

## FIRST MEETING OF THE BFUG WG 1 ON MONITORING

Kirkegt 18, Oslo (Norway) 19 February 2016

### Working Document: Guidelines to the evaluation of the 2015 Bologna Implementation Report

#### **Introduction**

The purpose of this document is to provide information to help guide the working group discussion on the evaluation of the 2015 Bologna Implementation report. It raises some questions that should be considered during the first meeting of Working Group 1, and provides relevant background information for the discussion.

#### **Part 1: Overview of Issues for discussion**

##### **Framework conditions for the 2018 report**

Guided by Working Group 1 and the BFUG, the report will be produced by Eurydice, in cooperation with Eurostat and Eurostudent, and will continue to draw on information provided through these three sources (BFUG questionnaire, Eurostat statistical data and Eurostudent survey data). The working group can consider, however, if other sources might also be considered. For instance, with regard to indicators that show national perceptions of reality, it could be possible to distinguish between Ministry perceptions and those of the national student unions or other actors. The indicators where such an approach could be considered are mentioned specifically in Part 2.

The Reference year for indicators in the 2018 report will be 2016/17, and data will be collected between January/February – May/June 2017.

The working group should bear in mind that the human resources to produce this report will be limited, and that the volume of information and analysis provided in the 2015 report should be considered as an absolute maximum that will be possible. Therefore, while there are issues that may require more investigation than in the 2015 report, and while new political commitments will require new questions and indicators, this should be balanced by reducing attention to other issues and removing certain indicators that are no longer essential. In Part 2 of this document, a first attempt has been made to highlight some indicators that may be less essential than others.

#### **New Topics**

The Yerevan Conference and Communiqué provide food for thought with regard to two issues in particular that need to be considered in relation to the 2018 report:

- 1) Fundamental values as the cornerstone of the EHEA

The debates regarding the accession of Belarus and the future of the EHEA have raised some key questions about fundamental academic values, and this was also reflected in the BFUG debates on a future vision for the EHEA. With the Yerevan Communiqué there is now a statement of a renewed

vision of European cooperation in higher education, and with the adoption of a roadmap for Belarus, a recognition that, despite the voluntary nature of the process, there are key commitments that have to be respected by all countries if the EHEA is to have sense and meaning.

Until now, the Implementation report has given little attention to core academic values and institutional autonomy. However, as Belarus is to be monitored specifically on issues related to these core values, all other countries should also come under some scrutiny. The working group is therefore asked to consider how this issue could be addressed. A starting point for the discussion should be the [Council of Europe Recommendation 2012/7](#) on the responsibility of public authorities for academic freedom and institutional autonomy.

## 2) Teaching and learning

Teaching and learning has not been addressed as a specific topic in previous reports, but rather improvements in the quality of teaching and learning have been assumed when implementation of agreed reforms and objectives has been demonstrated. The working group is asked to consider which aspects of teaching and learning it may be possible to report on in the 2018 report, including issues such as digital learning that have not previously been tackled.

## Structure of the 2018 report

### Questions for the working group:

- What are the strengths and weaknesses of the structure of the 2015 report?
- Could an alternative structure improve the report? For example, the chapter structure could be reorganised to better reflect the 4 priorities of the Yerevan Communiqué as suggested below:

Context; Structural Reforms; Learning and Teaching; Employability; Inclusive higher education; Quality Assurance

## Scoreboard indicators

### Questions for the working group:

- Are all "old" scoreboard indicators still relevant?
- Which new scoreboard indicators should be proposed?

In this context, the working group should bear in mind that an indicator on automatic recognition was desired and requested by the BFUG for the 2015 report, but proved to be not feasible at this time. This was because the BFUG questionnaire had not asked the questions that would have been required to create an indicator that is aligned with the recommendations of the Pathfinder Group (which of course was far from finalising its work when the BFUG Questionnaire was sent). For the 2018 report, however, it is possible to propose a scoreboard indicator that is based on the recommendations of the pathfinder group (see annex 1). This can now be considered.

