

Monitoring and Evaluation Group Regulation

Preamble

The Monitoring and Evaluation Group (MEG) represents a governance mechanism to monitor and evaluate project activities in relation to the aims and ambitions of the project.

I. General provisions

- 1. The MEG is part of the JoinUs4Health project (Project). It is an advisory body operating simultaneously at 3 universities (cohort study institutions) where the project is implemented - one MEG per university*
- 2. The main goal of the MEG is to monitor and evaluate the JoinUs4Health Project.*
- 3. In matters not regulated by these Regulations, the content of both the Grant Agreement and Consortium Agreement signed between the partners implementing the Project shall be applicable.*

II. The method of establishing the Monitoring and Evaluation Group

- 1. The MEG consists of 10-15 Board members from the defined Project stakeholder groups (2-3 members representing Citizens, Researchers, Education community, Policy makers, Business/Industry). The operation of the MEG is possible with a minimum of 8 members.*
- 2. Information about recruitment of MEG members will be disseminated via the local websites of the JoinUs4Health project and networks of the project partners. Applications can be made via e-mail (contact@joinus4health.eu) by submitting the provided application form developed by the Project Management Team that is also responsible for the recruitment process.*
- 3. The selection of the members of the MEG from the candidates is made by the project representatives or the Steering Committee of the respective cohort.*
- 4. The term of office of the MEG is ideally until 31/12/2023. However, members can choose to leave the board any time.*
- 5. If a MEG member resigns, another member will be recruited. This is the task of the Project Management Team in cooperation with the MEG.*

III. Principles of operation of the Monitoring and Evaluation Group

- 1. MEG meetings are scheduled quarterly to monitor the progress of the project and reflect on (potential) scientific as well as societal impacts, risks and opportunities.*

Roles

2. MEG members can take on different roles, which can either be fixed for a year or alternate between members: Chairperson, moderator, reporter (keeping notes and circulating draft reports).
3. The MEG will be chaired by a designated MEG representative. A chairing MEG member may either be elected by MEG members as a fixed member for one year or different members can share this responsibility to switch the chairing role between meetings.
4. One or more board members are selected to represent the MEG externally as well as in exchange with the representatives of the Project Management Team, Citizen Science Board, and Scientific steering committee.
5. The meetings are moderated by one or more selected MEG members or a project representative.

Organization of the meetings

6. Before each meeting, Project Management Team staff and MEG members propose agenda points and relevant documents to the Chair(s) of the respective group via e-mail. The JoinUs4Health Team will provide related materials.
7. The chair (with assistance from other members) revises these suggestions and discusses / clarifies aspects with project staff in advance and subsequently forwards these documents to the other group members. Ideally sought decisions and input are clearly specified in advance.
8. At least one Project Team Member will join each meeting.
9. MEG's decisions are made in open voting, by 2/3 majority of votes. If such an agreement cannot be reached, conflicting views will be clearly indicated in the meeting report and assessed by the JoinUs4Health project management team. Minority views will also be included in the meeting summary.
10. MEG meetings are usually held via virtual meetings.
11. A summary of each local meeting is translated into English for information of the MEGs of the other countries to allow peer-learning and inclusion of different (country) perspectives.
12. The MEG may invite experts participating in the project, platform members or other stakeholders to its meetings, as well as consult external experts on the discussed issues.
13. The MEG may establish partnership with other similar citizen science advisory bodies.
14. The MEG complies with national and European laws on personal data protection, research ethics and intellectual property.

IV. Tasks and the manner of their implementation

1. The tasks of MEG resulting from the provisions of the project include in particular:
 - engage in the decision process of the ongoing project and review submitted M&E reports, finances and other aspects related to management, monitoring and evaluation;
 - revise monitoring and evaluation reports every 6 months on the progress of the Project, examine indicators and risks and provide strategic advice;

- if necessary, propose modifications of the Consortium Plan to the Project Management Team
2. MEG members should:
 - prior to the meeting: Read the circulated documents and contemplate on the raised aspects;
 - at the meeting: Contribute to discussions and decision-making;
 - after the meeting: Revise the meeting summary.
 3. A MEG member with personal connections to the issue under review is excluded from voting
 4. Opinions, conclusions and recommendations developed by the MEG are presented in writing and sent to the Project Manager Team within ten working days.
 5. MEG members perform their tasks free of charge.
 6. MEG members can propose to extend their activities to the Project. Proposals for new activities are presented to the Project Management Team through the Chairperson or another MEG member appointed by the Chairperson.

V. Monitoring and Evaluation Group dissolution (termination)

1. After the end of the funding period (31/12/2023), the MEG is dissolved as an advisory body for the JoinUs4Health Project.
2. Since the activities via the platform and institutional changes are envisaged to continue after the end of the project, a MEG is envisaged to continue advising their respective cohort institution.
3. The functioning of the future MEG will be regulated by separate regulations prepared by the respective cohort institution, although cooperation between the three institutions would be beneficial even after the end of the project.