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Please note that this report is compiled 3 weeks before the BFUG meeting The oral presentation at the BFUG meeting will include updated information

*In this period since the BFUG meeting on 9-10 Apr BFUG in Athens Board meeting in Astana, the Working group has:*

* *reported to the BFUG Board meeting on 9July, 2014 in Rome;*
* *held a WG meeting on 2 July, 2014 in Riga;*
* *worked at the data received from countries*

## *Work process and status quo*

**Data collected through BFUG survey.** The work of the Working group was hindered due to slow data collection from then countries. 45 days after the deadline at least 15 countries still had not submitted the finalised, completed questionnaire. At 60 days past the deadline there were still 6 countries that had not submitted any data at all, and another 7 countries that had partially submitted data. For those reasons, in order to enable data analysis to begin, and for EHEA wide information to be considered, the WG Reporting decided that if the countries did not complete the online questionnaires by 27 July 2014, it could not be guaranteed that their data would be reflected in the Report. This decision helped. At the time of writing this report at the end of August, all countries except Ukraine have finalized data collection or at least have submitted most of the data requested.

**Data collected by Eurostat**. Sogeti, the subcontractor to Eurostat is in charge of collecting and analysing the statistical data for the Report. For the countries that are members of the European Statistical System (ESS) Eurostat data will be used; whereas for the non-members of ESS, data is being collected from the best available statistical sources. Questionnaires were sent out in May 2014 with a deadline for submission of 30 June 2014. However, following requests made by several countries, the deadline was extended. The further work is on track and the preliminary EUROSTAT data is expected in September and finalised data in October.

**Data collected by Eurostudent.** 30 countries participate in the project yet they do not all have the same status. The countries were split into two groups: the first group should have submitted data by the end of December 2013, and the second group would deliver the data by the end of August 2014. Some delays in data submission occurred for the first group, and data for 20 countries is currently being analysed. Taking into account that the number of participating countries has doubled and the number of indicators has increased, the delays in data submission may have consequences for the preparation of the final report.

**Preparing the report**. Eurydice is currently calculating indicators and carrying out the preliminary analysis and drafting. Eurostudent and Eurostat data will be integrated when it becomes available. It is expected that EURYDICE will manage to do the bulk of the analysis in September / October in order to submit the first draft of the report for the WG Reporting meeting in the beginning of November and to the BFUG meeting on 27-28 November in Rome.

## NEW SCORECARD INDICATOR PROPOSALS

At its meeting in Riga, 2 July, 2014 the WG Reporting discussed the suggested new scorecard indicators. The following indicators are submitted to the BFUG meeting in Rome on 18-19 Sep, 2014 for discussion and a decision on whether or not to include them in the report:

*Please see more details in Annex to this document*

**Indicator 1: Level of national openness to cross border QA activity of EQAR registered agencies**

**Indicator 2: Portability of public grants and publicly subsidised loans**

**Indicator 3: Support provided to disadvantaged students**

**Indicator 4: Mobility support to disadvantaged students**

**Indicator 5: National Implementation of the principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention**

**Indicator 6: System-Level recognition of 3 cycle degrees**

**Indicator 7: Internationalisation and Mobility\***

\* feasibility can only be assessed on the basis of statistical data from Eurostat   
 (to be available in September 2014)

Other new scorecard indicators suggested, although they could be interesting and useful, were omitted because the data collection revealed problems regarding the feasibility of data needed to produce those indicators. Available data will, however, be used to report as reliably as possible on the main issues covered by these proposed scorecard indcators. The excluded indicators are the following:

* Indicator Proposal (former 4): Information, guidance and counselling for students   
  (DATA NOT AVAILABLE)
* Indicator Proposal (former 5): Outgoing Mobility   
  (DATA NOT AVAILABLE)
* Indicator Proposal (former 6): Mobility grants to students with low socio-economic background (DATA NOT POSSIBLE)

## Important deadlines

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Jan 31, 2014* | *Sending questionnaire to countries* |
| *Feb 12, 2014* | *WG Reporting to BFUG board in Astana* |
| *Apr 9-10, 2014* | *WG Reporting to BFUG board in Athens* |
| *Apr 30, 2014* | *Deadline for data submission* |
| *Jul 2, 2014* | *WG meeting in Riga: first discussion of the structure of the implementation report, draft chapters; scorecard indicators* |
| September 18-19, 2014 | BFUG meeting - presentation of preliminary results. |
| November 5-6 (?), 2014 | WG Implementation meeting in Brussels: Second discussion on the draft report, finalisation of the scorecard indicators and discussion of issues for conclusions and recommendations. |
| **2015** | |
| January 13, 2015 | WG meeting in Riga: last amendments to final report |
| January 26-27, 2015 | BFUG: discussion of draft integrated report and of the conclusions prepared by the WG Implementation |
| March 24-25, 2015 | Print-ready electronic version of the integrated report provided to BFUG |
| **May 2015** | **Presentation of final integrated report to the ministerial conference** |

