# EU4ART_*differences*

Deliverable D3.1

| Deliverable 3.1: Description of a common framework for quality management | |
|---|---|
| Related Work Package: | WP3 "R&I Agenda and Transfer to Citizens & Society" |
| Lead Beneficiary: | HfBK Dresden |
| Dissemination Level: | public |
| Delivery type: | Report |
| Author: | Till A. Baumhauer, Claudia Reichert |
| Reviewers: | Content Management Team |
| Due submission date: | 30/06/2021 |
| Actual submission date: | 30/06/2021 |
| Description: | This detailed description of a common framework including tools for quality management and for the equality of opportunity and access and inclusivity refers to the steps that are taken to guarantee an excellent quality in the execution of the project. This includes a clear definition of the common quality criteria as well as their adequate content and technical implementation.<br><br>Special consideration must be given to questions of equal opportunities, gender justice and inclusion, as well as comparable issues. |

## Versioning and Contribution History

| Version | Date | Modified by | Modification reason |
|---|---|---|---|
| v.01 | 30/06/2021 | | First version |
| v.02 | 11/09/2023 | Claudia Reichert | Dissemination level changed from „confidential" to "public" based on amendment |
| v.03 | | | |

## Glossary

| Abbreviation | Meaning |
|---|---|
| AB | Advisory Board |
| ABAROMA | Academy of Fine Arts of Rome |
| CA | Consortium Agreement |
| CM Team | Content Management Team |
| Co | Confidential |
| EC | European Commission |
| GA | Grant Agreement |
| LMA | Art Academy of Latvia |
| M | Month (e.g. M1, M18) |
| MKE | Hungarian University of Fine Arts |
| PMM | Project Management Manual |
| Pu | Public |
| R | Report |
| RP | Reporting Period |
| SC | Steering Committee |
| WP | Work Package |
| | |

## List of tables:

# Table of Content

# 1. Introduction

D3.1 "Description of a common framework for quality management", is a confidential deliverable report related to the work package 3: "R&I Agenda and Transfer to Society" in close collaboration with WP1 "Project Management" of the EU4ART_differences project. It has been developed in the first half year of the project by the Project Coordinators and the Content Management Team. This document is an extension of the project management plan which have already submitted end of March as D1.1 by the Project Manager. In the submitted deliverable the alliance has outlined the role of all partners, governing and management structures.

This deliverable is not meant to interfere with internal quality management processes of each partner or to modify partner's procedures. All beneficiaries are free to apply their own procedures for quality. Deeper investigation on artistic research revealed that, due to the very different approaches, methodologies and ideas of artistic research as such, clear (common) quality criteria cannot be defined now. They will only become visible through the process, and through comparing similar approaches or contents to each other. Therefore, this question remains important even for the time after the first three years of the project, and a relevant question in terms of sustainability.

With respect to quality assurance, the plan describes the responsibilities, schedules, and review criteria for each deliverable. With respect to risk management, the plan provides an update on the current impact of the COVID-19 situation on the partners. Then, the plan assesses the likelihood and impact of all critical implementation risks (detailed in table 3). Mitigation measures for the risk levels are also included. Implementation of the plan will be monitored by the SC during regular meetings, and updates to the plan will be made throughout the life of the project in a continuous process.

Quality management activities ensure that:

- deliverables are prepared to meet agreed-upon standards and requirements;
- the staff in all work packages is motivated and eager to fulfil their tasks;
- all risks are closely monitored and measures of mitigation are taken; and
- results of regular evaluation of project management are used for improvement

Each university has set its own plans for quality management. The quality policy of the Hungarian University of Fine Arts (see Quality Policy Statement in Hungarian[1]) provides a framework for setting and reviewing quality objectives, and makes known the necessary quality-oriented principles that contribute to the development of training, research and management activities. MKE quality management principles follow the principles of the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG 2015), both in external and internal quality audits (accreditation procedures and organisational self-assessments). All necessary documents (in Hungarian language) are available online[2] (e. g. Quality improvement actions based on the recommendations of the MAB – Hungarian Accreditation Committee in 2015, Institutional Accreditation Report, Quality Assurance Policy, Quality Assurance Board Rules of Procedure 2021, Quality Improvement Programme 2020-21, Annual report on the implementation of the Quality Improvement Programme 2020, Quality Manual and in addition to these documents, various forms, questionnaires, reports and analyses could be downloaded).

