Deliverable Assessment Grid

Deliverable (Title)	D3.3 Apprenticeship scheme report		Date	July 2023
WP3	New tools and training design		Task Leader	AERES
Author(s)	Daniël van Straten, Marg Leijdens, Jan Gundelach			
Quality assurance Reviewer		Luis Mayor	Partner	ISEKI

The Deliverable comply with the description stated in the application form			Comments/Remarks[1]	
☐	☐	☐	X	☐

The Deliverable comply with all Task requirements			Comments/Remarks	
☐	☐	☐	X	☐

The information addressed the key issues			Comments/Remarks	
☐	☐	☐	X	☐

The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable[2]			Comments/Remarks	
☐	☐	☐	☐	X

---

[1] In case of NOT ENOUGH & POOR grades the reporting of comments/remarks is mandatory, otherwise the assessment will be invalidated. Reviewer comments must be accurate, comprehensive and fully articulated.

[2] In case of Technological Output, the Reviewer shall consider if the Deliverable description is comprehensive and coherent with the Technological Output.

The Deliverable presented is using the project's format				Comments/Remarks
☐	☐	☐	☐	X

The Deliverable is written in good English				Comments/Remarks
☐	☐	☐	☐	X

The Deliverable has been released by its due date				Comments/Remarks
☐	☐	☐	☐	X

Overall assessment		Suggestions for improvements:		
☐	☐	☐	X	☐

Date of Quality Assurance review	27/10/2023
Signature:	

fields

ADDRESSING THE CURRENT AND FUTURE SKILL NEEDS FOR SUSTAINABILITY, DIGITALIZATION
AND THE BIO-ECONOMY IN AGRICULTURE: EUROPEAN SKILLS AGENDA AND STRATEGY – AGREEMENT 612664-EPP-1-2019-1-IT-EPPKA2-SSA-B

Addressing the current and Future skIll needs for sustainability, digitalization and the bio-Economy in agricuLture: European skills agenDa and Strategy

D3.3 - ANNEX I

Deliverable Assessment Grid

1 ANNEX I: Deliverable Assessment Grid

Deliverable (Title)	D3.3 – Apprenticeship scheme report		Date	10/07/2023
WP3	New tools and training design		Task Leader	UNITO
Author(s)	Daniël van Straten, Marg Leijdens, Jan Gundelach			
Quality assurance Reviewer		Remigio Berruto	Partner	UNITO

The Deliverable comply with the description stated in the application form / Comments/Remarks[1]

☐	☐	☐	☐	x

The Deliverable comply with all Task requirements / Comments/Remarks

☐	☐	☐	☐	x

The information addressed the key issues / Comments/Remarks

☐	☐	☐	☐	x

The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable[2] / Comments/Remarks

☐	☐	☐	☐	x

---

[1] In case of NOT ENOUGH & POOR grades the reporting of comments/remarks is mandatory, otherwise the assessment will be invalidated. Reviewer comments must be accurate, comprehensive and fully articulated.

[2] In case of Technological Output, the Reviewer shall consider if the Deliverable description is comprehensive and coherent with the Technological Output.

The Deliverable presented is using the project's format				Comments/Remarks
☐	☐	☐	☐	x

The Deliverable is written in good English				Comments/Remarks
☐	☐	☐	☐	x

The Deliverable has been released by its due date				Comments/Remarks
☐	☐	☐	x	☐

Overall assessment	Suggestions for improvements:			
☐	☐	☐	☐	x

Date of Quality Assurance review	26/06/2023

Signature:

2 The grading system

The grading system included in the Evaluation Grid template (Annex I) provides a quick overview of the main conclusions at the level of each assessment question. A five-grade scale is adopted using the following categories (Table 1):

Table 1. Grading reference table.

Score	Grading reference table for assessing and monitoring questions
	I disagree = 1: There are deficiencies which are serious. If not addressed, they may lead to failure of the Deliverable. Major adjustments and revision of the intervention logic and/or implementation arrangements are necessary.
	I slightly disagree = 2: There are issues which need to be addressed. Necessary improvements do not, however, require a major revision of the intervention logic and implementation arrangements.
	Neutral = 3: The situation is considered satisfactory, but there may be room for improvement. Recommendations are useful, but not vital to the project or programme.
	I agree = 4: All issues within the scope of the project have been fairly addressed. Authors have answered any requirement stated in the Task description, reaching the intended objectives. There is no request for further improvements gathered in the evaluation process.
	I completely agree = 5: The Deliverable quality goes beyond the expected quality standards reported in the Quality assurance procedure, leading to an outstanding standard. Authors did not confine the activity implementation to the proposal description, but they have contingently approached the task by considering any additional information arising during the project development. The delivery deadline has been met.