## Part 2: Review of indicators

This section considers all indicators in the 2015 report, with suggestions as to which may need to be adapted, and those which could possibly be omitted. Indicators which merit particular discussion are highlighted (in yellow) with comments (in green).

Suggestions for new indicators are also highlighted.

### Chapter 1: Context of the European Higher Education Area

All indicators in this chapter are considered relevant in providing contextual information for the EHEA. No amendments are proposed.

- Figure 1.1: Number of students enrolled in tertiary education by ISCED level, 2011/12  
Figure 1.2: Distribution of students enrolled in tertiary level of education by ISCED level, 2011/12  
Figure 1.3: Change in the total number of students enrolled in tertiary education between 2005/06 and 2008/09 and between 2008/09 and 2011/12  
Figure 1.4: Enrolment rates in tertiary education for the 18-34 years old (% of the total population aged 18-34), 2005/06, 2008/09 and 2011/12  
Figure 1.5: Demographic projections in steering documents for higher education policy, 2013/14  
Figure 1.6: Number of higher education institutions in the EHEA, 2015  
Figure 1.7: Annual public expenditure on tertiary education as a % of GDP, 2011  
Figure 1.8: Annual public expenditure on tertiary education as a % of total public expenditure, 2005, 2008 and 2011  
Figure 1.9: Yearly changes in real public expenditure on tertiary education between 2008 and 2012, (price index 2005=100)  
Figure 1.10: Annual expenditure on public and private tertiary education institutions, per full-time equivalent student in PPS, 2005, 2008 and 2011  
Figure 1.11: Annual public expenditure on public and private education institutions on tertiary education per full-time equivalent student in PPS relative to the GDP per inhabitant in PPS, 2005, 2008 and 2011

### Chapter 2: Degrees and Qualifications

A number of indicators in this chapter could be amended and/or further developed to take account of evolving priorities.

Figure 2.1: Percentage of students enrolled in programmes following the Bologna three-cycle structure, 2008/09 and 2011/12

Figure 2.2: Scorecard indicator n°1:  
Stage of implementation of the first and second cycle, 2013/14  
The WG may wish to discuss whether this indicator should be amended

Figure 2.3: Distribution of students enrolled in programmes following the Bologna three-cycle structure, by cycle, 2011/12

Figure 2.4: Share of first cycle-programmes having workload 180 ECTS credits, 210 Credits and 240 ECTS credits or other number of credits, 2013/14

Figure 2.5: Share of second-cycle (master) programmes with a workload of 60-75, 90, 120 or another number of ECTS credits, 2013/14

Figure 2.6: Possible combinations of student workload of the first and second cycle

The WG may wish to discuss whether this indicator should be amended

Figure 2.7: Nationally set minimum total duration of the Bachelor & Master programmes, 2013/14

Figure 2.8: Presence of integrated/long programmes leading to a second cycle degree, 2013/14

Figure 2.9: Do short cycle programmes belong to higher education? 2013/14

Given the importance of the topic of short cycle higher education in the EHEA, this indicator and 2.10 may be insufficient. Proposals for additional indicators are therefore welcome

Figure 2.10: Gaining credits towards Bachelor programme in the same field for previous short-cycle studies, 2014

Figure 2.11: Scorecard indicator n°2:

Access to the next cycle, 2013/14

The WG may wish to discuss whether this indicator remains relevant

Figure 2.12: Requirement to sit exams, take additional courses or have work experience for holders of a first cycle degree to be admitted to a second cycle programme, 2013/14

Figure 2.13: Share of first cycle students continuing studies in a second-cycle programme after graduation from the first cycle (within one year), 2013/14

Figure 2.14: Share of doctoral candidates in the total number of students in Bologna pattern, 2012

Figure 2.15: Percentage of second cycle graduates eventually entering a third-cycle programme, 2013/14

Figure 2.16: Percentage of doctoral students in doctoral schools, 2013/14

The WG may wish to discuss whether this indicator should be amended

Figure 2.17: The length of full-time third cycle programmes defined in the national steering documents, 2013/14

Figure 2.18: Use of ECTS credits in doctoral programmes, 2013/14

Figure 2.19: Scorecard indicator n°3:

Implementation of national qualifications frameworks, 2013/14

Figure 2.20: Progress in development of national qualifications frameworks according to the 11 steps, 2013/14

Figure 2.21: Scorecard indicator n°4:

Stage of implementation of ECTS system, 2013/14

The WG may wish to discuss whether this indicator should be amended in view of the new ECTS User Guide

Figure 2.22: Share of programmes using ECTS credits for accumulation and transfer for all elements of study programmes, 2013/14

The WG may wish to discuss whether this indicator could be enhanced through comparison with ESU data

Figure 2.23: Extent to which ECTS credits are linked with learning outcomes in higher education programmes, 2013/14

The WG may wish to discuss whether this indicator could be enhanced through comparison with ESU data

Figure 2.24: Basis to award ECTS credit in the majority of higher education institutions, 2013/14

The WG may wish to discuss whether this indicator could be enhanced through comparison with ESU data

Figure 2.25: Steering and/or encouraging use of learning outcomes in national policy for programme development, 2013/14

The WG may wish to discuss whether this indicator should be amended

Figure 2.26: Steering and/or encouraging student assessment procedures to focus on learning outcomes, 2013/14

The WG may wish to discuss whether this indicator should be amended

Figure 2.27: Importance of elements of student-centred learning in the eyes of EHEA countries (of total score 5), 2013/14

The WG may wish to discuss whether this indicator could be enhanced through comparison with ESU data

Figure 2.28: Scorecard indicator n°5:

Stage of implementation of the Diploma Supplement, 2013/14

The WG may wish to discuss whether this indicator should be amended

Figure 2.29: Issuing Diploma Supplement to graduates in the third cycle, 2013/14

The WG may wish to discuss whether this indicator remains relevant

Figure 2.30: Principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention in national legislation, 2013/14

Figure 2.31: Institution which makes final decisions on recognising foreign qualifications for academic purposes, 2013/14

Figure 2.32: Do higher education institutions typically make recognition decisions centrally? 2013/14

Figure 2.33: System-Level recognition of three cycle degrees, 2013/14

NEW SCOREBOARD INDICATOR ON AUTOMATIC RECOGNITION TO BE ADDED

## Chapter 3

The indicators in this chapter will need to be revised in light of the revised ESG. There is also a need to develop a new indicator on the European Approach to QA of Joint Programmes.

Figure 3.1 Publication of institutional strategies for quality enhancement in past 5 years

The WG may wish to discuss whether this indicator remains relevant

Figure 3.2 Responsibility for external QA

Figure 3.3 Main outcome of external evaluation by QA agency

Figure 3.4 Publication of critical and negative outcomes

The WG may wish to discuss whether this indicator should be amended so that it is not only about publication by HEIs

Figure 3.5 QA Agencies registered on EQAR

3.6 Encouraging national QA agencies to register with EQAR and become a member of ENQA

The WG may wish to discuss whether this indicator should be amended

3.7 Scorecard on openness to cross border

New indicator on implementation of European Approach to QA of Joint programmes to be added

Figure 3.8: Scorecard indicator n°7:

Stage of development of external quality assurance system, 2013/14

Figure 3.9: Involvement of students in quality assurance governance bodies, 2013/14

The WG may wish to discuss whether this indicator could be enhanced through comparison with ESU data

Figure 3.10: Involvement of students in external review teams, 2013/14

The WG may wish to discuss whether this indicator could be enhanced through comparison with ESU data

Figure 3.11: Involvement of students in decision-making processes for external reviews, 2013/14

The WG may wish to discuss whether this indicator could be enhanced through comparison with ESU data

Figure 3.12: Scorecard indicator n°8: Level of student participation in external quality assurance system, 2013/14

Figure 3.13: Scorecard indicator n°9: Level of international participation in external quality assurance, 2013/14

Figure 3.14: Required involvement of employers in quality assurance governance bodies and external review teams, 2013/14

## Chapter 4: Social Dimension in Higher Education

Some indicators in this chapter merit more detailed exploration. There are arguably too many indicators on fees.