---

[1] URL: http://www.mke.hu/node/39904 [23/06/2021]
[2] URL: http://www.mke.hu/node/39904 [23/06/2021]

The quality assurance of teaching at the HfBK Dresden is defined in the development plan of the university, as of 18th June 2018[3], and in the University Development Plan 2025, as of 14th of June, 2018[4]. Additionally, there are regulations on Evaluations and Quality Management at the Dresden University of Fine Arts, as of 13th April 2016.[5]

On November 22, 2016, the Saxon state government adopted the "Higher Education Development Planning 2025", which sets out the strategic objectives and development expectations for the state universities in the portfolio of the Saxon State Ministry of Science, Culture and Tourism (SMWK). This university development plan, which was developed in dialogue with the universities, is focusing amongst others on the maintenance of quality standards in teaching and research in the Saxon university landscape.

The "Zukunftsvertrag Studium und Lehre stärken" ("Future contract strengthening study and teaching") was adopted by the heads of government of the federal and state governments on June 6, 2019. It is the successor to the Higher Education Pact (HSP) and is designed to be permanent. It is intended to ensure high quality of study and teaching as well as good study conditions.

The University Development Plan focuses on quality management in all academic areas – teaching as well as artistic processes, but also management and organization. For quality assurance purposes, the university has joined the Higher Education Didactic Centre of Saxony (HDS) in order to be able to develop didactic training and further education courses tailored to teaching at art universities and to offer them to teachers. Since 2018, the HfBK has been joining the full program of HDS.[6]

The quality of the artistic work and academic research of the teaching staff is proven within the university, but primarily in non-university contexts, as in the success of exhibitions and performances, publications, in artistic and academic debates, in successful applications for third-party funded research projects in which the art-creating and researching members of the university participate, and last but not least in the influence that the works of art themselves have[7] - which can to some extent be understood as a process of peer-reviewing as well.

ABAROMA, according to its statutes, has an evaluation committee, whose mission and duties are as follows: a) It evaluates the results of the scientific and research activities of the institution, as well as the functioning of the institution as a whole, and assesses the optimal use of resources, including through comparative analyses of costs and revenues. b) Periodically solicits the opinions of students on didactic activities, while maintaining anonymity, and accounts for them in an annual report. c) Prepares an annual report on the activities and functioning of the institution based on the general criteria established by the commission for the evaluation of the university system (ANVUR). The report shall be sent to the Ministry of Education, Universities and Research by March 31 of each year.

The principles on quality management of the Academy of Arts of Latvia was approved by the senate of the Academy of Arts of Latvia as part of the strategic specialization and basic principles on May 5, 2016.

---

[3] URL: https://www.hfbk-dresden.de/fileadmin/user_upload/Downloads/Hochschule/Portrait/Mission-Statement/HEP2020_140618.pdf [24/06/2021]

[4] URL: https://www.hfbk-dresden.de/fileadmin/user_upload/Downloads/Hochschule/Portrait/Mission-Statement/HEP2020_140618.pdf [24/06/2021]

[5] URL: https://www.hfbk-dresden.de/fileadmin/user_upload/Downloads/Hochschule/Organisation/Ordnungen/Qualitaetsmanagement16_04_13.pdf [24/06/2021]

[6] See footnote 4, p. 11.

[7] See ibid., p. 11f.

The internal quality management of the Academy of Arts of Latvia is based on an implementation of the principles of the European Standards and Guidelines (2015 edition) and combines them with the model of the modified CAF 2013 Education. In 2020, a new quality assurance model was developed, based on CAF 2020 and recognizing the results of the pandemic.

