



### [D1.3]

### [Quality guidelines and mechanisms for implementation]

Deliverable information	
Work package number	WP1
Deliverable number in work package	D1.3
Lead beneficiary	UMH
Due date (latest)	30/04/2024 (M6)

Document History		
Version	Description	Date
1.0	'Quality guidelines and mechanisms for implementation'. Draft Version.  Authors: María-José Such (UMH), Inmaculada Blaya (UMH) Contributors: Juana Gallar (UMH), Magnus Johansson (KI), Simona Ciotlaus (UMF).	08/04/2024
1.1	'Quality guidelines and mechanisms for implementation'. Revised version.	17/04/2024

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

## Table of Contents

<b>1. Executive summary</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3. Scope</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>4. QA at the level of Project Management</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>5. QA at the level of Strategic Growth</b>	<b>3</b>
5.1 QA dashboard (1 <sup>st</sup> monitoring period).	4
<b>6. QA at the level of Learning Activities.</b>	<b>4</b>
6.1. Online survey tool to collect student feedback: Review of implemented actions.	5
6.2. Online survey tool to collect student feedback: Conclusions.	6
<b>Annex 1. QA indicators (1<sup>st</sup> monitoring period).</b>	<b>7</b>

## 1. Executive summary

This document outlines the first version of the Quality Assurance (QA) guidelines and mechanisms for the NeurotechEU processes. These guidelines have been created by leveraging the knowledge acquired during the previous project stage. The guidelines have been developed with a practical outlook and designed to meet the actual needs of alliance teams. Furthermore, the guidelines and mechanisms for the project have been categorized into three distinct process categories. These categories are QA at the level of Project Management, QA at Strategic Growth, and QA at the sustainable categories of alliance-wide actions. Two pipelines were used to select case studies for each category. The first two categories have been chosen based on pushing through priorities for a specific monitoring period until Month 12. The third category has focused on procedures for student feedback. We will expand this scope in each updated version of this deliverable.

Overall, this document showcases the alliance's steadfast commitment to implementing value-creation processes. Instead of waiting for an ideal state where all alliance processes are perfectly defined, the alliance prioritizes progress toward its goals through a step-by-step approach. This approach ensures that the alliance continually advances towards its objectives while maintaining a focus on quality and consistency.

## 2. Introduction

This document starts from the following background:

- The previous [NeurotechEU Quality Assurance System \(NERQ\) Compendium](#), where the Alliance made a clear commitment to the basic principles of quality assurance outlined by the Standards and Guidelines for QA in the European Higher Education Area (ESG). The compendium encompassed a complete framework identifying competencies, principles, processes, and mechanisms for the entire quality assurance workflow.



- The steps done to bring the foundations of the NERQ Compendium into practice, namely the evaluative activities developed in 2023 on a selected sample of both student-oriented activities (such as summer schools and courses) and other NeurotechEU events (aimed at establishing academic-industry relationships).
- The conclusions and guidelines produced by the [EuniQ project](#), as a transversal-specific initiative implemented to develop a European Approach for Comprehensive QA of European University Networks. Dedicated highlights are repeatedly emerging toward addressing separate QA approaches at different levels, such as the alliance, the project and, joint courses and programmes. According to the insights gathered from the reviews conducted as part of the EuniQ project, there is a consensus about the significance of a narrative that showcases the transformative impact of the European Universities Initiative, in contrast to relying solely on quantitative indicators, which may not be sufficient to demonstrate the Initiative's full potential (e.g., "[QA Development Roadmap: Implementing the European Framework for the Comprehensive Quality Assurance of European Universities](#)" and the '[2023 European Quality Assurance Forum Paper](#)', among others).

### 3. Scope

This document is the first version of definitions of quality guidelines and mechanisms established for each category of processes defined for the project. These categories are:

- QA at the level of Project Management.
- QA at the level of Strategic Growth.
- QA at the level of sustainable categories of alliance-wide actions.

The approach defined for this purpose is based on the lessons learned during the previous project stage. During that stage, a significant gap was identified between the theoretical QA framework and the actual needs of the cross-disciplinary teams to follow the QA guidelines effectively. Additionally, the approach responds to the lesson learned from the resistance found in teams to implement QA approaches that must be fully aligned with local QA approaches.

