UNIVERSITY LANGUAGE SCHEME
2018/19
STAGE 6b

Learning outcomes:

Assessments at this level are designed to test the following learning outcomes:

- Produce accurate and stylistically-equivalent written translations in English of a wide range of text types in the foreign language relating to the social, political, commercial, technological and economic environment of the foreign language country/countries.
- Perform liaison interpreting tasks as an effective intermediary between speakers of the target language and English on both general and business related topics.

TASK 1 – Translation (50%):

Instructions:

You will translate a text from the target language into English. You will be given the text on the day of the assessment. Your translation is to be included in an English-speaking business journal, so you should aim to produce a text in English that reflects both the content and the style of the original text.

Time allowed: **1 hour 30 minutes**

Reference resources (specific corpus-based and bilingual dictionaries) allowed for the translation will be specified by your module leader. You may also use the language tools available in Word.

Translation assessments will take place in SHU week 20 (w/c 10th December 2018).

ULS (STAGES 5 & 6)
MARKING CRITERIA - TRANSLATIONS (T.L. TO ENGLISH)

Accuracy (40%)	
28-40 (1st)	The translation fully conveys the correct meaning of the original text, with no more than occasional, minor inaccuracies (or, possibly, an isolated, incorrect rendering).
24-27 (2.1)	The overall meaning is conveyed correctly, despite some inaccuracies which may include significant errors, providing these do not seriously impede the reader's understanding.
20-23 (2.2)	The meaning of the original text is conveyed although understanding of the translation is increasingly undermined by mistranslations towards the bottom end of this category.
16-19 (3rd)	The translation shows some understanding of the original text but it suffers from a substantial number of incorrect renderings, sometimes demonstrating gaps in vocabulary fundamental to the course.
0-15 (fail)	The translation does not convey the meaning of the original text, demonstrating little or no understanding of it. Many of the mistranslations stem from inadequate knowledge of the L2, particularly in respect of its vocabulary and structures.

Style/register (40%)	
28-40 (1st)	The translation reads like an equivalent, original text in English. It fully captures the style and tone of the original and demonstrates flair, imagination and a high level of fluency when coping with the more challenging elements.
24-27(2.1)	Style and tone of the original text is generally captured, despite occasional lapses where its influence has resulted in a small number of literal passages of inauthentic English. Sensitivity towards the activity of translation is limited.
20-23 (2.2)	The translation is inconsistent in capturing the style of the original. A significant number of passages contain literal renderings, producing inappropriate English which lacks fluency. There is only limited awareness of the nature of translation.
16-19 (3rd)	The translation rarely resembles an original English text. There is little fluency and scarcely any stylistic awareness.
0-15 (fail)	There is no attempt to capture the style or tone of the original, nor any apparent awareness of the need for this. As a result, the English version is frequently incomprehensible

Lexis/Idiom/Figures of Speech etc. (20%)	
14-20 (1st)	Consistently appropriate rendering of vocabulary and terminology. The translation copes extremely well with idioms, metaphors, culture-bound allusions included in the original text.
12-13 (2.1)	The vocabulary and terminology of the original and idioms, metaphors and culture-bound allusions are mostly translated in an appropriate manner.
10-11 (2.2)	Some of the vocabulary and terminology of the original and idioms, metaphors and culture-bound allusions are translated in an appropriate manner. However, there are a number of lapses.
8-9 (3rd)	Vocabulary, and terminology are occasionally dealt with appropriately and, at times, there is an attempt to translate idioms, metaphors and culture-bound allusions. However, there are frequent lapses in this category.
0-7 (fail)	Choice of vocabulary, and terminology is very rarely appropriate and there is little or no attempt to translate idioms, metaphors and culture-bound allusions.

Task 2 – Interpreting (50%):

Instructions:

You will act as liaison interpreter for an interview based on a scenario that you will be given two weeks before the assessment.

The exercise will last for approximately **10 minutes**

You are allowed to take notes during the exercise and you may ask for clarification at any point.

Interpreting assessments will take place in SHU weeks 36 and 37 (w/c 1st and 8th April 2019).