Figure 4.1: Percentage of women in new entrants in tertiary education in 2008/09 and 2011/12 and the variation in %

The WG may wish to discuss whether this indicator should be amended. More relevant to show the share of women / men completing HE

Figure 4.2: Percentage of women in new entrants in tertiary education by level of education, 2011/12

The WG may wish to discuss whether this indicator should be amended so that it shows the new ISCED levels (first and second cycle etc)

Figure 4.3: Median share of women in enrolled students in Bologna structures by field of education and level of Bologna structure (first and second cycle), 2011/12

Figure 4.4: Early leavers from education and training as percentage of the foreign-born, native-born and the total population, 2013

Figure 4.5: Participation rates in tertiary education among persons aged 18-29, foreign-born, native-born and total population, 2013

Figure 4.6: Tertiary education attainment of 25 to 34-year-olds by country of birth: odds ratio of native-born over foreign-born population to complete tertiary education, 2013

These 3 indicators could be reduced to one (4.6)...

- Figure 4.7: Educational attainment by educational background: odds ratio of young adults (25-34) with highly educated parents (i.e. tertiary educational attainment) over young adults (25-34) with medium educated parents (i.e. upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary education) to complete tertiary education, 2011
- Figure 4.8: National policy approaches to widening participation in higher education, 2013/14  
This indicator is not the most telling. Strengthen or drop?
- Figure 4.9: Monitoring the composition of the student body, 2013/14  
Questions on monitoring should go further: what do countries do with the information they collect?
- Figure 4.10: Scorecard indicator n°10: Measures to support the participation of disadvantaged students, 2013/14  
Forms of support could be broadened
- Figure 4.11: Alternative routes to higher education for non-traditional candidates, 2013/14  
More information on alternative routes should be requested: target groups, extent of use etc
- Figure 4.12: Recognition of prior learning for progression in higher education studies, 2013/14
- Figure 4.13: Scorecard indicator n°11: Recognition of prior learning, 2013/14  
Criteria for light green should be toughened: it should not be enough to have procedures that are not used in practice
- Figure 4.14: Prevalence of fees in public higher education institutions for home students in the first cycle, 2013/14  
The WG may wish to discuss whether this indicator should be amended: countries with low administrative fees only could be shown in an amended category "no fees or administrative fees below 100 EUR"
- Figure 4.15: Percentage of first cycle students who pay fees, 2013/14
- Figure 4.16: Criteria for determining fee-payers and/or the amount of fees they need to pay, 2013/14
- Figure 4.17: Most common amount of yearly fees for full-time students as a percentage of GDP per capita, 2013/14
- Figure 4.18: Maximum amount of yearly fees for full-time students as a percentage of GDP per capita, 2013/14  
Two maps is perhaps one too many
- Figure 4.19: Monthly fees for first cycle students not living with their parents, in euro and in % of total monthly expenses, 2013/14
- Figure 4.20: Monthly fees for second cycle students not living with their parents, in euro and in % of total monthly expenses, 2013/14
- Figure 4.21: Share of total expenditure for tertiary education institutions from household funding, 2005, 2008, 2011
- Figure 4.22: Support to students enrolled at tertiary education level as a percentage of public expenditure on tertiary education (2005-2008-2011)
- Figure 4.23: Proportion of students receiving grants/scholarships, 2013/14
- Figure 4.24: Student support in the form of grants, loans and tax benefits, 2013/14
- Figure 4.25: Proportion of students taking out loans (both cycles combined), 2013/14
- Figure 4.26: Percentage of fee-payers among recipients of public support in the first cycle, 2013/14
- Figure 4.27: Percentage of fee-payers among non-recipients of public support in the first cycle, 2013/14
- Figure 4.28: Students' assessment of the extent of current financial difficulties (%), 2013/14
- Figure 4.29: Students' assessment of the extent of current financial difficulties by finance-related characteristics of students not living with parents, % of students with (very) serious difficulties, 2013/14
- Figure 4.30: Status of doctoral candidates, 2013/14
- Figure 4.31: Main sources of funding for doctoral candidates, 2013/14

## Chapter 5: Lifelong Learning

The working group for the 2015 report considered that a separate chapter on LLL is not necessarily a good idea. An alternative would be to include issues on adult learning and part-time learners in a new chapter structure.