As a result of the improved QA roadmap for this new period, we present the following:

- QA at the level of Project Management: General guidelines have been defined to prioritize a collaborative approach. Additionally, the guidelines support the implementation of the new project approach, which involves two layers of work packages and working groups to be monitored.
- QA at the level of Strategic Growth: A set of indicators and a fully visual display of quantitative/qualitative measures of progress have been developed. This indicator display is a remarkable achievement as it will enable teams to identify the project's critical areas and refine action plans to address the challenges collaboratively and confidently.
- QA at the level of sustainable categories of alliance-wide actions: The scope of this level will grow in the future, but for now, the focus is on 'Learning Activities'. Guidelines have been developed to gather student feedback in a systematic and standardized way.

All guidelines, processes, and mechanisms have been designed to support the Quality Committee in its first monitoring period, which will be at month 12.

### 4. QA at the level of Project Management

Neurotech<sup>EU</sup> Project Management processes should follow the following QA general principles:



- Collaborative interactions between partner institutions are a priority. However, some areas need to be addressed to make collaboration feasible. To overcome these challenges, the following supporting tools will be produced for the first QA monitoring period:
  - Templates and procedures to implement standard communication processes between deliverable/milestones institutional owners and the rest of the partner institutions within their corresponding work package.
  - Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for working groups.
  - A Glossary with definitions for key terms for cross-work package and cross-discipline communication and dialogue
  - Templates for the clarification of Working Groups' approaches and specific action plans.
- Having alliance-wide processes to manage joint NeurotechEU actions is crucial. Efforts should be made to define an action plan to progressively go from case studies to global procedures.
- To establish an SOP for communication between WorkPackages or Working Groups and BoG. Implementing a pipeline procedure that could filter under priorities will be relevant.
- The management of NeurotechEU Learning Activities also requires a Standard Operating Procedure (SOP), with clear responsibilities for its journey, from proposal design to final implementation and assessment.
- The Quality Committee should be operative at the end of the first QA monitoring period at the latest.
- Ensure a communication channel between partner institutions, Work Package leads, and MCO to monitor and evaluate any possible deviations concerning the WorkPackages scope and use of resources according to plan. With each work plan update, every WP leader will replan their resource plan, informing MCO if relevant deviations occur.

## 5. QA at the level of Strategic Growth

At the project's outset, QA at the Strategic Growth level has become a key priority.

The aim is to equip the alliance with the essential resources required to adopt a proactive approach towards collecting lessons learned. From a cross-cutting perspective, considering the intersection between different Work Packages, these resources will help refine future priorities by taking step-by-step measures and setting several intermediate control points during the four-year project.

First, it is essential to define the term QA indicator. QA indicators are specific measurement scopes that monitor particular action plans that can be feasibly implemented in the short term from a realistic yet ambitious perspective. These measurements help in extracting lessons learned. It is vital to note that QA indicators are not the sole measurements of the project's progress. They are defined with a clear purpose: to serve the Quality committee to push self-assessment and foster identification of lessons learned along several intermediate control points during the four-year project. In addition to QA indicators, work packages may have additional indicators serving their unique monitoring purposes according to their clear WP goals. Furthermore, indicators to measure the long-term impact of the project's sustainability in the future are also expected to be developed separately from the QA scope (WP5).

The set of QA indicators that will support the first QA project monitoring period is presented below. These indicators have been defined under the following guidelines:

- Eight key areas have been identified as the primary focus. These key areas are:
  - Identifying key factors for successful NeurotechEU learning activities.
  - Tracking progress in building a Joint Master's degree in Neurotechnology.
  - Identifying key factors for successful NeurotechEU mobility
  - Actions implemented to foster widening access in NeurotechEU mobility.
  - Progress on delivering short-term results that enable partnering with new strategic associates.