***Annex***

# NEW SCORECARD INDICATOR PROPOSALS

## Background

At its meeting of 2 July in Riga, the Reporting Working Group agreed to recommend to the BFUG the following proposals for new scorecard indicators for the 2015 Bologna Implementation Report.

These indicators have been developed to follow up policy priorities outlined in the 2012 Bucharest Communiqué. Relevant BFUG working groups have had the opportunity to comment on the indicators, and adjustments have been made in line with received comments.

It is hoped that these indicators will provide a better balance of scorecard and other indicators throughout the report, with scorecard indicators highlighting progress on some of the main policy commitments agreed in recent years, as well as continuing to show the evolution on commitments agreed during the first decade of the Bologna process.

These indicators have been tested in the light of preliminary questionnaire data submitted by the BFUG national representatives. From a technical perspective, the first 6 can be considered feasible. In the case of indicator 7 on internationalisation, the feasibility can only be assessed on the basis of statistical data which is currently being collected and should be available by September 2014.

Indicator Proposal 1: Level of national openness to cross border QA activity of EQAR registered agencies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| List of countries | Description of categories |
|  | **All institutions/programmes** can choose to be evaluated by an EQAR-registered QA agency to fulfil the official requirements for external QA, and the outcome of the review is fully recognised. EQAR registration serves as a criterion for agencies to be allowed to carry out cross-border evaluation/accreditation/audit. |
|  | **Some institutions/programmes** can choose to be evaluated by an EQAR-registered QA agency to fulfil the official requirements for external QA, and the outcome of the review is fully recognised. EQAR registration serves as a criterion for agencies to be allowed to carry out cross-border evaluation/accreditation/audit. |
|  | **Some or all institutions/programmes** can choose to be evaluated by QA agencies from outside the country to fulfil the official requirements for external QA, but **criteria other than EQAR registration** are used to determine which agencies are able to carry out such cross-border evaluation/accreditation/audit. |
|  | Discussions are ongoing or plans have been made to establish a legal framework allowing EQAR-registered agencies to operate in the country. |
|  | Institutions/programmes cannot be evaluated by QA agencies from outside the country to fulfil the official requirements for external QA, and no plans are being discussed. |

Source: Eurydice

**Indicator Proposal 2: Portability of public grants and publicly subsidised loans**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| List of countries | Description of categories |
|  | **Full portability** across the EHEA of available national student support measures – grants and/or loans – for credit and degree mobility. Equivalent requirements for public grants and/or loans if students study in the home country or abroad |
|  | **Portabilit**y of available national student support measures – grants and/or loans – for credit and degree mobility, but **with some restriction**\*. |
|  | **Credit portability** of all available national student support measures – grants and/or loans – with or without restrictions. **Degree portability of either grants or loans**, but not both. |
|  | **Credit portability** of all available national student support measures – grants and/or loans – with or without restrictions. **No degree portability**. |
|  | **No portability\*\***: public grants and/or loans are only provided if students study in the home country or in exceptional cases (no equivalent programme is available in the home country). |

Source: Eurydice + Eurostudent

**\*** Restrictions considered relate to geography (country limitations), types of programme, field of study or time.  
\*\* Countries where less than 10% of the student population receive financial support in the form of grants and/or loans will be considered as "Not Applicable" for this indicator.

Indicator Proposal 3: Support provided to disadvantaged students

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| List of countries | Description of categories |
|  | Financial support targeted at disadvantaged students  **OR** Mainstream support with need-based allocation provided to more than 50% of students  Quantitative policy objectives for participation and/or completion of disadvantaged students  Monitoring participation and completion of disadvantaged students; |
|  | Financial support targeted at disadvantaged students  **OR** Mainstream support with need-based allocation provided to more than 50% of students  No quantitative policy objectives  Monitoring the participation and completion of disadvantaged students; |
|  | Financial support targeted at disadvantaged students  **OR** Mainstream support with need-based allocation provided to more than 50% of students  No quantitative policy objectives  No monitoring |
|  | Financial support with need-based allocation provided to some, but less than 50% of students,  No quantitative policy objectives  No monitoring; |
|  | No financial support provided to disadvantaged students\*  No quantitative policy objectives  No monitoring |

Source: Eurydice & Eurostudent

\* Countries where less than 10% of the student population receive financial support in the form of grants and/or loans will be considered as "Not Applicable" for this indicator.

