



## **Module 3**

### **Unit 7**

#### **Tasks**

---

Task 1: Multiple choice .....	2
Task 2 .....	4
Task 3 .....	6
Task 4 .....	8
Task 4: Handout 1 .....	9
Task 4: Handout 2 .....	11
Task 4: Handout 3 .....	13

---

## Module 3

### Unit 7: Evaluation

#### Task 1: Multiple choice<sup>1</sup>

##### Question 1

Complete the following sentence: The aim of any evaluation is to...

- a) show you know more than someone else.
- b) check an endeavour is meeting its goals.
- c) improve the original as you see fit.
- d) provide an objective description.

##### Question 2

What does a formative evaluation aim to do?

- a) Assess the final result.
- b) Check the experience of persons with sight loss (PSL).
- c) Impose your ideas on another person's work.
- d) Improve the final result.

##### Question 3

What does a summative evaluation aim to do?

- a) Assess the final result.
- b) Improve the final result.
- c) Impose your ideas on another person's work.
- d) Check the experience of PSL.

---

<sup>1</sup> The responses are based on the ADLAB PRO core videos. Only one answer is correct.

#### Question 4

Which of the following is not a stakeholder in AD quality?

- a) AD users.
- b) Audio describers.
- c) The venue.
- d) People who are D/deaf or hard of hearing.

#### Question 5

Complete the following sentence: The dry run is an example of...

- a) Embedded evaluation.
- b) Summative evaluation
- c) Criticising your co-describer.
- d) A vocal warm up.



## Module 3

### Unit 7: Evaluation

#### Task 2

##### Aim(s):

- Learners can list 6 macrocriteria on which quality in live AD can be evaluated and 2 deviations from each of those criteria.

**Grouping:** individual, small groups.

**Approximate timing:** 30 minutes for the class presentation, with 90 minutes preparation prior to the class.

##### Material and preparation needed:

- Writing materials.
- Handout for Task 4.
- Recommended reading: Fryer, Louise and Amelia Cavallo (2018) Integrated Access Inquiry 2017-18 Report. *Extant*, retrieved from [http://extant.org.uk/docs/uploads/Extant\\_Integrated\\_Access\\_Report\\_2018\\_Full\\_Length.docx](http://extant.org.uk/docs/uploads/Extant_Integrated_Access_Report_2018_Full_Length.docx)
- Recommended reading: Fryer, L. (2019). Quality Assessment in Audio description: Lessons learned from Interpreting. In E. Huertas-Barros, S. Vandepitte & E. Iglesias-Fernández (Eds.), *Quality Assurance and Assessment Practices in Translation and Interpreting*, (pp. 155-177). Hershey: IGI-Global.

## **Development:**

Ask learners to read relevant literature about quality in AD and give a short presentation about what to listen/look out for at a dry run. It may be useful to use the handouts and for groups of learners to divide the macro criteria between them.



## Module 3

### Unit 7: Evaluation

#### Task 3

##### Aim(s):

- Learners can deliver constructive criticism of their own and other people's AD.
- Learners can amend their own work in response to peer/teacher/user evaluation or feedback.

**Grouping:** pairs.

**Approximate timing:** 30 minutes.

##### Material and preparation needed:

- Additional video for Unit 1 (AV AV\_M3\_U1\_1).
- AD Scripts written for Tasks in Unit 4.
- Evaluation sheets in the handout.
- Recommended reading: Chapter 6 (pp. 81 – 84): Fryer, L. (2016) *An Introduction to Audio Description: A Practical Guide*. London: Routledge.

##### Development:

Ask pairs of learners to use the evaluation sheets to assess their own and their peer's AD scripts created in Task 4.2.

### **Additional comments:**

As a group discuss any differences between self- and peer evaluation and the extent to which learners were influenced by the professional description. As a follow up ask learners to amend their scripts and repeat the self-evaluation process, noting how their scripts had changed.



## Module 3

### Unit 7: Evaluation

#### Task 4

##### Aim(s):

- Learners can amend their work in response to peer/teacher evaluation.

**Grouping:** pairs.

**Approximate timing:** 15 minutes.

##### Material and preparation needed:

- Additional video for Unit 1 (AV\_M3\_U1\_1).
- Revised scripts written for Task 2 in Unit 4.
- Evaluation sheets in the handout for Task 4.