## 2. Regulatory Framework and Reference

The execution of EU4ART_*differences* shall comply with and governed by:

- The Grant Agreement (no. 101016460) signed by the Project Legal Signatory Jochen Beißert, HfBK Dresden with the European Commission and all partners in the accession form. The Grant Agreement entered into force 1st of January 2021;
- Consortium Agreement signed 23rd November 2020 including descriptions of the roles of the protagonists in the project;
- National legislation frameworks or each beneficiary country;
- Deliverable 1.1 (WP1) and the according Project Management Manual;
- Work Plan published in form of a Gantt chart in the Grant Agreement 3.1. "Work plan";
- Reporting structures: monthly reports within the consortium and quarterly reports for the Steering Committee; and
- Culture of meetings: regular virtual meetings and planned personal meetings.

All information on management structure (roles and responsibilities) are to be found in D1.1 (from p. 10). All information on Management and operating procedures including reporting are to be found in D1.1 (from p. 14)

An overview about deliverables, milestones, reporting to Steering Committee is to be found on our MIRO road map, where all team members are encouraged to work on and share ideas. More information about digital team collaboration is to be found in D5.1.

## 3. Deliverables and Review Procedure

### 3.1. Contractual Deliverables

All research outcome that is documented in deliverables or published will be peer-reviewed by the consortium partners, the Advisory Board members, or respective colleagues to meet high quality. Publications, findings, and documentations will be disseminated through the work of WP5, the consortium follows Open Access (see D1.2) rules and works in reference to the Project Management Plan (set out as Deliverable 1.1).

All deliverables agreed on in the Grant Agreement are listed below in table 1.

| WP No | Del No | Title | Lead Beneficiary | Nature | Dissemination Level | Est. Del. Date (annex I) |
|-------|--------|-------|------------------|--------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| WP1 | D1.1 | Information exchange and management processes established | HfBK Dresden | Report | CO | 31 Mar 2021 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| WP1 | D1.2 | Plan for Data Management | HfBK Dresden | ORDP | CO | 30 Jun 2021 |
| WP1 | D1.3 | first short policy brief | HfBK Dresden | Report | CO | 30 Jun 2022 |
| WP1 | D1.4 | second short policy brief | HfBK Dresden | Report | CO | 31 Dec 2023 |
| WP2 | D2.1 | Reports of situation analysis of the partners' knowledge transfer activities | MKE | Report | CO | 30 Jun 2022 |
| WP2 | D2.2 | Summary of harmonized Intellectual Property Rules | MKE | Report | CO | 30 Jun 2022 |
| WP2 | D2.3 | Order of the Artistic Research & Innovation Labs | MKE | Report | CO | 31 Dec 2023 |
| WP2 | D2.4 | Publication of anthology on artistic research | MKE | Report | PU | 31 Dec 2023 |
| WP3 | D3.1 | Description of a common framework for quality management | HfBK Dresden | Report | CO | 30 Jun 2021 |
| WP3 | D3.2 | Final list of cooperation with protagonists from society, science and creative industries | HfBK Dresden | Report | CO | 30 Jun 2022 |
| WP3 | D3.3 | Report on new teaching formats for the outreach to society | HfBK Dresden | Report | CO | 31 Dec 2023 |
| WP3 | D3.4 | Report on the Pilot Phase of the Labs, Hubs and Graduate Schools | HfBK Dresden | Report | CO | 31 Dec 2023 |
| WP4 | D4.1 | Concept for a series of webinars | ABAROMA | Report | CO | 30 Jun 2022 |
| WP4 | D4.2 | Set of ICT tools for supporting the virtual ateliers | ABAROMA | Report | CO | 30 Jun 2022 |
| WP4 | D4.3 | Documentation of a series of webinars | ABAROMA | Report | CO | 31 Dec 2023 |
| WP4 | D4.4 | Concept for a series of entrepreneurship-related courses | ABAROMA | Report | CO | 31 Dec 2023 |
| WP4 | D4.5 | Architecture of a knowledge management system for arts and creativity training | ABAROMA | Report | CO | 31 Dec 2023 |
| WP5 | D5.1 | Common Communication Strategy | LMA | Report | CO | 30 Jun 2021 |
| WP5 | D5.2 | Concept for Research and Innovation Transformation Networking web platform | LMA | Report | CO | 31 Dec 2021 |
| WP5 | D5.3 | Interim report on publications, the Open Artistic Research seminar and status-quo of the Common R&I database | LMA | Report | CO | 30 Jun 2022 |
| WP5 | D5.4 | Report on further national and international funding possibilities to support schemes for follow-up steps | LMA | Report | CO | 30 Jun 2023 |

