

Deliverable (Title):	D3.1: Training methodologies	Date:	26/08/2022
Work package:	New tools and training design		
External evaluator (Name):	Dimitrios Vlachos		
<b>1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*</b>			
<b>a) structure and content</b>		<b>Score: 80/100</b>	
<p>The content is comprehensive providing an overview of the pedagogical approaches that will be used to develop the training programmes in the project.</p> <p>The structure of the deliverable is efficient providing sufficient introductory information as well as explanations about the decisions taken regarding the means for developing the training courses. The authors provide a list of references that support the information provided.</p> <p>The deliverable should contain more information about state-of-the-art methodologies for persons with disabilities.</p>			
<b>b) length</b>		<b>Score: 95/100</b>	
<p>The length of the report is appropriate.</p>			
<b>c) format</b>		<b>Score: 80/100</b>	
<p>The format of the deliverable is sufficient. The introduction of graphs and tables with comparative information about the available systems and learning outcomes would contribute to a more efficient assessment procedure.</p>			
<b>d) English language use</b>		<b>Score: 95/100</b>	

\*Please check the grades' table at the end of this file. Reviewers' comments must be accurate, comprehensive, and fully articulated.

Very good use of the English language.

**2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:**

**a) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)**

**Score: 90/100**

The deliverable addresses satisfactory the key issues of the objectives of the task it belongs and the project in general. The authors provide a comprehensive overview of state-of-the-art training methodologies emphasizing the new tools and training design aspects.

**b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)**

**Score: 80/100**

The information provided is comprehensive. The introduction of graphs and tables with comparative information about the available systems and learning outcomes would enable an easier understanding of the characteristics of its system.

The deliverable should contain more information about state-of-the-art methodologies for persons with disabilities.

**c) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)**

**Score: 90/100**

The authors provide a list of references that support sufficiently the information provided enhancing its credibility.

**d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)**

**Score: 90/100**

\*Please check the grades' table at the end of this file. Reviewers' comments must be accurate, comprehensive, and fully articulated.

The authors provide useful information about several methodologies (in person classes, online learning, microlearning, gamification, etc.) based on the considering target groups and their different needs (farmers, students, and farmers advisors), and finally provide their recommendations about using the most suitable training platform.

**3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?**

*\*only for Sustainability External Expert*

**Score: /100**

Comments:

**b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?**

*\*only for Digitalization External Expert*

**Score: 80/100**

The deliverable focused on training implementation methods based on digital tools, covering their basic requirements, and technical aspects and capabilities. The authors could extend their study on the digital tools as enablers for the training of persons with disabilities.

**c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?**

*\*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert*

**Score: /100**

Comments:

<b>4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?</b>	<b>Score: /100</b>
<b>5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?</b>	<b>Score: /100</b>
N/A	
<b>6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?</b>	<b>Score: 90/100</b>
The conclusions and final recommendations have been clearly supported by pedagogical and technical evidence.	
<b>7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?</b>	<b>Score: 90/100</b>

\*Please check the grades' table at the end of this file. Reviewers' comments must be accurate, comprehensive, and fully articulated.

The authors recommend an open-source learning management system (LMS) which involves less costs related to software licences and maintenance/upgrades and offers the liberty to develop/expand the LMS, based on own goals and requirements, ensuring the sustainability and feasibility of the project.

**Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:**

**Overall Score:** 90/100

The authors provide very useful information about several methodologies and specific recommendations which enables their direct utilization for the next steps of the project.

Date of external evaluation review:

26/08/2022

Signature/Name: Dimitrios Vlachos

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

\*Please check the grades' table at the end of this file. Reviewers' comments must be accurate, comprehensive, and fully articulated.