|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable (Title): | | D1.7 Survey Analysis | Date: | 29/07/2022 |
| Work package: | Skills Needs Identification | | | |
| External evaluator (Name): | | Juliet Achieng Owuor | | |
| 1. **Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:\*** | | | | |
| 1. **structure and content** | | | **Score**:80 /100 | |
| The introduction section provides very little background information. The topics being addressed in the survey are not clearly elaborated beyond this “It will contain information relating to the demographic profile of participants, organisational insights, stakeholder engagement, identified skills (both current and future skills requirements), training needs and recognition of training and finally business trend analysis.”  The dissemination campaign is comprehensively elaborated starting from the languages to be used for the survey, details about the survey (content and time taken), additional information collected, and how the survey was disseminated. Why did you settle for the selected languages?  The flow is great, main points clearly highlighted. Presenting the main trends for the country level analysis is helpful. It is easy to pick them up and get an idea of what is happening in different countries. | | | | |
| 1. **length** | | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| Very appropriate! The introduction and methodology section before getting to the main content of this report which were the training legislations in different countries offers good background information. | | | | |
| 1. **format** | | | **Score**: 70/100 | |
| 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 mix of tables, graphs, pie charts and even word cloud is great. It makes the report appealing to the reader and easy to pick the main points.  More than 90% of the figures and tables in the deliverable both in the main and annex sections are not numbered making it to refer to them directly. The authors refereed to them as the table/figure on the left or right.  Majority of the figures did not have labels for the x and y axis.  The pie charts did not have % making it difficult to compare the results especially when there were small differences in the sizes of the pies.  The legend in the figure on page 37 should be defined. | | | | |
| 1. **English language use** | | | **Score**: 80/100 | |
| Excellent. Correct tenses, spelling, terms used, simple language.  Which tasks are these (task 1.3 and task 1.4) in full?  Work Package 1,full name should have been provided  The text in the description of the report on page 1 was copy pasted directly from the project proposal because it is in future tense instead of present tense.  “It will contain information relating” copy pasted from the proposal. So the tense is in future instead of present  I recommend a language check to correct the few mistakes present. | | | | |
| 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**: 85/100 | |
| The deliverable has identified the current and future skills needs which was one of the main project’s goals. It is good to see that the skills assessment was conducted in line with the skills categories that were identified across the project, shows link with the other work packages.  In the proposal, the project planned to identify global trends, but the survey’s focus was Europe. Where does global come in, for this case?  The results from the survey are expected to support the development of a strategy at the EU and Country level to improve the skills which will make the strategy reliable because it represents the real situation as it currently is at the EU and country levels. | | | | |
| 1. **comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)** | | | **Score**: 80/100 | |
| The target audience of the survey was not specified in the introduction and the questions to be assessed were not elaborated.  There was little/no mention of how these results will be applied in the next project tasks. Since the report is not available to the public, is it possible to summarize the results in the form of a policy brief or factsheets to inform policy makers? The respondents indicated the need for policy initiatives in digitalization, sustainability, business and entrepreneurship skills, and bio industries, sharing the outcomes of the survey with the policy makers could be a starting point. These results should also be presented in meetings where policy makers are present so that they can be aware of what is missing an example of such meetings is the European Forest Week. The project can organize a side event. | | | | |
| 1. **reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)** | | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| The sample size is reliable because of the high number of the respondents (517) from 29 countries within the European Union, as well as countries outside of the European Union, and within the European Economic Area (EEA), which surpassed the target of 300 that was stated in the project proposal. Maybe if the data collection period was long enough more than two months, more responses would have been collected.  The results show a true picture of the situation in Europe for many topics, that means that the project did a great job. Does the infographic information collected from the survey represent the true picture of the sector? For example, as having more males than females, or the average age of the stakeholders.  The depth of the analysis is excellent for example for organizational insights, analysis of skills at three levels.  My concern is about the unequal distribution of responses. Why did Spain and Italy have more responses compared to other countries? What did they do to achieve that? It should be stated that results from countries with low number of responses should be interpreted with caution. | | | | |
| 1. **usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)** | | | **Score**: 85/100 | |
| The analysis of the results at European level and country levels provides a holistic view of very many issues that the stakeholders in agriculture, bioeconomy and forestry sector need to be aware of.  I didn’t see the need for analysis the identified skills across sectoral levels because even the results revealed that there were no differences in opinions regarding the importance of the skills except for the bio-economy sector which was divided into three categories.  The seven skills groups assessed: sustainability skills, digitalisation skills, bioeconomy skills (Agriculture), bioeconomy Skills (Forestry and food industry), soft skills and business and entrepreneurship skills are very essential therefore focusing the survey to address them is a brilliant idea. Most these topics have also not been sufficiently investigated before, so the outcomes of the survey contribute to the knowledge in these areas. Most research usually investigate soft skills or entrepreneurship separately and single country focus, I like how this survey brought together all these aspects at European level.  It is impressive that the survey did not end at only identifying the skills but went a step further to investigate the training aspects. I haven’t come across this information before, that was very creative!  To increase the usefulness, please consider summarizing the outcomes into a policy brief of factsheets for policy makers. | | | | |
| 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**: 85/100 | |
| Bioeconomy & Forestry domain has been well covered. Current and future skills for the Bioeconomy sector were identified. The assessment was comprehensive because it looked at bioeconomy from three angles: Agriculture, Forestry and Food Industry. This was helpful because the skills needs are different for these three groups and separating them provided a good opportunity to determine the specific skills for forestry which would have otherwise been overshadowed by agriculture.  Gaps in training provision also in bioeconomy were identified.  Trends at country and EU levels on bioeconomy have been presented. So far this is the deliverable that has widely covered bioeconomy and forestry. | | | | |
| 1. **Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?** | | | **Score**: 80/100 | |
| Subsections 3.2 and 3.3 clearly detail the stakeholders involved. There is a lot of diversity in the categories of stakeholders who participated in the survey. Splitting the analysis of the organizational profiles helps to further highlight the diversity among the engaged groups.  How were the farmers reached? It is surprising to see them on top of the stakeholders profiles list. Policy makers are also presented which is a group that is usually not well represented and also hard to reach.  More students should have been engaged.  Bio-based industries did not respond to the survey but I believe that you did not miss out on much because this is something that is yet to be established so there are few players involved at the moment but it would still add value to get their perception. | | | | |
| 1. **Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?** | | | **Score**: 85/100 | |
| The dissemination plan was well described. The target group should have been stated and the topics of the survey well elaborated. Are the current respondents what was expected or how are they similar to or different form the original target? | | | | |
| 1. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable? | | | **Score**: 80/100 | |
| The interesting findings on stakeholders profiles, differences across countries and trends are supported by the results of the survey.  The conclusion should have gone deeper into highlighting the main interesting results from the EU and country level comparisons. I find the conclusion so brief, it does not provide sufficient policy recommendations. | | | | |
| 1. **Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?** | | | **Score**: 70/100 | |
| There were no recommendations provided by this deliverable to the best of my knowledge. This was not the objective of the task and the deliverable. However summarising the main findings would have been helpful just like how it was done in the country level analysis where the main trends were listed. Otherwise one needs time to read the entire report to be able to identify the trends. | | | | |
| **Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:** | | | **Overall Score**: 81.54/100 | |
| Very good! The report comprehensively highlights the findings from the survey which were very interesting and touched on topics that have been least investigated. The results will contribute to increasing the knowledge the respective fields. To be able to reach a wider audience, recommendations from the results should be developed and presented to policy makers and universities. A scientific paper should also be developed out of this deliverable. | | | | |
| 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 |