Addressing the current and Future skIll needs for sustainability, digitalization and the bio-Economy in agricuLture: European skills agenDa and Strategy

D3.3 - ANNEX I

Deliverable Assessment Grid

Deliverable (Title)	D3.3 – Apprenticeship scheme report		Date	10/07/2023
WP	New tools and training design		Task Leader	UNITO
Author(s)	Daniël van Straten, Marg Leijdens, Jan Gundelach			
Quality assurance Reviewer		Billy Goodburn	Partner	ICOS

The Deliverable comply with the description stated in the application form — Comments/Remarks[1]

☐	☐	☐	☐	X

The Deliverable comply with all Task requirements — Comments/Remarks

☐	☐	☐	☐	X

The information addressed the key issues — Comments/Remarks

☐	☐	☐	☐	X

The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable[2] — Comments/Remarks

☐	☐	☐	☐	X

---

[1] In case of NOT ENOUGH & POOR grades the reporting of comments/remarks is mandatory, otherwise the assessment will be invalidated. Reviewer comments must be accurate, comprehensive and fully articulated.

[2] In case of Technological Output, the Reviewer shall consider if the Deliverable description is comprehensive and coherent with the Technological Output.

The Deliverable presented is using the project's format				Comments/Remarks
☐	☐	☐	☐	X

The Deliverable is written in good English				Comments/Remarks
☐	☐	☐	☐	X

The Deliverable has been released by its due date				Comments/Remarks
☐	☐	☐	☐	X

Overall assessment	Suggestions for improvements:			
☐	☐	☐	☐	X

Date of Quality Assurance review	31/10/2023
Signature:	

2 The grading system

The grading system included in the Evaluation Grid template (Annex I) provides a quick overview of the main conclusions at the level of each assessment question. A five-grade scale is adopted using the following categories (Table 1):

Table 1. Grading reference table.

Score	Grading reference table for assessing and monitoring questions
	I disagree = 1: There are deficiencies which are serious. If not addressed, they may lead to failure of the Deliverable. Major adjustments and revision of the intervention logic and/or implementation arrangements are necessary.
	I slightly disagree = 2: There are issues which need to be addressed. Necessary improvements do not, however, require a major revision of the intervention logic and implementation arrangements.
	Neutral = 3: The situation is considered satisfactory, but there may be room for improvement. Recommendations are useful, but not vital to the project or programme.
	I agree = 4: All issues within the scope of the project have been fairly addressed. Authors have answered any requirement stated in the Task description, reaching the intended objectives. There is no request for further improvements gathered in the evaluation process.
	I completely agree = 5: The Deliverable quality goes beyond the expected quality standards reported in the Quality assurance procedure, leading to an outstanding standard. Authors did not confine the activity implementation to the proposal description, but they have contingently approached the task by considering any additional information arising during the project development. The delivery deadline has been met.

Addressing the current and Future skIll needs for sustainability, digitalization and the bio-Economy in agricuLture: European skills agenDa and Strategy

D3.3 - ANNEX I

Deliverable Assessment Grid

1 ANNEX I: Deliverable Assessment Grid

Deliverable (Title)	D3.3 – Apprenticeship scheme report		Date	10/07/2023
WP	New tools and training design		Task Leader	UNITO
Author(s)	Daniël van Straten, Marg Leijdens, Jan Gundelach			
Quality assurance Reviewer	DANIEL ROSSI		Partner	CONFAGRI

The Deliverable comply with the description stated in the application form

Comments/Remarks[1]

The Deliverable comply with all Task requirements

Comments/Remarks

The information addressed the key issues

Comments/Remarks

The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable[2]

Comments/Remarks

---

[1] In case of NOT ENOUGH & POOR grades the reporting of comments/remarks is mandatory, otherwise the assessment will be invalidated. Reviewer comments must be accurate, comprehensive and fully articulated.

[2] In case of Technological Output, the Reviewer shall consider if the Deliverable description is comprehensive and coherent with the Technological Output.

The Deliverable presented is using the project's format   Comments/Remarks

☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☒

The Deliverable is written in good English   Comments/Remarks

☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☑

The Deliverable has been released by its due date   Comments/Remarks

☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☑

Overall assessment   Suggestions for improvements:

☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☑

Date of Quality Assurance review   27/10/2023

Signature: DANIEL ROSSI