the Excel sheet focusing on "Keep doing" and another column focusing on "Work on". This is a positive and encouraging way to provide feedback and it also clearly point out areas for improvement from student's perspective. I liked to see concrete examples of positive strategies and not so successful ones in the feedback as it gives an idea of the criticality of the error, for example. Marks lower than in the interpreting cohort but expected. There seem to be more fails than last year, but obviously cohorts are different and students who failed were definitely weaker than the rest of the students in the cohort.

As for the Extended Translation, I was particularly impressed by the feedback provided for the into English translations. The feedback was extremely detailed and the breakdown of illustrative examples of problems is really helpful from students' perspective. As improvement for next year, perhaps the course team could look at the possibility to provide external examiners with electronic copies of the project where we can see the in-text comments and feedback sheet online, rather than receiving them by post. It would be much easier if the scrutiny of projects could be done online instead of me having to scrutinise hard copies and send them back by post.