| WP5 | D5.5 | Final report on the completed dissemination activities | LMA | Report | CO | 31 Dec 2023 |

All milestones agreed on in the Grant Agreement are listed below in table 2.

| Nr. | Title | Lead Beneficiary | Due Month | Related WP |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| M1 | Kick-off meeting | HfBK Dresden | 1 | 1 |
| M2 | Presentation of common R&I agenda | HfBK Dresden | 10 | 3 |
| M3 | Symposium & press conference | LMA | 18 | 5 |
| M4 | Launch of extended website & database | LMA | 18 | 5 |
| M5 | Kick-off for series of webinars | ABAROMA | 19 | 4 |
| M6 | Virtual conference/meeting of graduate schools/ hubs/ staff | HfBK Dresden | 25 | 1, 2 |
| M7 | Press conference for the start of Graduate Schools and hubs | MKE | 25 | 1, 2, 3 ... |

## 3.2 Structure of Deliverables

The EU4ART_*differences* deliverables template is stored in the template folder at the project's SharePoint. Reports and deliverables should have a consistently styled cover sheet and structure, based on the template. All pages should be numbered and be provided with the necessary logos and funding information. The document should comprise the parts described as follows:

**Part I** – Cover Page, it contains the information regarding the EU4ART_*differences* project (this applies to all deliverables) and regarding the specific deliverable, title and ID of the project

- Logos of the project and of the H2020 program
- Title of the document
- Related work package(s), deliverable, lead beneficiary
- Dissemination level and delivery type
- Author(s) and reviewer(s)
- Due submission date/actual submission date
- Description

The partner responsible for the deliverable is requested to fill in the front page ensuring that all the information is correctly provided, and that those items particularly related to the project Grant Agreement are not modified.

**Part II** – Versioning and Contribution History, provides the information concerning the evolution of the deliverable in the form of a table summarising the changes made before it became an official version

for delivery to the Commission. For each document version, the version number, a short description of the changes made, and the date will be detailed. A document must be at version 1.0 or later before being considered an official version for delivery to the Commission.

**Part III** – Abbreviations (optional), contains a table with the abbreviations used in the document to improve the understanding and readability of the deliverable.

**Part IV** – Table of Contents, provides an index of the deliverable contents linked to the respective part in the document.

**Part V** – List of tables and list of figures (optional).

**Part VI** – Introduction, describes the purpose of the document, the position of this document with respect to the whole project, and provides a brief overview of the contents of the document, and the context of the work within the overall work plan.

**Part VII** – Deliverable content, this is the main body of the document which provides a stringent structure and all necessary details for the elaboration of the respective topic.

**Part VIII** – References (optional), provides a summary of references related to the deliverable.

**Part IX** – Annexes (optional), includes further information mentioned in the deliverable, either documents used, documented processes or detailed elaborations.

## 3.3. Deliverable production and review procedure

All documents planned to be submitted to the EC must follow a certain procedure to assure their quality.

The task leader or WP leader is responsible for involving other colleagues with valuable contributions to the respective deliverable, for editing and preparing a draft of the document, which is peer reviewed within the WP as a first step. Each deliverable will be approved by the CM team to assure quality before submission to and discussion with the SC by the Speaker. Each WP leader (as part of CM team) decides who from the consortium or Advisory Board will additionally peer review every deliverable. Steering Committee members, Advisory Board members, other peer reviewer or collaboration partners can be involved to perceive their reflections and hints.

