Evaluation Criteria Identification

This form is for Quality Control and Monitor member (QCMM) to identify criteria for task evaluation.

**QCMM Name: Teresa Monteiro**

**WP No.: WP1**

**Task No.: 1.2 – Analysing of MSIE curricula being offered, and of learning and teaching methods being applied**

1. **Objective(s) and Deliverable(s)**

The task 1.2 aiming at analysing MSIE curricula being offered, and of learning and teaching methods being applied and will be carried out considering the following tasks:

* Task 1.2.1 Reviewing MSIE curricula being offered currently in Thailand
* Task 1.2.2 Reviewing teaching and learning methods being applied currently in Thailand
* Task 1.2.3 Reviewing MSIE curricula being offered currently in partners’ countries
* Task 1.2.4. Reviewing teaching and learning methods being applied in partners’ countries
* Task 1.2.5 Analysing curricula, and teaching and learning methods

The output of these tasks will contribute to an understanding about the MSIE curricula in Thailand and European countries, in order to create a ground base for the identification of the gap between competences’ needs for Industry 4.0 and sustainability and the academic development of Industrial Engineering master students.

The deliverable(s) of this task are two reports and focuses on:

* Outcome ref. nr. 1.2 - Comprehensive analysis of MSIE curricula being offered in Thailand and in EU partner countries
* Outcome ref. nr. 1.3 - Assessment of learning and teaching tools and methods in Thailand and in EU partner countries
1. **Process Monitoring & Assessment**

**In your opinion, what should we look at in order to say that the task is done properly and met the objective?**

The task is considered to be done successfully if:

* a list of MSIE programs was selected for analysis from Thailand and EU.
* a framework and conceptual questions for curriculum analysis was considered (a list of areas of knowledge and competences in IE and also a glossary of active learning strategies)
* a form and methods for data collection was created to curriculum analysis, in terms of learning outcomes and best practices of teaching and learning methods.
* two reports were developed, taking into account (1) a comprehensive analysis of MSIE curricula being offered in Thailand and in EU partner countries; and (2) a critical overview of learning and teaching tools and methods used in Thailand and in EU partner countries.
* All partners have high commitment and actively participate in the data collection and final contributions in both reports.

**Can we measure them and how do we measure them? If you can’t measure it, please remove and find another one.**

It is possible to identify the main elements aforementioned in the deliverables. For instance: the list of MSIE programs, the framework of analysis, the list of best practices, etc. Furthermore, it is also possible to identify the different report versions during execution, which implied interaction and feedback from different partners.

1. **Deliverable Assessment**

**In your opinion, what should be the specifications of the deliverable(s)?**

In terms of format:

* The deliverables meet the commitments from Application Form: identification (e.g. WP number, deliverable name, version, author, etc.), table of contents, proper language and style (e.g. grammar, spelling)
* The deliverables present a clear structure: project background, methodological approach, analytical review, discussion and recommendations

In terms of content:

* The deliverable 1.2 must include a comprehensive analysis of MSIE curricula being offered currently in Thailand and EU partners’ countries, in which strengths and weaknesses in Thai and EU universities, the common points, but also the differences are identified.
* The deliverable 1.3 must include a critical analysis of teaching and learning methods being applied currently in Thailand and EU partners’ countries.
* Both deliverables contribute for the main objective of WP1, considering the recommendations that are addressed in the reports.

**Please identify similar deliverable(s) elsewhere.**

N/A

**Please rate those deliverables according to your specifications.**

N/A

**What are the criteria or scales that you have used to rate those deliverables?**

N/A

**According to your criteria, please set the target specifications for our deliverables to claim that the objective is met?**

The deliverables (outcome 1.2. and 1.3.) are embed in the task 1.2 and contribute to identify the strengths and weaknesses, the common points, the differences and the good practices concerning curricula, teaching methods and tools in Thai and EU universities. This analytical review is essential as a starting point to identify the gap between the needs of industry, for being ready for Thailand 4.0, and the competence of MSc graduates from current curricula offered by Thai and EU universities. Furthermore, the recommendations in both deliverables provide important information to be considered in the design of the new foreseen curricula (MSIE4.0).