Figure 5.1: Types of lifelong learning provision in higher education institutions, 2013/14

Categories to be checked/amended

Figure 5.2: Lifelong learning as a recognised mission of higher education institutions, 2013/14

The WG may wish to discuss whether this indicator remains relevant

Figure 5.3: Sources of financing for lifelong learning, 2013/14

Many countries cited difficulties with getting this information, ("not possible to estimate"). Possible amendments to categories

Figure 5.4: Existence of a formal student status other than the status of a full-time student, 2013/14

Figure 5.5: Impact of formal student status on financial arrangements related to higher education studies, 2013/14

Figure 5.6: Impact of student status on eligibility of financial support for students, 2013/14

Figure 5.7: Provision of part-time or other alternative study forms by higher education institutions, 2013/14

The WG may wish to discuss whether this indicator remains relevant.

Figure 5.8: Median of country percentages for students studying part-time in tertiary education, by age, 2011/12

Figure 5.9: % of students studying part-time in tertiary education, by country and by age, 2011/12

Figure 5.10: Median, percentile 25 and percentile 75 of the percentage of students studying part-time in tertiary education, by year, 2002-2012

The WG may wish to discuss whether this indicator remains relevant.

Figure 5.11: Students by formal status of enrolment (self-reported) in %, 2013/14

Figure 5.12: Share of full-time and part-time students by hours spent on study-related activities in a typical week in %, 2013/14

Figure 5.13: % of students enrolled in tertiary education, total and by gender, 30 or more years old, 2011/12

Figure 5.14: % of students enrolled in tertiary education, 30 or more years old, in 2008/09 and variation from 2008/09 to 2011/12

Figure 5.15: Share of delayed transition students in the overall student population among respondents, 2013/14

AND

Figure 5.16: Share of delayed transition students among respondents, by age, 2013/14

Figure 5.17: Adults (30-64) who acquired their higher education degree (ISCED 5 or 6) during adulthood (aged 30 or above) as a percentage of all adults (30-64), 2013

## Chapter 6: Effective Outcomes and Employability

Attainment and completion indicators arguably fit better with social dimension chapter, following the logic of the Yerevan Communiqué

Figure 6.1: Percentage of persons with tertiary education, by age group, 2010 and 2013

Figure 6.2: Completion rates in tertiary type A programmes (%), 2011

Figure 6.3: Net entry rate and net graduation rate (%), tertiary type A programmes, 2011/12

Figure 6.4: Net entry rate and net graduation rate (%), tertiary type B programmes, 2011/12

Figure 6.5: Median net entry rate and median net graduation rate (%), tertiary type A programmes, by academic year, 2001/02-2011/12

Limited added value of indicators on entry and graduation rates. Could be dropped.

Figure 6.6: References to student retention/completion in steering documents, 2013/14

Indicator could be re-thought. An indicator on targets would be stronger

Figure 6.7: Policies/measures on retention/completion targeting under-represented groups of students, 2013/14

Figure 6.8: Targeting the retention of first-year students, 2013/14

Figure 6.9: Application of main measures (introductory or insertion courses, tutoring or mentoring programmes, support for learning and organisational skills) targeting the retention of first-year students, 2013/14

Presentation of this indicator could be improved

Figure 6.10: Incentives given to students to finish their studies on time, 2013/14

Figure 6.11: Systematic measurement of completion rates, 2013/14

Figure 6.12: Systematic measurement of drop-out rates, 2013/14

These two indicators could be merged

Figure 6.13: Impact of completion performance on higher education institutions' funding, 2013/14

Figure 6.14: Unemployment ratio of people aged 20-34 by educational attainment level (%), 2013

Revise indicator: use unemployment rate instead of ratio (easier to understand), and separate by first and second cycle if possible

Figure 6.15: Average annual growth rate of unemployment by educational attainment (%), 2008-2013

Figure 6.16: Unemployment ratio of people aged 20-34 by educational attainment level and by sex (%), 2013

