



CHECK LIST FOR REVIEW OF DELIVERABLES¹

Deliverable title	D2.3 - Training of teaching staff for innovative teaching methods	
	Training report - University of Messina (UNIME), Italy, 19-20 September 2017	
Work package	WP2 – Development of Master Curricula	
Author	Sally Priest	
Deliverable Date	21 September 2017	

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein"

¹ This questionnaire concerns quality issues of NatRisk upon completion of each deliverable. Please complete the form and submit it by email Project Coordinator (natriskuni@gmail.com) and WP leader. The achieved results will be useful for the project's risk management. They will also make part of the QAC final report, as well as of the Coordinator's progress and final reporting to EACEA.





Assurance point	Issues to be	Assessment	Comments	Reccomendations	
	addressed				
Compliance with	Does the	Xes			
NatRisk objectives	deliverable comply				
	with the overall	∐ No			
	objectives of the	Partially			
	project?				
Compliance with the	Does the				
specfic objectives of	deliverable comply	∑ Yes			
the WP	with the WP	□ No			
the VVI	Objectives as				
	specified in the WP	☐ Partially			
	, ,				
C 1	description?				
Correspondence	Does the	X Yes			
with the description	deliverable				
of work of the	correspond with	∐ No			
relevant activity	the activity	Partially			
	description as				
	specified in the				
	Application Form?				
Compliance with	<i>Is the deliverable</i>	⊠ v			
the deliverables	presented using the	∑ Yes			
format	Project's	No			
	deliverable format	Partially			
	- Annex B?				
Adequacy of	Examples of		Additional		
complementary	complementary	∑ Yes	materials		
information	info:	No	included agenda,		
	- Sources used,	Partially	photos,		
	- Bibliography,		presentations,		
	- List of contacts,		evaluations,		
	2		participant lists		
	- Methodology used.		participalit lists		
Adequacy of	Level of written	<u> </u>			
written language	English	Excellent			
8 8	8	Adequate			
		Poor			
Overall assessment					
and suggestions for					
improvement					
Deadline for submission of amended version of the deliverable n.a					