Evaluation Criteria Identification

This form is for Quality Control and Monitor member (QCMM) to identify criteria for task evaluation.

**QCMM Name: Anintaya Khamkanya**

**WP No.: WP3**

**Task No.: 3.2 - Translating teaching materials between English and Thai**

1. **Objective(s) and Deliverable(s)**

The main objective(s) of this task:

 The objective of this task is to convert the developed teaching materials in Task 3.1 to be learning materials for students to ease learning of a large group of students.

The deliverable(s) of this task:

 Learning materials for students in English translated in Thai within its original.

1. **Process Monitoring & Assessment**

In your opinion, what should we look at in order to say that the task is done properly and met the objective?

The task is considered to be done successfully if the learning materials are translated correctly.

Can we measure them and how do we measure them? If you can’t measure it, please remove and find another one.

1. The correctness of translated learning materials must be reviewed by at least two reviewers.
2. The translation should have a high level of quality according to these following criteria.
3. Validity of translation.

The correctness of translation will be justified as follows

* 1. Able to convey the desired messages, the *main* concepts of the materials are conveyed correctly.
	2. Able to convey a complete context, *all* concepts are conveyed completely.
	3. Understandable, learning materials should be easy to read and to understand.
1. Reliability of translation

The translation should be consistent. Four criteria are summarized as follows.

* 1. Choice of words used, the material should use the right and suitable engineering terminology.
	2. Consistency of words used, the terminology or translated technical terms should be consistent for the whole document.
	3. Appropriateness, sentences should sound fluent and native. Sentences should be correct in terms of structure.
	4. Errors, the materials should not have typos or irrelevant use of unnecessary words.
1. The evaluation form is presented in Appendix I.
2. The Likert scale will be used to evaluate the translation quality. Evaluation scales are 5-Excellent, 4-Very Good, 3-Good, 2-Fair, and 1-Poor.
3. The translation quality score is calculated using the weighted average method. Suppose that we have *i* evaluation elements, where *i* = *1…n*; a score rated by a reviewer of the element *ith*  is defined as *xi*; *xmax* is the maximum rating scale; the weight for the *ith* evaluation element is denoted as *wi*, where $\sum\_{}^{}w\_{i}$=1.0 ; thus, the total translation quality score (*%Q*) can be calculated as

$$\%Q= \left(\frac{\sum\_{i=1}^{n}x\_{i}w\_{i}}{\sum\_{i=1}^{n}x\_{max}w\_{i}}\right)×100\%$$

1. To pass the translation assessment, translated materials must receive at least 80% on an average of the translation quality score from two reviewers. Otherwise, the revision of translated material must be submitted for the re-assessment process.
2. **Deliverable Assessment**

In your opinion, what should be the specifications of the deliverable(s)?

Learning materials developed for all courses must be translated correctly.

Please identify similar deliverable(s) elsewhere.

Not applicable. The outcomes are developed specifically for this project only.

Please rate those deliverables according to your specifications.

Not applicable.

What are the criteria or scales that you have used to rate those deliverables?

See Section (II).

According to your criteria, please set the target specifications for our deliverables to claim that the

objective is met?

Overall translation quality score of learning materials for all courses must be at least 80%.

**Appendix I: Translation Evaluation Form**

**Course Number and Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

(✓) Reviewer#1, (X) Reviewer#2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation elements** | **Scale****(5-Excellent, 1-Poor)** | **Weight** **(1.0)** |
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 1. **Validity**
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.1 Able to convey the desired messages  |  |  |  |  |  | **0.20** |
| 1.2 Able to convey a complete context |  |  |  |  |  | **0.20** |
| 1.3 Understandable |  |  |  |  |  | **0.20** |
| 1. **Reliability**
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * 1. Choice of words used
 |  |  |  |  |  | **0.10** |
| * 1. Consistency of words used
 |  |  |  |  |  | **0.10** |
| * 1. Appropriateness
 |  |  |  |  |  | **0.10** |
| * 1. Errors
 |  |  |  |  |  | **0.10** |
| 1. Translation Quality Score from Reviewer#1 = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ %
2. Translation Quality Score from Reviewer#2 = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ %
 |
|  Average Translation Quality Score = [(A)+(B)] / 2 = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ % |
|  **Translation Evaluation Result: [ ] Passed [ ] Failed** |

*Additional Comments: …*

*\*\*\* End of Document \*\*\**