- Progress on providing alliance-wide processes
  - Progress on providing incremental value to society.
  - Descriptive analysis of the traffic generated by the current communication strategy.
- QA indicators offer valuable insights when analyzed as subsets. Therefore, it will be necessary not to interpret any single QA indicator in isolation but rather in conjunction with others related to the same area.
  - Contextual factors in the interpretation of QA indicators will also be crucial. As such, the QA dashboard submits data per area and per partner institution, where local institutional rules make a clear difference in the way and possibilities for implementing concrete action.
  - QA indicators require quantitative and qualitative data. The latter are particularly relevant and should be noted.
  - QA indicators will be defined dynamically. The set presented below serves what is determined as a priority for the first QA monitoring period (M12). However, this set of indicators could and should evolve as unknowns in the equation of the project success are being clarified after each control point.
  - The timeline for each QA control point will be determined by the nature of the improvement actions defined after each incremental, but it is recommended that they be done annually.
  - A targeted internal dissemination strategy will be implemented throughout the alliance to improve alliance awareness of QA results and Quality Committee conclusions.

After M6, and with the approval of the present deliverable, the Quality Committee will collect from each QA indicator responsible (as drafted in Annex 1) a target definition for M12, as realistic but also ambitious expected result per QA indicator (both quantitative and qualitative).

Note: Annex 1 is the first attempt to define the assigned responsibilities for each quality assurance indicator. However, it is a dynamic document that may undergo further refinements to facilitate efficient data collection and to achieve the objectives outlined in the guidelines above.

## 5.1 QA dashboard (1<sup>st</sup> monitoring period).

The visual mockup is presented here to serve as a framework for the internal dissemination of the QA dashboard and their respective Quality Committee conclusions.

[https://www.canva.com/design/DAF-P2t4eEg/ymjES-OJAGU0FHdbnl\\_BCQ/view?utm\\_content=DAF-P2t4eEg&utm\\_campaign=designshare&utm\\_medium=link&utm\\_source=editor](https://www.canva.com/design/DAF-P2t4eEg/ymjES-OJAGU0FHdbnl_BCQ/view?utm_content=DAF-P2t4eEg&utm_campaign=designshare&utm_medium=link&utm_source=editor)

Note: The figures in the mockup are for illustrative purposes only and do not represent actual project data. The actual data will be uploaded at the end of the first monitoring period.

## 6. QA at the level of Learning Activities.

NeurotechEU Learning Activities must adhere to the general principles of Quality Assurance when seeking feedback from students, educators, and staff. This aligns with the alliance's commitment to standards 1.3, 1.7 and 1.9 of the ESG Standards and Guidelines. NeurotechEU needs to maintain a high standard of quality in their learning activities. Therefore, collecting feedback from students is crucial for ensuring that their learning experience is optimal. The following general principles should be followed:

- Regular collection and evaluation of **student feedback** will be a vital component to self-reflective practice after NeurotechEU Learning Activities.



- A **standard feedback questionnaire template** will be provided, including mandatory questions such as a **global assessment question** (on a 4-point Likert scale) and an open-ended question to gather qualitative input from students regarding their observations and suggestions.
- The organizers of the Learning Activities should take the necessary steps to understand the factors that affect the overall student experience and assessment of the learning activity.
- The student feedback questionnaire is an essential checkpoint to monitor various aspects of the student experience, and additional questions can be added to the questionnaire upon request of the Quality Committee or the WPs.
- Data protection policy information must be included in the form according to the organizing institution's guidelines.
- The responsible for creating the student feedback questionnaire under these guidelines is the organizing institution/s of each Learning Activity.
- They should also ensure that the questionnaire is launched under the appropriate conditions to obtain a high response rate<sup>1</sup>, ideally close to 100%.
- The institutions responsible for organizing each Learning Activity will consider the feedback provided by students following the guidelines of their local Quality Assurance institution. Additionally, they must submit a global self-assessment report to the NeurotechEU Quality Committee. During the first monitoring period, this report must cover, at a minimum, the response ratio, the distribution of responses to the global assessment question, a summary of the responses to open-ended questions, and a self-assessment of lessons learned from the feedback.
- The QA dashboard will collect a global overview of the student feedback, including the total cumulative and split satisfaction ratings for the key strategic categories<sup>2</sup> established for NeurotechEU Mobilities.

