**Deliverable Consolidated Evaluation Template (DCET)**

**WP5**

**Outcome T 5.1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Acronym:** | ReCap4.0 |
| **Project full title:** | Reinforcing Non-University Sector at the Tertiary Level in Engineering and Technology to Support Thailand Sustainable Smart Industry |
| **Project No.:** | 619325-EPP-1-2020-1-TH-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP |
| **Work Package N° and title** | WP5 |
| **WP Leader** | MU |
| **Deliverable (Task) N°/Title** | D5.1 -Dissemination, Exploitation and Sustainable Plan -DESP |
| **Author responsible for the Deliverable** | Tuangyot Supeekit |
| **Date of Deliverable submission** |  |
| **Status:** | V2 |
| **Dissemination Level:** | Internal |

**Revision Sheet**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | **Date** | **Author (Partner/Person)** | **The revision reason** |
| V1 | Sep 10 | Andrei Szuder | Consolidation with the initial evaluation of QCMB members |
| V2 | Sep 10 | Danaipong Chetchotsak | Collect more suggestions: Green as P1; Yellow as P3; Red as P4; Light Blue as P8 |
| V3 | Sep15 | Danaipong Chetchotsak | Add more comments based on group meeting on Fri Sep 10, 2021. |
| V4 | Sep 16 | Andrei Szuder | Final version of the DESP V2 evaluation |

**Assessment of Deliverable**

**Adequacy with the format**

Mark with X the appropriate column (Y: Yes - N: No - NA: Not applicable)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Format** | **Y** | **N** | **NA** | **Comments** |
| Does the document meet the commitments from Application Form? *(answer with Y/ N only)* | **x** | **P3; P4 X** |  | (P2). WP leader name, Task Leader name, No Distribution List  (P3). Some of the deliverables of DESP are not complied with the main proposal. According to the main proposal, the deliverable WP5-5.4 is required to be produced every quarter. In DESP, WP5 failed to fulfil such requirement. Here Tables 5, 6 and 7 are needed to be revised accordingly.  (P4). The major deliverables must be reported to QCMB to monitor its progress towards the project plan. |
| Does the document contain:  WP number, Deliverable name, Version, Author Name and Date? | **x** |  |  |  |
| Does the document contain all the necessary official logos of the project and the program? | **x** |  |  |  |
| Does the document include a Table of Contents? | **x** |  |  |  |
| Does the document include a list of participants and reviewers (approvals)? | **x** |  |  | (P8). The names of the WP leader and Task leader (missing on the first version) were now included in the first table of the document (pág. 1) |
| Does the document use the fonts and paragraphs defined in the official template? | **x** |  |  |  |
| Does the spelling, grammar etc. of the document is appropriate? | **x** |  |  | (P8). Most of the recommendations (regarding the first version) were attained. Only a few minor issues are present (Please see the pdf file “ReCap 4.0 WP5.1 DESP V2.1 - P8-Sousa”). |

**Quality evaluation**

The following scores will be utilized in delivery review; 1-Poor;2-Average;3-Satisfactory;4-Good;5-Very Good

Mark with X the appropriate column:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **P1** | **P2** | **P3** | **P4** | **P5** | **P6** | **P7** | **P8** | **Total** | **Score** | **Comments** |
| **How deliverable comply with the WP objectives as specified in the WP description?** | **3** | **4** | **4** | **3** | **5** | **3** | **4** | **4** | **30** | **Good** | In the DESP reference could have been made in 5.1 and 5.2 to a greater number of deliverables. |
| **How deliverable correspond with the activity description as specified in the Application Form?** | **3** | **4** | **3** | **3** | **5** | **4** | **3** | **4** |  | **Good** | (P1). In order to match with what have been stated in QCMB V2.0, the quality assessment should also be done from the viewpoint of various stakeholders (e.g., trained staff, teaching staff, and other participants). Internal assessment should be done for all deliverables before execution as proposed in the report, but post-assessment should also be conducted for improvement purpose. For post-assessment, some procedures/templates should be developed and incorporated into the report. |
| **The clarity of the contents of the document is evaluated as…** | **3** | **4** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **3** | **4** | **3** | **29** | **Good** | (P6). See comments below- some small writing errors  (P8) Suggestion: A visual representation (e.g. Gantt chart) of the time plan textually described on page 26 would be very useful, namely to clearly understand the tasks described in the following subsections. |
| **How is the treatment of the contents of the document regarding the required depth?** | **3** | **4** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **4** | **3** | **4** | **30** | **Good** |  |
| **The quality of the contents of the document is evaluated as** | **3** | **4** | **3** | **3** | **5** | **4** | **3** | **4** | **28** | **Good** |  |
| **Does the document need the addition of sections to reach completeness (Yes/No)? Specify which ones** | (P1). Y.The reporting procedures/templates should be elaborated more.  (P4). Y, the procedure and tools or templated will be used to monitor and control activities or events in DESP V2. The forms or templates in the Control and Monitoring Plan (QCMP) V2 can be applied into WP5 DESP and it can synchronise the quality assessment activity between WP5 and WP4.  (P8). No (the missing section on quality was now included (11. Monitoring and evaluation | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Are there any sections in the document that should be removed (Yes/No)?**  **Specify which ones** | **No** | | | | | | | | | | |