Figure 6.17: Unemployment ratio of tertiary education graduates aged 20-34, by the number of years since graduation (%), 2013

Figure 6.18: Unemployment ratio of tertiary education graduates aged 20-34, by the number of years since graduation and by sex (%), 2013

Make revisions in line with 6.14

Figure 6.19: 25, 50 and 75 percentiles of annual gross income of employees by educational attainment, EU-28, in PPS EUR, 2010 and 2013

Figure 6.20: Ratio of median annual gross income of employees with tertiary education to the median annual gross income of employees with lower levels of education, 2010 and 2013

Figure 6.21: Distribution of people with tertiary education (ISCED 5-6) aged 25-34 and employed in ISCO 1 or 2 (legislators, senior officials, managers and professionals), in ISCO 3 (technicians and associate professionals) and in ISCO 4-9 (%), 2013

Figure 6.22: Change in percentage points of the share of people with tertiary education (ISCED 5-6) aged 25-34 and employed in ISCO 4-9, 2010 to 2013

Figure 6.23: Distribution of people with tertiary education (ISCED 5-6) aged 25-34 and employed in ISCO 1 or 2 (legislators, senior officials, managers and professionals), in ISCO 3 (technicians and associate professionals) and in ISCO 4-9, by sex (%), 2013

Figure 6.24: Percentage of people aged 25-34 with tertiary education (ISCED 5-6) who are vertically mismatched (in ISCO 4-9) by field of study, 2013

Eurostat is re-thinking mismatch indicators – so we will need their advice

Figure 6.25: Labour-market and skills forecasting at national level, 2013/14

Figure 6.26: Using labour-market and skills forecasting in central planning, 2013/14

Figure 6.27: Involvement of employers in higher education planning and management, 2013/14

Indicator should be developed further given the Yerevan Communiqué. Typology of forms of involvement

Figure 6.28: Public funding for university-business cooperation projects, 2013/14

As above. Need to find out more about what is being funded...

Figure 6.29: Incentives given to institutions for work placements, 2013/14

Amend to show where there is a requirement to provide work placements, as well as incentives

Figure 6.30: Allocation of public funding to develop career guidance services in higher education institutions, 2013/14

Figure 6.31: Targeted career guidance services for students from under-represented groups, 2013/14

Figure 6.32: Graduate tracking surveys, 2013/14

Figure 6.33: Systematic use of graduate tracking surveys in planning, 2013/14

Figure 6.34: Impact of employability performance on higher education institutions' funding, 2013/14

## Chapter 7: Internationalisation and Mobility

Statistical data will depend on the quality and availability of Eurostat data...

Figure 7.1: National strategies for internationalisation of higher education, 2013/14

Figure 7.2: Specific budget for internationalisation activities in higher education, 2013/14

Figure 7.3: Other incentives for higher education institutions to engage in internationalisation activities, 2013/14

Figure 7.4: Estimated percentage of higher education institutions that have adopted an internationalisation strategy, 2013/14

Not a reliable indicator, but is there a better alternative?

Figure 7.5: Estimated percentage of institutions that award joint degrees, 2013/14



Not a reliable indicator but is there a better alternative?

Figure 7.6: Estimated percentage of institutions that participate in joint programmes, 2013/14

Not a reliable indicator but is there a better alternative?

Figure 7.7: Countries where higher education institutions have campuses abroad, 2013/14

Figure 7.8: Countries in which public higher education institutions offer MOOCs, 2013/14

Figure 7.9: Countries' perceptions: Main regions of cooperation for international student mobility (Percentage of EHEA higher education systems where data is available), 2013/14

Figure 7.10: Countries' perceptions: Main regions of cooperation for joint programmes/degrees, 2013/14

Figure 7.11: Countries' perceptions: Main regions of cooperation for international cooperation in research (Percentage of EHEA higher education systems where data is available), 2013/14

Is there a way to strengthen these indicators? Eg base them on existence of agreements/strategy? Or drop them??