The WP leader shares the document with the Content Management team as well as with the coordinators for their review and additional information. This discussion does usually take place in an online meeting ending with a final acceptance. The coordinator finalizes the document and reviews it for the last time.

Every deliverable will be presented to the SC at least two weeks before the submission to the EC. This timeslot does include the possibility for the SC to revise the deliverable and consider changes until seven days before the final submission date. Feedback should be delivered to the speaker who will share and implement it with the CM Team.

The coordinators (project manager or project speaker) are responsible for the upload into the Funding & Tender portal before the submission deadline.

The coordinator sends the deliverable as PDF version to the Steering Committee right after the upload for information.

# 4. Financial quality management

EU4ART_differences is a 36 month project started on 1 January 2021. Its total estimated eligible costs are 1.999.997,52 EUR, fully funded as a lump sum project by the European Commission. The project budget has been developed based on five work packages leaded by four European art academies. All tasks within the project are allocated to one of these five work packages and costs are reported accordingly.

All eligible costs regard the personnel, travel costs, costs for digital developments and symposia.

Every beneficiary has allocated staff to respective work packages and is responsible for all occurring costs within the respective institution. The Project Coordinator at HfBK Dresden collects cost statements quarterly, documents the expenses and controls whether the funds spent comply with the provisions of the EC.

Everyone is aware that funding depends on meeting the project goals in the work packages. If work package goals are not met, this will result in funding cuts.

# 5. Staff involvement

In the beginning of the project regular meetings were held to get to know each other better as there are new persons involved when some knew others already. An official kick-off meeting together with EU officers provided the chance to present the project and share own ideas and ask questions.

The Project Manager has provided a list of contacts giving out full names and email addresses assigned to the respective WP and responsibility. This list is open to everyone. Once MS 365 is perfectly implemented all team members can work together in separate channels.

The European Commission as well as local offices dealing with Horizon Europe or Horizon2020 framework programmes provide tutorials, workshops, and meetings to promote quality and build up networks. The Project Management does highly recommend and encourage the participation in relevant events, makes sure documentations and best-practice ideas are shared and discussed, and offers tutorials or feedback rounds for the consortium members.

## 5.1. Staff motivation and team collaboration

In the middle of the week, we invite to a so-called *fika*, which is often translated as a coffee and cake break, but it does mean more than that. A *fika* is a chance to meet up and chat about common tasks or about undefined subjects to get to know each other better and to keep in touch in a rather informal way. We found the online service kumospace.com appropriate and find a differing number of participants each week.

Using experiences from former projects and collaborations with partners in other countries the Project Management team does highly recommend keeping in mind some simple rules for online meetings.

1. **Time frame:** Every meeting should set a maximum time to allow everyone to meet appointments without missing important content.
2. **Agenda:** Every meeting should have a draft agenda for all participants to warm up with before the meeting.
3. **Moderation:** Every meeting should be moderated to follow a path and end with conclusions or agreements. The moderation can alternate or stay with the WP leader.
4. **Minutes:** Every meeting should have minutes, shared with the group later and/or uploaded to the OneDrive. Minutes can be taken by anyone and should be taken as brief and clear as possible.
5. **Communication rules:** Define your own communication rules within the WP meetings in order to interrupt when discussions lead nowhere and focus on important points to discuss. Make sure everyone is heard and feels welcome to talk.

The teams usually start meetings with a quick chat about the general wellbeing and the latest topics. The Project Manager as well as the Speaker of the project are always available for hints, critique, or suggestions for improvement. They encourage to use "out of office" responder to be transparent with own availability. They do also provide all information on interesting and related workshops, conferences and meetings to strengthen our knowledge network.

Our Project Management Manual acts as guideline for new staff members. The Project Manager and the Speaker try to have a conversation with new staff at the start of their work for the project.

All staff members are hired according to a set of qualification requirements that each beneficiary is responsible for. All staff members shall obtain contracts according to the duration of the project when possible.