**Observations/ suggestions** (add rows as needed)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Partner** | **Page No.** | **Section** | **Observations / Suggested Improvement** |
| P2 | 37 | Table 7 | It is the good job. |
| P2 | 42 | 11.3 | I think, 11.3 would have added the monitor of the expected result of deliverables on table 7, for example, report every quarter. |
| P3 | 42 | 11.3 | For more clarity, DESP should mention to follow and comply with QCMP. |
| P4 |  | Table 7 | In type of deliverable column, reports in terms of assessment reports must be added as output of the deliverable activities or tasks as well including publications, conferences, events, training events. |
| P4 | 42 | 11.3 | The quality assessment reports should be officially reported to QCMB after conducting events or activities for some days to make sure that the plan will be executed, monitored, and controlled perfectly. The reports will be used to prevent some non-conforming found from the latest event. This can guarantee the quality of projects, tasks or activities of WP5. |
| P5 | 4 | Lists of Tables | The Table 5 is on page 30.  The Table 6 is on page 33.  Changes require in the Lists of Tables |
| P6 | 10 |  | In order to perform efficient and coordinated the dissemination exploitation and sustainability activities, the DES will be separated into 3 stages with different purposes as follows (It would sound a little better to write this as follows)  In order to perform the dissemination exploitation and sustainability activities in a coordinated and efficient way, the DES will be separated into 3 stages, each having different purposes. This is set out below. |
| P6 | Page 14 |  | Aware internal members of the consortium to build an identity and profile for the project and its outcomes within the communities belonging to the Program Erasmus Plus;  Raise awareness among members of the consortium to build an identity and profile for the project and its outcomes within the communities belonging to the Program Erasmus Plus; |
| P6 | Page 30 |  | Task 5.6 Setting up training network among the members of partner universities and of associated partners. In this final stage, in order to ensure sustainability of the project, the Innovative Teaching and Learning Centre for Thailand Sustainable Smart Industry will be established. During the establishment, WP5 leader and co‐leader will invite the partners and other stakeholders to join as members of the centre starting form M30 of the project, April 2023. |
| P7 | **37** |  | Table 7 should be modified according to the observations for 11.3. Quality Assessment chapter |
| P7 | **42** |  | The 11.3. Quality Assessment chapter should be modified comply with the official QCMB V2.2 included procedures and templates for quality assessment and activities assessment. |
| P7 | **43** |  | Table 8 should be modified according to the observations made for 11.3. Quality Assessment chapter |
| P8 | several | several | Please see the pdf file “ReCap 4.0 WP5.1 DESP V2.1 - P8-Sousa” where some other minor issues are highlighted, namely on pages 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 41 and 42. |
| P8 | 43 |  | The DESP is too long and suggested that it should be more concise. |
| P8 | **1** | **-** | Work package Leader and Task Leader names are missing |
| P8 | 37 - 40 | 10 | In my opinion, for the following deliveries: “Project website”, “Publications in professional journals…”, “Dissemination events with relevant stakeholders”, “A dissemination sustainability conference” listed on Table 7, summary reports should be given together with the products |

**Summary of the major comments of the QCMB members (P2;P3;P4;P5) reunion;**

1. Major deliverables including publications, training events, dissemination events, and conferences (5.1, 5.2, 5.5 (Publications) 5.7, and 5.8), must be reported to QCMB as they are needed to monitor and control to make sure that the whole project will be working perfectly according to time and quality dimensions and importantly towards the project proposal.
2. For more clarity, DESP should mention to follow and comply with QCMP, along with procedures and templates for quality assessment.