##### Development:

Ask learners to present their amended scripts to the class and explain where and why they amended their AD.

##### Additional comments:

As a follow up, learners could comment on how evaluation criteria might differ for screen AD.



## Task 4: Handout 1

### Evaluation sheets: 1. Accuracy

Criterion	Band	Effectiveness of visual information conveyed	AD ref.	Ability
<p><b>Accuracy</b></p> <p>The quality of faithfully conveying the visual information of the Source Text (ST) with semantic and pragmatic equivalence, i.e. reproducing the same meaning and intended effect</p> <p>Deviations from accuracy should be considered in terms of the effect on the coherence/logic and faithful rendering of the message</p> <p>Examples of deviations: omissions, additions, and unjustifiable changes of the meaning; failure</p>	6	The visual information was delivered accurately with intended effect.		Complete understanding of the needs of users
	5	The visual information was generally delivered with intended effect but a few minor deviations from the source text were found, which did not significantly affect the overall meaning or coherence.		Good understanding of the needs of users
	4	The visual information was mostly delivered but some deviations from the source text with an impact on the meaning and effect but coherence was maintained.		Adequate understanding of the needs of users
	3	The message was delivered inaccurately with many deviations from the source text and coherence was		Inadequate understanding of the needs of users

to convey the emotion or visual impact of the scene; poor use of pronouns leading to confusion.		compromised.		
	2	The message was delivered inaccurately with serious deviations from the source text and incoherence.		Poor understanding of the needs of users
	1	The interpreted message was incoherent and completely inconsistent with the source text.		Very limited understanding of the needs of users
	Mark		/6	



## Task 4: Handout 2

### Evaluation sheet: 2. Language

Criterion	Band	Linguistic Quality of AD	AD ref	Ability
<p><b>Language</b></p> <p>The quality of faithfully conveying the message of the ST in language that is <sup>SEP</sup>vivid, succinct and appropriate.</p> <p>Deviations should be considered in terms of the effect on the rendering of the message, making it unclear, ambiguous or hard to understand.</p> <p>Examples of deviations: Uneconomic use of language; clumsy language use (cacophony); grammatical errors; inappropriate use of pronouns; poor</p>	6	Excellent use of language with no linguistic errors and vivid & appropriate expressions.		Excellent language proficiency
	5	Very good use of language using appropriate expressions with a few minor linguistic errors that do not hinder immediate appreciation of the ST.		Very good language proficiency
	4	Good use of language with very few linguistic errors that hinder immediate comprehension. A few minor inappropriate target language expressions were found.		Good language proficiency
	3	Adequate use of language with some linguistic errors that hinder comprehension and some inappropriate expressions		Adequate language proficiency

word order; Use of anachronisms; or language that is bland or inaccurate.	2	Inadequate use of language with many linguistic errors. Inappropriate words and expressions were consistently found.		Inadequate language proficiency
	1	Poor language use. Difficult to understand with inappropriate choice of words and expressions.		Poor language proficiency
	<b>Mark</b>			<b>/6</b>



## Task 4: Handout 3

### Evaluation sheet: 3. Synchrony

Criterion	Band	Quality of AD Timing	Ability
<p><b>Synchrony</b></p> <p>The AD was successfully woven around the dialogue, music and sound effects.</p> <p>Examples of deviations: talking over dialogue or important sound effects; describing too soon or too late (asynchronously); giving away the plot.</p>	6	Excellent timing with no deviations.	Excellent timing
	5	Very good timing with very few deviations.	Very good timing
	4	Good timing with a few deviations.	Good timing
	3	Adequate timing with a few deviations	Adequate timing
	2	Inadequate timing with frequent deviations.	Inadequate timing
	1	Poor timing with frequent deviations.	Poor timing
	<b>Mark</b>	<b>/6</b>	
<b>Total Mark</b>		<b>/24</b>	

Creation of these training materials was supported by ADLAB PRO (Audio Description: A Laboratory for the Development of a New Professional Profile), financed by the European Union under the Erasmus+ Programme, Key Action 2 – Strategic Partnerships, Project number: 2016-1-IT02-KA203-024311.

The information and views set out in these training materials are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the European Union.

Neither the European Union institutions and bodies nor any person acting on their behalf may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein.