## 5.2. Gender and equal opportunities (see CSA Part B)

In art academies there is mostly no surplus of male or female staff. In our project gender is rather balanced. Our gender table in the F&T portal shows a rather balanced ratio. The partners respect the staff gender equality in scientific careers, the gender balance in decision making, and strive to integrate the gender dimension into the content of research and innovation. As an alliance with a strong focus on networking and interaction with society, a strengthened human capital is crucial. To date, our universities have dealt with topics such as equal opportunities, family-friendly and barrier-free academies, gender, and diversity to varying degrees in their respective countries. In our consortium, everyone will benefit from the concepts of those who have had these topics on their agenda for a long time. An exchange will not only take place at the scientific level, but also at the level of cooperation and exchange of knowledge and experience. We will take gender aspects into account both when recruiting staff and when putting together research teams or selecting people for scholarships, exhibitions, training courses, etc. In the selection of our research questions, we will consider minority perspectives and transcultural approaches as well as a student body that represents the diversity of the population.

Table 3 "Gender of researchers and workforce involved in the project"

| Beneficiary | No. of female researchers | No. of male researchers | Number of females in workforce other than researchers | Number of males in workforce other than researchers | Total number of females in workforce | Total number of males in workforce |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| HfBK | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| MKE | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 1 |
| ABAroma | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 |
| LMA | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 |

Special consideration must be given to questions of equal opportunities, gender justice and inclusion, as well as comparable issues. We do take into consideration the "Freedom of the Arts and Sciences" provided at the EC webpage.

# 6. Risk Mitigation and adaption of identified risks

The proposal was written one year ago, so all identified risks need to be reflected on.

The HfBK as the lead of the project keeps the overview of the identified risks. The designated Speaker and Project Manager are the first contact people for all partners, should an identified risk turn into a tangible problem or should a previously ignored risk occur. To guarantee the achievement of EU4ART_*differences* objectives it is crucial to identify and assess risks. To discuss early indicators for potential risks, regular meetings (CM team meeting, WP1 meetings, SC meetings) are called.

The consortium has carefully evaluated potential project risks and is aware of the significance of each one. It will provide an updated list of risks in the periodic report.

The experiences in H2020 project management will raise during the project phase. The Project Manager makes sure to take advantage of all further education options in terms of tutorials or workshops regarding financial management, and to share all interesting events with the consortium.

The outlined risks in the proposal have been reviewed and there was no need for an update.

Table 4: List of identified risks

| Description of risk (indicate level of likelihood: Low/Medium/High) | Work package(s) involved | Proposed risk-mitigation measures |
|---|---|---|
| Pandemia (high) | all partners | Reallocations and budget redistributions to the WPs that are able to work (including consultation and exchange of experience in health care, emergency operation, mobile work to carry out the planned tasks) |
| Loss of working hours due to prolonged illness or other (medium) | all partners | occasional or regular appraisal interview; personnel planning; reallocations and budget redistributions to the WPs that are able to work |
| Travel cancellations for planned meetings (medium) | all partners | Switch to virtual meetings |
| Cooperation partners do not share information and access to an extended technology platform (low) | WP4 / all partners | Consulting in Content Management Team; joint search for another solution and, if necessary, budget redistribution and task reallocation |
| Planned projects are limited by political structures (medium) | all partners | Consulting in Content Management Team; Consultation with the EU Commission; Involvement of European mediators where appropriate; Promotion of the dialogue between members of the university among themselves and with the population; increasing the presence of the university in public; presentation of the social tasks and achievements of the university, events on current political issues concerning education, art, culture |
| Disagreements within the consortium | all partners | The EU4ART Consortium Agreement contains provisions to help in such cases; Depending on which partners have disagreements, uninvolved partners or members of the Steering Committee are asked to act as mediators. |
| Finances are not sufficient to complete projects | all partners | Consulting in Content Management Team; joint search for another solution and, if necessary, budget redistribution and task reallocation; Submission of project applications to potential providers of third-party funding |
| Conviction to ethical principles | all partners | Consulting in Content Management Team; Consultation with the EU Commission; Involvement of European mediators where appropriate |
| Failure of IT systems and data loss | all partners | Data protection; backup; updating of hardware and software, regular system checks appointment of IT security officer |

