|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable (Title): | | D1.1: Stakeholders strategic plans and analysis report | Date: | 15/07/2022 |
| 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**:85 /100 | |
| * The introduction section provides sufficient overview of the project and the aims of the task, but at times it was difficult to distinguish between the project’s objective and the aims of the task. It would be good to describe the project first then end with the task. * The justification for developing the growth strategy is not strong enough, as it is, the necessity of having this document is not convincing enough yet we know that this exercise is important because this information is usually spread all over. * I like how you analysed the trends and policies for sustainability, bioeconomy and digitalisation separately, it helps in understanding them better. In as much as there is uniformity in how these sections have been presented, would it have been possible to also highlight the gaps/challenges in sustainability and bioeconomy as you did for digitalisation? * On section Also, 2.1.2.1, would it be possible to provide a link to these projects that you have mentioned? “Erasmus+ programme funded several projects related to sustainability topics.” As well as section 2.2.3 “Those involved in VET are no exception. The European Commission has captured more than 250 examples and ideas from over 30 countries of how VET providers and other VET stakeholders have adapted.” * It would be great to inform the readers in advance that more information about the European Projects mentioned in this report are described in detail in Table 1, like you did for the section on bioeconomy (2.3.2.1). What criteria was used to list projects currently found on Table 1 in the Annex? * You could add one column to Table 1 for the project websites. * Could the trends identified for each field be summarised in a policy brief and the opportunities/gaps listed as well as recommendations provided? This section is very relevant. | | | | |
| 1. **length** | | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| * The team has done a great job to condense all the information to 39 pages, I am sure that there was a lot of information, and it wasn’t an easy task to decide on what to include and leave out. The length is sufficient! | | | | |
| 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. * Page 18 of 39, a text box or bullet points would help to present the response to the questions related to the key barriers for developing skills and make them visible otherwise they easily get lost in the text. * More illustrations could be used to break the monotony of the text especially for trends and EU Policies. | | | | |
| 1. **English language use** | | | **Score**: 80/100 | |
| * Some instances of copy and paste from original documents e.g. The document description on page 1 is copied directly from the project proposal “The growth strategy of the sector will be summarized through the available material and directives from the EU, producers associations and industries, in a comprehensive report in M6” This could be paraphrased to “this document is a summary of the available material and directives from the EU, producers associations and industries.” This is also the case for the description section of Table 1. * There are instances where acronyms are used without being written in full which might be difficult for someone who is not part of the project to understand or for someone who is interested in reading only one deliverable. Examples: M6 * Few grammatical mistakes but they can be ignored. Some examples:   + Mix up of spellings for digitalization and digitalisation, choose one and apply consistently   + Second sentences on page 19, nowadays could be replaced by currently   + Few wrong tenses * Language check would help alleviate these minor harmless errors. | | | | |
| 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**: 80/100 | |
| Comments:   * The information provided adequately addresses the three important areas and I like the description provided on how this task contributes to the other work pages as well as project objectives. * I could not understand the role of Chapter 3 “European Frameworks in Vocational Education and Training” in relation to Task 1.1, the relevance to other project activities has been stated but this is unclear with regards to T1.1. | | | | |
| 1. **comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)** | | | **Score**: 80/100 | |
| * The information provided offers a good overview of the trends in sustainability, digitalisation and bioeconomy. It is comprehensive and is summarized meticulously, only the presentation is wanting. * Elaborate more on the challenges that Covid presented to the sector. | | | | |
| 1. **reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)** | | | **Score**: 80/100 | |
| * Very reliable because it is based on information obtained from different sources from past national and EU based projects, EU policy papers, EU level studies from knowledge organisations and reports of associations. That is a good combination of sources. A short description of how the literature review was conduced would have been helpful. | | | | |
| 1. **usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)** | | | **Score**: 80/100 | |
| * A a section to summarize the gaps identified would have been helpful which could be linked to how the next activities would help address them. | | | | |
| 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**: 80/100 | |
| * Bioeconomy and forestry domain has been addressed sufficiently in this deliverable by making it one of the three sub chapters of chapter 2. This gives it all the attention that it requires. * There was no definition on forest bioeconomy. It would be great to highlight how the different strategies complement or contradict each other. * SDGs were mentioned a lot in the report, it would be great to highlight which SDGs these three fields cover (sustainability, digitalisation and bioeconomy) and how they do address them. | | | | |
| 1. **Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?** | | | **Score**: /100 | |
| N/A   * Is this question applicable to this deliverable because the task that produced this output did not require opinions from any stakeholders in my understanding. | | | | |
| 1. **Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?** | | | **Score**: 80/100 | |
| I am aware that this is not a scientific paper but creating a short section with a description on the methodology would be useful. How were the trends identified? How were the projects identified? Why is it important to list them? | | | | |
| 1. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable? | | | **Score**: 70/100 | |
| The report is missing a conclusion section, so this is a difficult to assess. As at now, the information is literally all over the place but a conclusion to summarize the findings and the next steps would help. | | | | |
| 1. **Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?** | | | **Score**: /100 | |
| N/A  No clear recommendations presented but this could be because it wasn’t one of the aims of this task. | | | | |
| **Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:** | | | **Overall Score**:79.55/100 | |
| Very good! I like how the information from different sources has been synthesized. The length is perfect, but it is still a lot of information to process. Is it possible to do a policy brief of 2-3 pages on trends for policy makers or a 2-page flyer? The policy brief and/or flyer could be translated into different languages. | | | | |
| Date of external evaluation review: | | | 15/07/2022 | |
| 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 |