|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable (Title): | | D3.1: Training methodologies | Date: | 29/07/2022 |
| Work package: | New tools and training design | | | |
| External evaluator (Name): | | Juliet Achieng Owuor | | |
| 1. **Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:\*** | | | | |
| 1. **structure and content** | | | **Score**: 100/100 | |
| The content has been well elaborated. The flow is excellent, it is like reading a novel.  The introduction delivers a lot of useful information about how the task will be organized in a very concise manner. There are no repetitions or very long stories.  The points from Erasmus that were regarded during the decision on the training platforms is helpful to the reader because most of us are not well versed in them.  The chapter on learning objectives sets a good scene for the introduction of the training methodologies.  The chapters are organised very well all, each elaborates the different topics so well and in a step-by-step manner, after introduction comes pedagogical approaches followed by learning objectives then training methodologies and so on.  The learning objectives have been very well elaborated and sufficient examples of training methodologies provided. | | | | |
| 1. **length** | | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| Very appropriate! Does not take much time to read! Short paragraphs make the deliverable easy to read. | | | | |
| 1. **format** | | | **Score**: 80/100 | |
| The information on the first page should be separated in to two pages: a cover page with the title of the project followed by that of the report, FIELDS Project and Erasmus Programme logos and date it was published and authors names.  A nice colour (green or blue) be used for the cover page instead of leaving it white.  The remainder information from the table currently on page 1 be moved to page 2 together with the project partner logos.  The deliverable is full of text. More use of tables for example to summarize the training methods just like what was done in Table 1. | | | | |
| 1. **English language use** | | | **Score**: 95/100 | |
| Excellent. Correct tenses, spelling, vocabularies. The technical content was presented it in a way that can be understood by many readers.  Very few grammatical mistakes. | | | | |
| 1. **Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:** | | | | |
| 1. **relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)** | | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| It addresses a very important question about the most effective and efficient teaching methods. This is helpful especially in forestry where the uptake of online training methods has been slow until the pandemic happened, and things had to change drastically. The information provided will help in streamlining that.  The different learning styles have been well described; I am curious about how they were selected. A sentence or two had been provided to that effect but more information about this could have clarified this further as in what indicators were used to qualify a methodology to be featured?  The deliverable will contribute to the objective on skills improvement because it provides options on how to conduct the planned pilot training. | | | | |
| 1. **comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)** | | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| It has touched on so many relevant topics from pedagogical approaches to training methodologies offering definitions, describing their characteristics and activities involved, highlighting the differences among them. I have learnt a lot from this report.  I would recommend that a summary table be created to summarise the main points for some readers who might not have time to go through all the text provided. The table could highlight the main similarities and differences among each method, how it could be applied to different target groups.  With the challenge of forestry being a practical oriented discipline, I was hoping to see training methodologies that could help address the problem that was created by lockdown during the pandemic therefore making students miss out the chance to go for field work. | | | | |
| 1. **reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)** | | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| The team did a great job. They did a thorough research and listed their sources of information. This part was well executed. | | | | |
| 1. **usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)** | | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| The proposals are very applicable. The forest sector needs information on how to change training from face to face to online or hybrid. This deliverable provides useful information to guide the process. The fact that the recommended methods are going to be applied to the trainings to be carried out by the project is commendable. | | | | |
| 1. **a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?**   *\*only for Sustainability External Expert* | | | **Score**: /100 | |
| N/A | | | | |
| **b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?**  *\*only for Digitalization External Expert* | | | **Score**: /100 | |
| N/A | | | | |
| **c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?**  *\*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert* | | | **Score**: /100 | |
| N/A to this deliverable. The focus of the deliverable was to define the pedagogical approach that will  be used to develop the training programme in order to enhance the learning process. | | | | |
| 1. **Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?** | | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| There was no room to involve stakeholders for this task. But the methods identified target unique groups. I like the idea of targeting farmers and their advisors; these are the most forgotten group when it comes to training, yet they are important stakeholders. It was stated in the project proposal that foresters and their advisors are also targeted but I did not come across this in the report. | | | | |
| 1. **Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?** | | | **Score**: /100 | |
| N/A  This task did not require a detailed methodology, but I would still recommend that a description be provided on how the methods listed were selected. Including a justification on why the task was needed is a good idea but it was very brief. | | | | |
| 1. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable? | | | **Score**: 80/100 | |
| The proposed training methodologies are supported by evidence based on the previous chapters on pedagogical approaches and learning objectives. For the section on E-learning platform Access Modality, the authors compared different available tools and developed parameters for comparisons before they settled for Moodle. They provided sufficient reasons based on thorough research that they conducted. | | | | |
| 1. **Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?** | | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| The proposed teaching methods are relevant, some of them are not popular in forestry, I hope that this will be a chance for educators to pick them up and apply them. I would have appreciated if the authors could already state in a summary table which method would be applied to which group and which sector. | | | | |
| **Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:** | | | **Overall Score**: 89.55/100 | |
| Very good! The deliverable provides very useful information about teaching methodologies that many trainers can borrow and if well applied they can supplement in person teaching which was impossible during the pandemic.  I hope that the deliverable will be published as a scientific paper to increase the reach in this case within the academia community. | | | | |
| Date of external evaluation review: | | | 29/07/2022 | |
| Signature/Name: A picture containing shape  Description automatically generated Juliet Achieng Owuor | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Maximum number of points for a criterion** | **Range of scores** | | | |
|  | **Very good** | **Good** | **Fair** | **Weak** |
| 100 | 76-100 | 51-75 | 26-50 | 0-25 |