## 6.1. Online survey tool to collect student feedback: Review of implemented actions.

An assessment has been conducted<sup>3</sup> to evaluate the online survey tools currently utilized by the partner universities for gathering students' feedback. The results indicate that the partners use different built-in tools to collect anonymous student feedback following each course/program. This approach is considered ideal in terms of data reliability and protection. The NeurotechEU Learning Platform (Campus+) must possess an in-built tool to be used by the alliance in the future. As an interim measure, third-party online survey tools are used by NeurotechEU partners, with some of the key highlights being summarized below:

- **Google Forms:** This tool is highly regarded for its simplicity and ease of use. It provides basic functionality suitable for conducting straightforward surveys. Unlike the other tools evaluated here, Google Forms is free to use, with no restrictions. It is an excellent option for avoiding entry barriers for any lay audience. Nevertheless, one partner institution (UBO) has reported issues with using Google products in line with its university policy.
- **Survey Monkey:** This platform offers a rich set of features for creating professional surveys, including 15 different expert-crafted question types, multilingual surveys, and advanced features for in-depth analysis and data visualization.

<sup>1</sup> As a recommended best practice, it is advised to perform the survey after the completion of the learning activity, wherein a predetermined time frame is exclusively allocated for this purpose. This approach should be promoted directly by the activity organizers.

<sup>2</sup> The corresponding WP/WG will set these key strategic categories for each QA monitoring period.

<sup>3</sup> The assessment was performed using the student feedback on learning activities organized by UMH, UMF, and KI.

- Artologik: While less widely recognized than the other two platforms mentioned above, Artologik is another option that shares similarities with Google Forms. It offers fundamental question types and a user-friendly survey interface, providing a simple yet effective data collection and analysis solution.
- Mailchimp: This marketing automation platform enables users to generate, deliver, and analyze email and ad campaigns. While not explicitly designed for surveys, providing each student with a unique code to ensure data reliability is a valuable feature of this platform.

All these third-party platforms present feasible options for the initial phase until an in-house solution is developed. However, some of them do not address the issue of non-intended individuals responding to each NeurotechEU activity, nor do they prevent multiple responses from the same student using different devices or browsers while maintaining anonymity.

## **6.2. Online survey tool to collect student feedback: Conclusions.**

Based on the review conducted and summarized above, the Quality Committee will offer the partners QA templates for Student feedback questionnaires in Google Forms as guidelines for the initial monitoring period. Nevertheless, each institution organizer is free to choose other 3<sup>rd</sup> party online survey tools, considering their specific needs and always adhering to the guidelines provided in this document. This decision prioritizes procedures with low entry barriers. In the update of these guidelines, other third-party survey tools could also be evaluated for scalability towards an in-built solution used by the whole Alliance.





## Annex 1. QA indicators (1<sup>st</sup> monitoring period).

The table below outlines the reasons for each QA Indicator, along with a first attempt to define the designated responsible for defining the target and providing the corresponding data to demonstrate progress during the first QA monitoring period.

**1<sup>st</sup> QA monitoring period:** 1<sup>st</sup> Nov'23 – 31<sup>st</sup> Oct' 24.

Id/QA Dashboard page	QA Indicator	Rationale	Responsible	Target definition for 1 <sup>st</sup> QA monitoring period (Quantitative & qualitative)
1. OFFER OF LEARNING ACTIVITIES: DESCRIPTIVE I				
1.1	<b>Number of Joint Learning Activities (organised by two or more institutions).</b>  [Total implemented during the entire QA monitoring period]	One of the primary QA implementation layers refers to joint courses and programs. This QA indicator aims to highlight the growth in the volume of these joint learning activities, which are the ones under the scope of NeurotechEU QA practices.	WP2 – as responsible for the design and proposal of NeurotechEU Learning Activities.	TBD (In progression for each annual period)
1.2	<b>Number of Learning Activities offered by a single partner (total &amp; subtotals per organiser Institution).</b>  [Total implemented during the entire QA monitoring period]	To gain a better understanding of the extent to which our diverse alliance partners are involved in the Learning Activities' offer thus far. The purpose is to visually represent their proportion, as support to identify any potential gaps and areas for improvement.	WP2 – as responsible for the design and proposal of NeurotechEU Learning Activities.	There is no figure to reach, the purpose of this indicator is just descriptive and serves as a baseline for interpreting measurements given for QA_indicators to be defined in forthcoming periods.
1.3	<b>Number of total Learning Activities (Total &amp; subtotals per category: physical/virtual/blended)</b>  [Total implemented during the entire QA monitoring period]	To showcase the diversity of NeurotechEU's learning activities regarding access-to-all and experiential learning journeys, as well as funding needs.	WP2 – as responsible for the design and proposal of NeurotechEU Learning Activities.	TBD (A qualitative description of what proportion per category would be desired for the end of the academic course 2023-2024).