Figure 7.12: Quantitative outward student mobility targets, 2013/14

Figure 7.13: Quantitative incoming student mobility targets, 2013/14

Figure 7.14: Incoming degree mobility rate – tertiary education mobile students from outside the EHEA as a percentage of the total number of students enrolled, by country of destination, 2011/12

Figure 7.15: Number of incoming degree tertiary education mobile students from outside the EHEA, by country of destination, 2011/12

Figure 7.16: Outward degree mobility rate – tertiary education students studying abroad outside the EHEA as a percentage of the total number of students of the same country of origin, 2011/12

Figure 7.17: Number of outward degree tertiary education mobile students studying outside the EHEA, 2011/12

Figure 7.18: Incoming degree mobility rate – tertiary education mobile students from the EHEA studying in the country as a percentage of the total number of students enrolled, by country of destination, 2011/12

Figure 7.19: Number of incoming degree tertiary education mobile students from the EHEA, by country of destination, 2011/12

Figure 7.20: Outward degree mobility rate – mobile tertiary education graduates within the EHEA as a percentage of all graduates of the same country of origin, by country of origin, 2011/12

Figure 7.21: Number of outward degree tertiary education mobile EHEA students within the EHEA, by country of destination, 2011/12

Figure 7.22: Share of tertiary students enrolled abroad (degree mobility), by country of origin, 2011/12

Figure 7.23: Mobility balance: Incoming/outgoing tertiary students ratio within the EHEA, 2011/12

Figure 7.24: Mobility balance: Incoming/outgoing tertiary students ratio within and outside the EHEA, 2011/12

Figure 7.25: Balance as a measure of the attractiveness of the education system of the country at tertiary education level (mobility flows within and outside EHEA), 2011/12

Figure 7.26: Student mobility flows: Top 3 countries of origin (inward) in %, 2011/12

Figure 7.27: Student mobility flows: Top 3 countries of destination (outward) in %, 2011/12

Figure 7.28: Outward mobility versus diversity of destination countries (mobility flows within and outside EHEA), 2011/12

Figure 7.29: Obstacles to student mobility, 2013/14

The WG may wish to discuss whether this indicator could be enhanced through comparison with ESU data

Figure 7.30: Share of students who have not been enrolled abroad and do not plan to enrol abroad considering selected issues as (quite) big obstacles (in %), 2013/14

Presentation of indicator too detailed

Figure 7.31: Recognition of credits gained during (most recent) enrolment abroad – Share of students who have been enrolled abroad (in %), 2013/14

Figure 7.32: Attainment of ECTS for study-related activities abroad (other than enrolment) – Share of students who have been abroad (in %), 2013/14

Figure 7.33: Portability of grants, 2013/14

Figure 7.34: Portability of loans, 2013/14

Figure 7.35: Scorecard indicator n°12: Portability of public grants and publicly subsidised loans

Figure 7.36: Central website with information about all mobility schemes for national and international students, 2013/14

Could be strengthened

Figure 7.37: Monitoring the effects of measures to tackle the obstacles to student mobility, 2013/14

Should be moved after Fig 7.29

Figure 7.38: Scorecard indicator n°13: Financial mobility support to disadvantaged students

Figure 7.39: National policy goals explicitly aimed at promoting staff mobility, 2013/14

Figure 7.40: Quantitative targets for staff mobility, 2013/14

Figure 7.41: National outward mobility programmes for staff, 2013/14

Figure 7.42: Legal requirement to publish vacancies in foreign media, 2013/14

Could be strengthened. Vacancies for all academic staff positions or some?

