BOLOGNA 2018 FOLLOW-UP REPORT: FORESEEN SCORECARD INDICATORS

Overview of scorecard indicators foreseen for the 2018 Bologna follow-up report

NB The numbering used in the 2015 Implementation report is shown here. It will be changed in relation to the new 2018 structure and the indicators will then go in order 1 – n…

Figure Number (from 2015 report, reordered in 2018 chapter logic)	Title	Amendments/changes foreseen (yes/no)
Chapter 1 Context		
Chapter 2 Teaching and Learning		
Figure 2.21:	**Scorecard indicator n°4**: Stage of implementation of ECTS system (revised variables)	Yes
Chapter 3 Degrees and Qualifications		
Figure 2.28:	**Scorecard indicator n°5**: Stage of implementation of the Diploma Supplement	Yes
Figure 2.19:	**Scorecard indicator n°3**: Implementation of national qualifications frameworks	Yes
Chapter 4 Quality Assurance and Recognition		
Figure 3.12:	**Scorecard indicator n°8**: Level of student participation in external quality assurance system	No
Figure 3.13:	**Scorecard indicator n°9**: Level of international participation in external quality assurance,	Yes
Figure 3.8:	**Scorecard indicator n°7**: Stage of development of external quality assurance system,	Yes
Figure 3.7	**Scorecard indicator n°6** on openness to cross border QA of EQAR registered agencies	Yes
NEW	**Scoreboard indicator** on automatic recognition	Not applicable
Chapter 5 Opening Higher Education to a diverse population		
Figure 4.13:	**Scorecard indicator n°11**: Recognition of prior learning	Yes
Figure 4.10:	**Scorecard indicator n°10 – A**: Measures to support the access of disadvantaged learners	Yes
	Scorecard indicator n°10 – B: Measures to support the retention and completion of disadvantaged students	Yes
Chapter 6 Relevance of Higher Education outcomes and employability		
Chapter 7 Internationalisation and mobility		
Figure 7.35:	**Scorecard indicator n°12**: Portability of public grants and publicly subsidised loans	Yes
Figure 7.38:	**Scorecard indicator n°13**: Supporting the mobility of disadvantaged learners	Yes

Scorecard indicator n°4: Stage of implementation of ECTS system

Rationale to revise the indicator

ECTS is a key factor in a number of Bologna process goals: degree structures, curriculum development, flexible learning, mobility etc, and a scorecard indicator on the topic has been included in previous editions of the implementation report. However, WG 1 recognised some problems with the indicator in the 2015 report – in particular that it was constructed on the basis of estimates on how many higher education programmes were implementing ECTS, rather than on more reliable evidence.

Now that the ECTS Users Guide has been adopted by Ministers in Yerevan, there is an additional responsibility for countries to ensure that the ECTS Users Guide is being correctly used. In the current data collection, this responsibility has been addressed through a series of questions that should allow a better picture to emerge of ECTS use in relation to the key specifications of the ECTS Users Guide.

The approach of looking into monitoring of ECTS has already been used successfully in Eurydice's Mobility Scoreboard – although with some different issues/elements under consideration. The focus on monitoring main elements of ECTS implementation should enable a more reliable indicator to be produced.

	Proposal for the 2018 report

🟩	The ECTS Users' Guide principles are used by external quality assurance as a basis to assess the implementation of ECTS in all higher education institutions.
	
	The following issues are monitored specifically:
	
	  o ECTS credits are awarded on the basis of learning outcomes & student workload;
	  o ECTS credit allocation is regularly monitored and followed up by appropriate revision if necessary;
	  o ECTS is used as a credit system for the accumulation of credits acquired within higher education institutions;
	  o ECTS is used as a credit system for the transfer of credits for student learning outcomes acquired in another institution in the country;
	  o ECTS is used as a credit system for the transfer of credits for periods of study abroad;
	  o The higher education institution has an appropriate appeals procedure to deal with problems of credit recognition.

🟩	The ECTS Users' Guide principles are used used by external quality assurance as a basis to assess the implementation of ECTS in all higher education institutions.
	
	4 -5 of the following issues are monitored specifically:
	
	  o ECTS credits are awarded on the basis of learning outcomes & student workload;
	  o ECTS credit allocation is regularly monitored and followed up by appropriate revision if necessary;
	  o ECTS is used as a credit system for the accumulation of credits acquired within higher education institutions;
	  o ECTS is used as a credit system for the transfer of credits for student learning outcomes acquired in another institution in the country;
	  O ECTS is used as a credit system for the transfer of credits for periods of study abroad;
	  O The higher education institution has an appropriate appeals procedure to deal with problems of credit recognition.