Id/QA Dashboard page	QA Indicator	Rationale	Responsible	Target definition for 1 <sup>st</sup> QA monitoring period (Quantitative & qualitative)
2. OFFER OF LEARNING ACTIVITIES: DESCRIPTIVE II				
2.1	<b>Number of Learning Activities (per length of the Learning Path: 1 day or less, 2 days, 3-5 days, more than 1 week)</b>  [Total implemented during the entire QA monitoring period]	To gain a better understanding of the variety of learning activities offered so far, specifically on whether they mostly consist of small learning units or not. This assessment is meant to complement other quality assurance indicators and initiate a discussion on how to enhance the effectiveness of the current learning activities being offered.	WP2 – as responsible for the design and proposal of NeurotechEU Learning Activities.	There is no figure to reach, the purpose of this indicator is just descriptive and serves as a baseline for interpreting measurements given for QA_indicators to be defined in forthcoming periods.
2.2	<b>Number of Learning Activities (per type; e.g., Lectures, seminars, ...).</b>  [Total implemented during the entire QA monitoring period]	To gain a comprehensive understanding of the various learning activities provided until now, giving visibility of the different categories that distinguish the NeurotechEU Learning Activities' offer in this initial phase. e.g. - Teacher-oriented/other formats with high student interaction. - Diversity of course offerings across the 8 NeurotechEU dimensions.  This information, when evaluated alongside other pertinent data, can aid in identifying areas that need improvement and initiate constructive discourse to improve future activities' efficiency.	WP2 – as responsible for the design and proposal of NeurotechEU Learning Activities.	TBD (A qualitative description of what proportion per category would be desired for the end of the academic course 2023-2024).
2.3	<b>Number of Learning Activities (per course level:</b> <b>1. Bachelor</b> <b>2. Master</b> <b>3. Doctorate</b> <b>4. Lifelong Learning (LLL)</b>  [Total implemented during the entire QA monitoring period]	To visualize the proportion in which the learning activities provided until now, address the diverse learning needs and skill levels of all alliance students.	WP2 – as responsible for the design and proposal of NeurotechEU Learning Activities.	TBD (A qualitative description of what proportion per category would be desired for the end of the academic course 2023-2024).
2.4	<b>Number of Learning Activities (classified by teaching language)</b>  [Total implemented during the entire QA monitoring period]	To gather data to understand how multilingualism is promoted within the current learning activities' offer.	WP2 – as responsible for the design and proposal of NeurotechEU Learning Activities.	TBD (A qualitative description of the kind of multilingualism that should be promoted for this first stage).