In general, we were trying to resolve some issues found in DESP, specifically in the procedures and templates for quality evaluation of WP5 since WP5 needs to perform internal quality evaluation as well. Our suggestion was based on the principle of QCMP and simplicity. We agreed that our QCMP is quite complete so WP5 can use it as a reference. We suggested that WP5 can use QCMP V 2.2. templates and procedures for “internal quality evaluation.” To evaluate Project poster or publications in professional journals, for example, WP5 can use Deliverable Quality Evaluation Procedure (DQEPR) in ANNEX5 for guidance of evaluation and Deliverable Evaluation Template (DET) in ANNEX3 for evaluation template. Furthermore, to evaluate dissemination event, WP5 can use Event Evaluation Template: EET in ANNEX 9 and Event Evaluation Procedure (EEPR) in ANNEX 10.

1. Regarding internal quality assessment in Table 8, DESP V2 did not specify at all the procedures and templates that will be used to evaluate the quality of the deliverables. In order to follow 1) and 2), we suggested that WP5 use the templates and quality procedures as described in Table below. In addition, Deliverables that are required to submit to QCMB for quality evaluation are listed in the table below as well.
2. Our suggestion is that WP4 and WP5 set up a joint-working group to help the set-up of the DESP V3 in relation with the official QCMP V2.2

**Summary of WP5 Deliverables Quality Assessment**

| Task | Deliverables | Quality Assessment | | Procedures and Templates |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Internal WP5 | QCMB |
| 5.1 | Project Dissemination Exploitation and Sustainability Plan (DESP) | √ | √ | DET (ANNEX3)  DQEPR (ANNEX5) |
| 5.2 | Project website  ‐  Content to be posted  ‐  Website | √ | √ | WET (ANNEX13) |
| -Project logo | √ |  | DET (ANNEX3)  DQEPR (ANNEX5) |
| 5.3 | 5.3  A list of registered trainees from the non‐ university sector at tertiary education level in Thailand | √ |  | DET (ANNEX3)  DQEPR (ANNEX5) |
| 5.4 | Project poster | √ |  | DET (ANNEX3)  DQEPR (ANNEX5) |
| Project leaflet | √ |  | DET (ANNEX3)  DQEPR (ANNEX5) |
| Booklet for final conference | √ |  | DET (ANNEX3)  DQEPR (ANNEX5) |
| Newsletters  ‐  Content to be included  ‐  Newsletter | √ |  | DET (ANNEX3)  DQEPR (ANNEX5) |
| 5.5 | Publications in professional journals, newspapers, magazines and brochures, social media | √ | √ | DET (ANNEX3)  DQEPR (ANNEX5) |
| Social media page | √ | √ | DET (ANNEX3)  DQEPR (ANNEX5) |
| 5.6 | A list of the members of the Innovative Teaching and Learning Centre for Thailand Sustainable Smart Industry | √ |  | DET (ANNEX3)  DQEPR (ANNEX5) |
| 5.7 | Dissemination events with relevant stakeholders | √ | √ | EET (ANNEX9)  EEPR (ANNEX10) |
| 5.8 | A dissemination‐sustainability conference | √ | √ | EET (ANNEX9)  EEPR (ANNEX10) |

.

**Reviewers Assessment**

(Mark with X the appropriate line)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Document accepted; no changes required** |  |
| **Document accepted but changes required** | P1; P2;P3;P4;P5; P6;P7;P8 |
| **Document not accepted; it must be reviewed after changes are implemented** |  |
| **Date of Review4** |  |
| **Reviewer’s Name & Organization (from QCMB)** |  |

**QCMB Chair Consolidated Assessment**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Document accepted; no changes required** |  |
| **Document accepted but changes required** | **X** |
| **Document not accepted; it must be reviewed after changes are implemented** |  |
| **Suggestions for improvement (if applicable)** |  |
| **Date of Quality assurance performed** |  |
| **Deadline for submission of amended version of deliverable (if applicable)** |  |

**PEC Approval**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Document accepted; no changes required** |  |
| **Document accepted but changes required** |  |
| **Document not accepted; it must be reviewed after changes are implemented** |  |
| **Suggestions for improvement (if applicable)** |  |
| **Date of Quality assurance performed** |  |
| **Deadline for submission of amended version of deliverable (if applicable)** |  |