In the first half year of the project the alliance members were not able to get to know each other personally due to the pandemic, which was rated as the highest risk. Instead of a common kick-off meeting in one of the partner's academy many online meetings were organized. That way all members could discuss more often via this newly more accepted way of communication. At the same time all partners agreed that at least one personal meeting in the beginning would have been crucial for the further collaboration. Within the first six months of the project most of the academies were closed completely or partly. Professors and staff were working from home with all advantages and disadvantages. Most of the members had and still have a huge workload due to online teaching and new ways of working with students and colleagues. Some colleagues got Covid-19 and are recovering from that, more ore less easily. Nevertheless, the project has started successfully, a first meeting is planned and the academies do open again in summer 2021. Everything that lays ahead of the project regarding mobility is not being able to be calculated now.

## 7. Evaluation of Project Management, Structure and Collaboration

To gain a good insight into the current working relationships, requirements, and criticisms of (especially digital) collaboration, evaluations are carried out on a regular basis. Free web tools are used for this purpose, which allow surveys with a smaller target group to be conducted at no additional cost. These surveys are always anonymous and regularly adapted, improved, and reviewed.

An initial survey about the entire team collaboration took place after 150 days of collaborative work using the provider SurveyMonkey. The 11-question survey was sent to 18 team members. 12 responses were collected within two weeks. These questions each contain choices for a gradation of agreement with statements and free-text fields for comments. This initial survey indicated that overall, consortium members are satisfied with the project management and collaboration tools provided. Some comments and critical assessments are being reviewed and suggestions for improvement are being developed. Overall, it showed that evaluations are a valuable tool to get a mood picture and to give everyone a voice for criticism and appreciation. The evaluations are created and evaluated by WP1 Project Management.

Other evaluations can be carried out in the form of self-reports by lectures and academic staff once the alliance starts with the third cycle phase in the third project year. The project's effectiveness in carrying out publications into the society will be closely monitored and evaluated. A critical feedback from the Advisory Board will also be taken into consideration.

## 8. Dissemination and Communication Standards

This part refers a lot to D5.1 (submitted in M6) as well as to D1.1 (submitted in M3).

### Templates

All documents of the EU4ART_differences project shall have a generic format and style. A Word template is used to help with typo and required determinations in the document (see templates in the annex and D1.1). All templates are made available on our file share server used by all beneficiaries. All

templates contain respective and EC funding information. They all follow the same structure to ensure readability and comprehensibility. All templates are named "tmpl_type".

### File Share Server

The Project Coordinator has set up a file share server along with grant access rules to share documents with all consortium members. Everyone should be able to find the latest version of collaborative documents. The Project Coordinator also takes care of regular viewing of files that are no longer needed to be minimalistic, clearly structured, and efficient. All files are sorted in folders following a clear structure.

All final deliverables submitted are named "Dx_y_EU4ART_differences.pdf"
All monthly reports are named "year_month_report_WPx"
All quarterly reports for the Steering Committee are named "year_month_quarterly_report_WPx"
All minutes are named "year_month_day_WPx_minutes" or saved in one ongoing document.
Month names are replaced by the related numbers.

### Language

All formal documents produced by the consortium will be written in English. Formal documents include meeting minutes, monthly and quarterly reports, deliverables, and interim and final report to the EC. All meetings on alliance level (WP meetings, CM team meetings, SC meetings, AB meetings) are held in English taking different English language levels into account.

### Software

The following software programmes are used within the consortium.

- MS Office 365 and MS Office desktop programmes (Word, Powerpoint, Excel, Notes, Teams, ect.)
- Presentation tool MIRO
- Adobe Acrobat Professional (PDF for forms and final versions of submitted documents)
- Zoom for online meetings (licensed)
- Teams for online meetings (partly licensed)
- Other online meeting tools (e.g. kumospace, wonder.me) for casual meetings, coffee breaks for socialising

Every partner institution follows, apart from this, their own quality management and controlling guidelines. These controlling systems will not be influenced by the project quality assessment and controlling.