Id/QA Dashboard page	QA Indicator	Rationale	Responsible	Target definition for 1 <sup>st</sup> QA monitoring period (Quantitative & qualitative)
3. JOINT MASTER IN NEUROTECHNOLOGY				
3.1	<p><b>Describe progress on each action plan step towards creating a Joint Master's Degree in Neurotechnology.</b></p> <p>[Situation at the end of the QA monitoring period].</p>	<p>To monitor the progress towards obtaining the approval of the first Joint Master's degree in Neurotechnology. The partner institution overseeing Milestone 2 has developed a detailed action plan. Quantitative and qualitative progress will be tracked at each stage of the action plan to identify any potential challenges and collaboratively make any necessary adjustments to the plan if needed.</p>	<p>RU – as owner of Milestone No. 2</p>	<p>TBD (quantitative and qualitative progress expected for each step of the defined action plan, for this first year of the project).</p>
4. NeurotechEU STUDENT MOBILITY				
4.1	<p><b>Number of Student Mobilities (total and subtotals per partner institution).</b></p> <p>[Total implemented during the entire QA monitoring period].</p>	<p>In order to ensure the successful completion of the mobility commitment in GA Milestone No. 4<sup>4</sup>, it is crucial to establish a self-review process based on data analysis. This process will help to identify areas that require improvement and enable the implementation of necessary measures to overcome any challenges. The QA_indicator is significant to achieving the progress and success of the mobility commitment.</p>	<p>ULille as owner of Milestone No. 4.</p>	<p>TBD (In progression for each annual period).</p> <p><b>Note:</b> The mobility goals for M48 in the GA MS4 require achieving a 35% student mobility rate and a 15% staff/researcher mobility rate.</p> <p><b>Proposal for this 1<sup>st</sup> QA monitoring period:</b> To define the 100% as the total number of students enrolled in the NeurotechEU Learning Activities (not the number students enrolled at the partner universities), which includes both the students from the home institution and those incoming from other members of the alliance. That is, 35% of the students following each learning activity offered by NeurotechEU should come from an institution different from the host university. The same goes for the staff of the learning activities; 15% should be incoming to the host institution.</p>

<sup>4</sup> Due date M48: Description: Reach of 35% student mobility and 15% of staff and researcher mobility.

Id/QA Dashboard page	QA Indicator	Rationale	Responsible	Target definition for 1 <sup>st</sup> QA monitoring period (Quantitative & qualitative)
4.2	<b>Number of individual student beneficiaries of the NeurotechEU mobilities (total and subtotals per partner institutions).</b>  [Total implemented during the entire QA monitoring period].	Until an alliance-wide student admission process is fully implemented, data is distributed among each institution. This QA indicator responds to the risk of having some students benefiting from the NeurotechEU mobility opportunities repeatedly.  This may not be identified as a problem if the student pursues a learning journey under the NeurotechEU program. But, in any case, the indicator aims to make visible cases where any abnormal situation would require improvement plans.	ULille as owner of Milestone No. 4.	There is no figure to reach, the purpose of this indicator is just descriptive and serves as a baseline for interpreting measurements given for QA_indicators to be defined in forthcoming periods. Nevertheless, actions <sup>5</sup> should be taken to address the abnormal situations that have been identified.
4.3	<b>Number of student beneficiaries of the NeurotechEU mobilities (per level of studies: Bachelor, Master, Doctorate, LLL)</b>  [Total implemented during the entire QA monitoring period].	To perform a self-assessment on mobility, using the same categories as they will be included in the reports to EC. This provides an aggregated view of data that complements the one in 'QA_Indicator_ 2.3'.	ULille as owner of Milestone No. 4.	There is no figure to reach, the purpose of this indicator is just descriptive.
4.4	<b>Descriptive of the most effective ways the alliance promotes mobility opportunities to reach NeurotechEU students.</b>  [Descriptive gathered in student feedback surveys during the entire QA monitoring period].	To assess the effectiveness of using different communication channels in promoting the students' mobility within the alliance promoting gender equality and fostering inclusiveness. The insights from this assessment will enable us to identify improvement measures in our strategy for promoting mobility of under-represented groups.	WP3 – as responsible for the follow up of the actions to promote equity and inclusivity and social bias avoiding.	There is no figure to reach, the purpose of this indicator is just descriptive.
5. NeurotechEU STUDENT MOBILITY/WIDENING ACCESS				
5.1	<b>Distribution of NeurotechEU student mobility beneficiaries per gender (alliance-wide).</b>  [Distribution gathered for all student mobilities during the entire QA monitoring period].	NeurotechEU is highly committed to strengthening equal opportunities in the alliance in accordance with the ERA policy agenda, which aims to promote gender equality and inclusiveness. To ensure the effectiveness of the alliance's efforts in this direction, it is essential to implement a data-driven monitoring practice.	WP3 – as responsible for empowering NeurotechEU learners	TBD (In progression for each annual period). (In progression for each annual period).

