

aN Eu Curriculum
for chef gasTro-engineering
in primAry food caRe



DELIVERABLE TITLE

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| Deliverable Number: | D1.3.2 |
| WP related to the Deliverable: | WP1 |
| Actual Date of Delivery to the CEC: | 30/04/2022 |
| PARTNER responsible for the Deliverable: | Odisee |
| WP starting month | M1 |
| WP ending month | M18 |



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

The European Commission's support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

AGREEMENT NUMBER – 621707-EPP-1-2020-1-BE-EPPKA2-SSA



1 ABSTRACT:

This report describes the identifies risks and the response actions during the first 18 months of the lifetime of the project.

2 INTERNAL REVIEWERS

| REVIEWER NAME | ORGANIZATION | DATE OF APPROVAL |
|---------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| Sandra Pais | University of Algarve | 28/06/2022 |
| Reviewer 2 | yyyyyy | |

3 VERSION HISTORY AND AUTHORS

| Version | Name / Organization | Status* | Date | Provided Content/Comment/ Summary of Changes |
|---------|----------------------------|---------|-------------|--|
| 1 | Willem vanden Berg, Odisee | A | 20/06/20222 | Version 1 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

*Status indicates if:

- A - Author (including author of revised deliverable)
- C - Contributor
- IF – Internal Feedback (within the partner organization)

4 PROGRESS CONFLICT AND RISK REPORT

During the first eighteen months of this project, **3** risks occurred, which also found their solution.

The **first** risk (failure in communication) concerns the partner 'University of Algarve'.

In November 2021, a discussion took place between the partner WIAB and the partner University of Algarve. The discussions increased and the University of Algarve informed the project coordinator that they wanted to leave the consortium. We (Odisee) traveled to Portugal the following week to discuss face to face the possible options in detail. The University is still in the consortium and also intends to do so until the end of the project lifetime.

The **second** risk (failure in communication) concerns the partner 'Styrian Chamber of Commerce'.

There was little to no communication with the partner the Styrian Chamber of Commerce. After twelve months, there was still no financial statement declared. After a bilateral conversation, it was decided that they will not issue a financial declaration now and in the lifetime of the project. At the same time, they did confirm that this decision will not affect their commitment and input which are necessary to make the project successful.

The **third** risk (delay in time schedule) concerns the Associated partner 'Center for Gastrology' and 'Odisee'.



Deliverable 1.3.2 – Progress Conflict and risk Report

As described in the project application there has been a good cooperation between Odisee and the Center for Gastrology (CfG) for over 10 years. Together we organized a modular training Gastro Engineering (GE) for chefs in healthcare, more than 200 chefs already completed this training and received a certificate.

The Belgian pilot in this project is designed in order to target working chefs/cooks who already have completed the specialized training for Gastro Engineering. The newly developed EU curriculum for Gastro Engineering (WP4) was not quite up to the expectation that the people at CfG had in mind when setting up this project. Of course, making a project outcome in an international project is a collaboration with different partners from different countries. Due to this dissatisfaction, there was a delay of several weeks to set up the Belgian pilot.

The breakthrough came after all through the following solution: Reformulating the Learning Outputs (LO's) of the NECTAR project into broader LO's that allow the link with the existing curriculum. The fundamental problem for the Center for Gastrology was that the LO's are now formulated in too much detail, which does not allow them to find sufficient connection between these LO's and the existing Chef Gastro Engineering course. This makes it difficult for them to do a mapping of the existing learning content onto the LO's that are currently before them.

As a solution, we rewrote the existing LO's, but within the existing structure of the different modules. In terms of content, the idea of each LO is retained, but it is mainly formulated more broadly so that more can be covered.

It is important to note that the other countries that have already started working with these LO's will not experience any problems with the changes, because the structure has been completely maintained, including the subdivision within the various modules.

Other teams will therefore not have to revise their work and will be able to continue their work. Today we, "Odisee" and the Center for Gastrology, strongly believe that we can offer a quality pilot of 40 ECTS next academic year.



ANNEX 1 – QUALITY CONTROL CHECK LIST

| Quality Control Check | |
|---|-------|
| Generic Minimum Quality Standards | |
| Document Summary provided (with adequate synopsis of contents) | yes |
| Compliant with NECTAR format standards (including all relevant Logos and EU-disclaimer) | yes |
| Language, grammar and spelling acceptable | yes |
| Objectives of the application form covered | yes |
| Work deliverable relates to adequately covered | yes |
| Quality of text is acceptable (organisation and structure, diagrams, readability) | yes |
| Comprehensiveness is acceptable (no missing sections, missing references, unexplained arguments) | yes |
| Usability is acceptable (deliverable provides clear information in a form that is useful to the reader) | yes |
| Deliverable specific quality criteria | |
| Deliverable meets the 'acceptance Criteria' set out in the Quality Register: | yes |
| Checklist completed and deliverable approved by | |
| Name: | Date: |
| | |