ULS STAGE 6b
MARKING CRITERIA FOR INTERPRETING

Meaning (50%)

40-50	Outstanding. All, or virtually all the conversation correctly interpreted
35-39	Very good. No major factual distortion/omission but there are a few minor inaccuracies of detail.
30-34	Good. The overall message is conveyed but there may be one major factual distortions/omissions and/or a number of minor inaccuracies of detail.
25-29	Satisfactory. Most of the overall message is conveyed but there are one or two major factual distortions/omissions and quite a number of minor inaccuracies of detail.
20-24	Barely adequate. Some of the message is lost due to a small number of major factual distortions/omissions and many inaccuracies of minor detail.
10-19	Poor. A substantial part of the message is lost due to a number of major factual distortions/omissions and many inaccuracies of minor detail.
0-9	Very poor. None or hardly any of the message is correctly conveyed due to a large number of major factual distortions/omissions.

Fluency/speed of delivery (10%)

9-10	Outstanding. Communication is effortless and the speed of delivery is close to that of original speakers
7-8	Very good. Communication takes place at a reasonable speed without serious disruption/intrusion despite one or two pauses/reformulations and/or requests for repetition or clarification.
6	Good. Communication takes place at a reasonable speed but there are some pauses/reformulations and/or a few requests for repetition and clarification.
5	Satisfactory. Communication is sustained despite a number of pauses/reformulations and/or a number of requests for repetition and clarification.
3-4	Barely adequate. Communication is generally sustained despite frequent pauses/reformulations and/or a number of requests for repetition and clarification.
2	Poor. Communication is seriously impeded by long pauses, very frequent reformulations and numerous requests for repetition and clarification.
0-1	Very poor. Communication is slow and disjointed due very long pauses and very frequent reformulations and numerous requests for repetition and clarification.

Appropriateness of Language (15%)

14-15	Outstanding. The candidate uses the appropriate register and terminology and shows sensitivity to the linguistic context and his/her role(s) in the context. He/she conveys fully the attitudes and tone of the original speakers.
12-13	Very good. The candidate shows sensitivity to the linguistic context and his/her role in this context by using appropriate terminology most of the time and nearly always adopting the correct linguistic register. He/she mostly conveys the attitude and tone of the original speakers.
10-11	Good. The candidate attempts and usually succeeds in using the appropriate terminology and register(s) in the context. He/she is sensitive to the attitude and tone of the original speaker and usually conveys these.

8-9	Satisfactory. The candidate sometimes succeeds in using the appropriate terminology and register(s) but there are gaps in his/her production and occasional gaffs. He/she shows some sensitivity to the attitude and tone of the original speakers and is sometimes able to convey these.
6-7	Barely adequate. The candidate occasionally succeeds in producing the terminology and register(s) which are appropriate in the context. He/she shows little sensitivity to the attitude and tone of the original speakers and only occasionally conveys these.
4-5	Poor. The candidate only occasionally succeeds in producing the terminology and register(s) which are appropriate in the context. He/she shows very little sensitivity to the attitude and tone of the original speakers and only occasionally attempts to convey these.
0-3	Very poor. The candidate has not produced sufficient evidence of competence in the use of terminology and register(s) appropriate in the context. He/she shows no sensitivity to the attitude and tone of the original speakers.

Grammatical accuracy (15%)

14-15	Outstanding. Virtually error free.
12-13	Very good. Grammatical structures are understood and are used accurately. There is a minimum of errors and those are of a very minor nature.
10-11	Good. Basic grammar is sound and errors only occur in the most difficult areas.
8-9	Satisfactory. The grammatical structures are known but success in applying them is inconsistent, especially in the less common structures.
6-7	Barely adequate. There are many errors but communication is not impeded.
4-5	Poor. There are a large number of serious errors due to gaps in basic grammar.
0-3	Very poor. Errors are elementary and so numerous that they impede communication.

Pronunciation (10%)

10	Outstanding. Accent and intonation are comparable to that of a native speaker.
7-9	Very good. Accent and intonation are largely authentic.
6	Good. Only minor interference from mother tongue.
5	Satisfactory. Some interference from mother tongue sound patterns which cause occasional and minor difficulties in communication.
4	Barely adequate. A large number of errors due to strong interference from mother tongue sound patterns.
3	Poor. Difficult for a native speaker to follow due to poor command of pronunciation and intonation.
0-2	Very poor. Almost completely unintelligible. Very difficult for a native speaker to follow.