<sup>5</sup> If partner institutions have several students who benefit from the NeurotechEU mobility offer on multiple occasions, the Quality Committee may request an analysis of the causes and a proposed action plan for improvement if it is deemed appropriate.

Id/QA Dashboard page	QA Indicator	Rationale	Responsible	Target definition for 1 <sup>st</sup> QA monitoring period (Quantitative & qualitative)
5.2	<b>Distribution of student mobility beneficiaries of NeurotechEU (per gender, subtotals per partner institution).</b>  [Distribution gathered for all student mobilities during the entire QA monitoring period].	As the alliance is built from countries from diverse cultural backgrounds, with very different Gender Equality Indexes, it is essential to collect data that could assist in understanding the challenges faced by each partner institution in promoting equal opportunities for all genders. This approach will aid in identifying partner institutions where specific promotional actions need to be taken to ensure equal mobility opportunities for everyone.	WP3 – as responsible for empowering NeurotechEU learners	There is no figure to reach, the purpose of this indicator is just descriptive.
5.3	<b>Description of actions executed to foster inclusiveness in mobility design and implementation.</b>  [Descriptive of a designated sample of relevant key actions during the entire QA monitoring period].	NeurotechEU is highly committed to promoting careers for members of underrepresented groups. It is essential to implement a data-driven monitoring practice to ensure that efforts are addressed in this direction from the very first moment.  This monitoring practice is defined as qualitative for the first QA monitoring period but could evolve to more quantitative indicators more in advance in the project (desirable).	WP3 – as responsible for empowering NeurotechEU learners	There is no figure to reach, the purpose of this indicator is just descriptive.
6. INNOVATIVE LEARNING PROCESSES/PEDAGOGICAL METHODS				
6.1	<b>Description of innovative learning processes and pedagogical methods for the alliance learning activities.</b>  [Descriptive of a selected sample of more relevant key processes/methods implemented during the complete QA monitoring period].	NeurotechEU strives to achieve institutional transformation by focusing on innovative learning processes across Europe grounded in the emerging field of Neurotechnology. This QA indicator aims to measure the progress made by NeurotechEU in enhancing the training experience for learners (e.g., how NeurotechEU is developing and launching AI-supported, interactive, and immersive tools for online learning, as well as complementary in-person resources; how more coursework options are offered to match the varying academic standards and expectations; how interdisciplinary education is implemented).	WP2 – as responsible for the development of pedagogical models	There is no figure to reach, the purpose of this indicator is just descriptive.

Id/QA Dashboard page	QA Indicator	Rationale	Responsible	Target definition for 1 <sup>st</sup> QA monitoring period (Quantitative & qualitative)
7. NeurotechEU STUDENTS' MOBILITY SATISFACTION RATES				
7.1	<p><b>Rate of satisfaction gathered from student feedback surveys in NeurotechEU Learning Activities/Mobility (Total and subtotals per virtual/physical/blended mobilities.</b></p> <p>[Distribution on "mobility satisfaction" responses from student feedback surveys throughout the QA monitoring period].</p>	<p>Through its ESR (Evaluation Summary Report), the EC noted the appropriateness of including student and staff feedback in the quality guiding principles. In this first QA monitoring period, the effort is focused on implementing an alliance-wide procedure to gather student feedback. After critically assessing this initial implementation, the method will also be extended to collect staff feedback.</p>	<p>The partner institutions that are responsible for organizing each NTEU Learning Activity</p>	<p>Target Satisfaction rate: 80%</p>
7.2	<p><b>Insights from student feedback surveys.</b></p> <p>[Cloud of words/Insights from the qualitative student feedback provided in surveys throughout the QA monitoring period].</p>	<p>Qualitative feedback is essential for transformational projects. For this first QA monitoring period, this will be collected from the open-ended questions included in student feedback questionnaires in <b>NeurotechEU Learning Activities/Mobilities</b>.</p>	<p>The partner institutions that are responsible for organizing each NTEU Learning Activity.</p>	<p>There is no figure to reach, the purpose of this indicator is just descriptive.</p>
8. IMPLEMENTED ALLIANCE-WIDE PROCESSES				
8.1	<p><b>Qualitative and quantitative summaries of the progress on implementing alliance-wide processes (for each WP).</b></p> <p>[Sample of most relevant alliance-wide processes implemented per WP throughout the QA monitoring period].</p>	<p>It's crucial to adopt cross-institutional processes instead of local ones, shifting from the single-institution mindset ("I") to a collective mindset ("WE"). The progress in this direction will be measured through an indicator that tracks the implementation of alliance-wide WP processes aligned with this objective.</p>	<p>WP1; WP2; WP3; WP4; WP5</p>	<p>TBD</p>