**Indicator Proposal 4: Mobility support to disadvantaged students**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| List of countries | Description of categories |
|  | Financial mobility support targeted to disadvantaged students  **OR** Portable targeted grants provided to disadvantaged students  **OR** Mainstream portable grants with need-based allocation provided to more than 50% of students;  Systematic monitoring of disadvantaged students in mobility; |
|  | Financial mobility support targeted to disadvantaged students  **OR** Portable targeted grants provided to disadvantaged students  **OR** Mainstream portable grants with need-based allocation provided to more than 50% of students;  Ad hoc monitoring of disadvantaged students in mobility; |
|  | Financial mobility support targeted to disadvantaged students OR Portable targeted grants provided to disadvantaged students OR Mainstream portable grants with need-based allocation provided to more than 50% of students;  No monitoring of disadvantaged students in mobility; |
|  | No targeted support for mobility provided to disadvantaged students;  Support with need-based allocation provided to some, but less than 50% of students  No monitoring; |
|  | No support provided to disadvantaged students for mobility.\* |

Source: Eurydice and Eurostudent

\*Countries where less than 10% of the student population receive financial support in the form of grants and/or loans will be considered as "Not Applicable" for this indicator.

**Indicator proposal 5: National Implementation of the principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| List of countries | Description of categories |
|  | The Convention has been ratified and appropriate legislation complies with the legal framework of the Lisbon Recognition Convention and the later Supplementary Documents[[1]](#footnote-1), so that the five main principles are fulfilled and:  1) Applicants have a right to fair assessment;  2) There is recognition if no substantial differences can be proven;  3 )In cases of negative decisions, competent authority demonstrates the existence of substantial difference  4) There is a right of appeal |
|  | The Convention has been ratified and appropriate legislation complies with abovementioned principles 1) 2) and 3) |
| **)** | The Convention has been ratified and appropriate legislation complies with abovementioned principles 1) 2) and 4) |
|  | The Convention has been ratified and appropriate legislation complies with abovementioned principles 1) and 2) |
|  | The Convention has been ratified but either principle 1) or 2) or both is not fulfilled  **OR**  The Convention has not been ratified |

**Indicator proposal 6: System-Level recognition of three cycle degrees**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| List of countries | Description of categories |
|  | Qualifications from all EHEA countries giving access to the next cycle are treated in the same way as national qualifications for all 3 cycles |
|  | Qualifications from all EHEA countries giving access to the next cycle are treated in the same way as national qualifications for at least one cycle |
|  | Qualifications from some EHEA countries giving access to the next cycle are treated in the same way as national qualifications for all cycles |
|  | Qualifications from some EHEA countries giving access to the next cycle are treated in the same way as national qualifications for at least one cycle |
|  | Qualifications from all EHEA countries giving access to the next cycle are treated differently to national qualifications |

**Indicator proposal 7: Internationalisation and Mobility**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| List of countries | Description of categories |
|  | 1. National strategy on the internationalisation of higher education which sets targets for both student and staff mobility 2. (> 80%) of HEIs provide evidence of a strategic approach to internationalisation 3. (> 80%) of HEIs provide evidence of international cooperation in higher education 4. (> 15%) of second cycle students have acquired their prior first cycle qualification abroad   **And**  (> 15%) of first cycle graduates leave to study the second cycle in a higher education institution in another country  **Or**  Since 2010 there has been an increase of (more than 3%) in second cycle students that have acquired their prior first cycle qualification in another country  **And**  Since 2010 there has been an increase of (more than 3%) in first cycle graduates that leave to study the second cycle in a higher education institution in another country |
|  | 3 of the 4 elements are met |
|  | 2 of the 4 elements are met |
|  | 1 of the 4 elements are met |
|  | None of the elements are met |

1. Recommendation on the Criteria and Procedures for Recognition (2001), Recommendation on the Recognition of Joint Degrees (2004), Code of Good Practice in the Provision of Transnational Education (2001) <http://www.enic-naric.net/instruments.asp?display=legal_framework> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)