## Annex 1

### New Scorecard Indicator Proposal: Automatic Recognition at system level

	Description of categories
	<p><b>All higher education qualifications issued in other EHEA countries are recognised on an equal level with qualifications in the home country without any additional procedures in higher education institutions.</b></p>
	<p><b>Automatic Recognition takes place with a subset of European countries</b></p> <p>For other countries, all of the following conditions apply to recognition practice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National legislation has been reviewed and, if necessary, modified to ensure that the principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention (LRC) are respected</li> <li>• Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) or other recognition bodies receive clear guidance on properly implementing the principles of the LRC</li> <li>• Recognition decisions are taken within a 4 month limit</li> <li>• Appeals procedures are in place, and decided within a clear and reasonable time limit</li> <li>• Recognition practice in HEIs is monitored by external Quality Assurance (QA)</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Automatic Recognition takes place with a subset of European countries</b></p> <p>For other countries, some but not all of the following conditions apply to recognition practice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National legislation has been reviewed and, if necessary, modified to ensure that the principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention (LRC) are respected</li> <li>• Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) or other recognition bodies receive clear guidance on properly implementing the principles of the LRC</li> <li>• Recognition decisions are taken within a 4 month limit</li> <li>• Appeals procedures are in place, and decided within a clear and reasonable time limit</li> <li>• Recognition practice in HEIs is monitored by external Quality Assurance (QA)</li> </ul>
	<p><b>There is no automatic recognition at system level.</b></p> <p>At least 2 of the following conditions apply to recognition practice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National legislation has been reviewed and, if necessary, modified to ensure that the principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention (LRC) are respected</li> <li>• Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) or other recognition bodies receive clear guidance on properly implementing the principles of the LRC</li> <li>• Recognition decisions are taken within a 4 month limit</li> <li>• Appeals procedures are in place, and decided within a clear and reasonable time limit</li> <li>• Recognition practice in HEIs is monitored by external Quality Assurance (QA)</li> </ul>
	<p><b>There is no automatic recognition at system level.</b></p> <p>Less than 2 of the conditions apply to recognition practice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National legislation has been reviewed and, if necessary, modified to ensure that the principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention (LRC) are respected</li> <li>• Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) or other recognition bodies receive clear guidance on properly implementing the principles of the LRC</li> <li>• Recognition decisions are taken within a 4 month limit</li> <li>• Appeals procedures are in place, and decided within a clear and reasonable time limit</li> </ul>

- Recognition practice in HEIs is monitored by external Quality Assurance (QA)

### **New Scorecard Indicator Proposal: ECTS Implementation (to replace Scorecard indicator 4: 2.21)**

	<p>The 2015 ECTS Users' Guide is used by external Quality Assurance agencies as the basis to assess the implementation of ECTS in all higher education institutions.</p> <p>The following issues are monitored specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ECTS credits are awarded on the basis of learning outcomes &amp; student workload</li> <li>• ECTS supporting documents (Course Catalogue, Learning Agreement, Transcript of Records, and Work Placement Certificate) are used appropriately</li> <li>• All credits gained during a period of study abroad – as agreed in the Learning Agreement and confirmed by the Transcript of Records – are transferred without delay and count towards the student's degree without any additional work by or assessment of the student.</li> <li>• The HEI has an appropriate appeals procedure to deal with problems of credit recognition</li> <li>• The HEI's statistical grade distribution tables in each field of study</li> </ul>
	<p>The 2015 ECTS Users' Guide is used by external Quality Assurance agencies as the basis to assess the implementation of ECTS in all higher education institutions.</p> <p>Some but not all of the following issues are monitored specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ECTS are awarded on the basis of learning outcomes &amp; student workload</li> <li>• ECTS supporting documents (Course Catalogue, Learning Agreement, Transcript of Records, and Work Placement Certificate) are used appropriately</li> <li>• All credits gained during a period of study abroad – as agreed in the Learning Agreement and confirmed by the Transcript of Records – are transferred without delay and count towards the student's degree without any additional work by or assessment of the student.</li> <li>• The HEI has an appropriate appeals procedure to deal with problems of credit recognition</li> <li>• The HEI's statistical grade distribution tables in each field of study</li> </ul>
	<p>The 2015 ECTS Users' Guide is used by external Quality Assurance agencies as the basis to assess the implementation of ECTS in all higher education institutions.</p> <p>No specific issues regarding ECTS use are defined.</p>
	<p>The 2015 ECTS Users' Guide may in some cases be used by external Quality Assurance agencies as the basis to assess the implementation of ECTS in higher education institutions.</p>
	<p>The 2015 ECTS Users' Guide is not used by external Quality Assurance agencies as the basis to assess the implementation of ECTS in higher education institutions.</p>