Id/QA Dashboard page	QA Indicator	Rationale	Responsible	Target definition for 1 <sup>st</sup> QA monitoring period (Quantitative & qualitative)
9. IMPACT IN SOCIETY				
9.1	<p><b>Description (qualitative and quantitative) of impact in society.</b></p> <p>[Sample of actions more descriptive of progress for (9.1.1) &amp; (9.1.2) throughout the QA monitoring period].</p>	<p>One of the NeurotechEU goals is to identify and address societal challenges through innovation and collaboration, including cultural innovations.</p> <p>This QA_Indicator focuses on two key axes for this first QA monitoring period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- (9.1.1) Monitor progress on having NeurotechEU results and good practices that could be addressed in exhibitions and events and be the embryo of the future Museum of Brain and Technology.</li> <li>- (9.1.2) Monitor how progress is made in engaging with key stakeholders that could make more impactful the steps done by NeurotechEU.</li> </ul>	WP5 and an ad hoc created WG	TBD (qualitative in this 1 <sup>st</sup> QA monitoring period)
10. NeurotechEU COMMUNICATION TRAFFIC				
10.1	<p><b>NeurotechEU site visitors description</b> (Total number of views; subtotals of users who access the website from organic search, links or social networks)</p> <p>[Data obtained during the last quarter of the monitoring period will be analyzed].</p>	<p>Increased website traffic does not always mean that progress is being made toward the desired goal, in particular during the early stages of a community. Under this context, this indicator aims to provide a descriptive overview of who is looking at our NeurotechEU website.</p> <p>In successive QA monitoring periods, more precise quantitative indicators will be added, for instance, the comparison between number of views and number of registrations on the different activities.</p>	WP5	TBD (qualitative)
10.2	<p><b>Description of the newsletter impact (MCO and public versions): No. of users; % reading rate.</b></p> <p>[A period will be defined to acquire the data, preferably close to the end of the monitoring period (e.g., the last quarter or other if justified)].</p>	<p>Newsletters are a type of communication aimed at specific targets, and impact measurements must be made to evaluate their effectiveness.</p>	WP5	TBD
10.3	<p><b>Description of Social Media Insights (per target profiles being impacted, uploaded content, engagements built at the social media channel)</b></p>	<p>Even though quantitative measurement of social media impact is valuable, here at this first QA monitoring period, what is required is a more descriptive approach that could provide information on the kind of impact that efforts in each social channel are producing.</p>	WP5	TBD

Id/QA Dashboard page	QA Indicator	Rationale	Responsible	Target definition for 1 <sup>st</sup> QA monitoring period (Quantitative & qualitative)
	[A period will be defined to acquire the data, preferably close to the end of the monitoring period (e.g., the last quarter or other if justified)].			
11. NeurotechEU LOCAL WEBSITES				
11.1	<p><b>Quantitative description of the impact of NeurotechEU local websites</b> (No. of users; % opening rate of news; per partner institution).</p> <p>[A period will be defined to acquire the data, preferably close to the end of the monitoring period (e.g., the last quarter)].</p>	<p>NeurotechEU encourages each partner institution to use their local channels to create engagement from their built communities.</p> <p>This QA indicator measures the effectiveness of efforts made through the local channel partner institutions use, such as local websites or blogs that will be tracked.</p>	WP5	TBD