🟨	The ECTS Users' Guide principles are used used by external quality assurance agencies as a basis to assess the implementation of ECTS in all higher education institutions.
	
	1- 3 of the following issues are monitored specifically.
	
	  o ECTS credits are awarded on the basis of learning outcomes & student workload;
	  o ECTS credit allocation is regularly monitored and followed up by appropriate revision if necessary;
	  o ECTS is used as a credit system for the accumulation of credits acquired within higher education institutions;
	  o ECTS is used as a credit system for the transfer of credits for student learning outcomes acquired in another institution in the country;
	  O ECTS is used as a credit system for the transfer of credits for periods of study abroad;
	  O The higher education institution has an appropriate appeals procedure to deal with problems of credit recognition.

🟧	The ECTS Users' Guide Guide principles may in some cases be used by external quality assurance as a basis to assess the implementation of ECTS in all higher education institutions.
🟥	The ECTS Users' Guide principles are not used by external Quality Assurance agencies as a basis to assess the implementation of ECTS in all higher education institutions.

Scorecard indicator n°5: Stage of implementation of the Diploma Supplement

Rationale to revise the indicator

The proposed amendments to this indicator aim to simplify and clarify the criteria. There is no change to the criteria themselves, but a clearer focus on first and second cycle graduates (rather than "every graduate") and the removal of either/or conditions.

	Proposal for the 2018 report

🟩	Diploma Supplement in the EU/CoE/UNESCO Diploma Supplement format is issued to 1st and 2nd cycle graduates:
	   o automatically
	   o to every graduate
	   o free of charge
	   o in a widely spoken European language

🟩	Three of the above criteria are met.
🟨	Two of the above criteria are met.
🟧	Only one criterion is met.
🟥	None of the above criteria is met.

Scorecard indicator n°3: Implementation of national qualifications frameworks

Rationale to revise the indicator

The proposed amendment to this indicator is to introduce step 11 (stakeholders use the framework as a reference point for specific agreed purposes.)

	Proposal for the 2018 report

🟩	Step 10-11:
	
	   o 11.Stakeholders use the Framework (as a reference point) for specific agreed purposes.
	   o 10. The Framework has self-certified its compatibility with the Qualifications Framework for the European Higher Education Area

🟩	Steps 7-9:
	   o 9. Qualifications have been included in the NQF
	   o 8. Study programmes have been re-designed on the basis of the learning outcomes included in the NQF
	   o 7. Implementation of the NQF has started with agreement on the roles and responsibilities of higher education institutions, quality assurance agency(ies) and other bodies

🟨	Steps 5-6:
	   o 6. The NQF has been adopted in legislation or in other high level policy fora
	   o 5. Consultation/national discussion has taken place and the design of the NQF has been agreed by stakeholders

🟧	Step 4: The level structure, level descriptors (learning outcomes), and credit ranges have been agreed

🟥	Step 3-1:
	   o 3. The process of developing the NQF has been set up, with stakeholders identified and committee(s) established
	   o 2. The purpose(s) of the NQF have been agreed and outlined
	   o 1. Decision to start developing the NQF has been taken by the national body responsible for higher education and/or the minister

Scorecard indicator n°8: Level of student participation in external quality assurance system

Note: No revision is foreseen in this indicator. However, data will be considered not only from the BFUG questionnaire but also from a questionnaire to ESU members. Where there are differences in answers to the same questions, there will be further investigation to clarify the reality.

	Proposal for the 2018 report
🟩	In all quality assurance reviews, students participate as full members at five levels: • in governance structures of national quality assurance agencies • in external review teams • in the preparation of self-evaluation reports • in the decision making process for external reviews • in follow-up procedures
🟩	Students participate at four of the five levels mentioned above
🟨	Students participate at three of the five levels mentioned above
🟧	Students participate at two of the five levels mentioned above
🟥	Students cannot participate or participate at only one level mentioned above

Scorecard indicator n°9: Level of international participation in external quality assurance

Rationale to revise the indicator

There is a minor proposed amendment, removing the word "full" in relation to ENQA membership.

	Proposal for the 2018 report
🟩	In all cases the following four aspects are met: • agencies are members of ENQA and/or listed on EQAR • international peers/expert participate in governance of national QA bodies • international peers/experts participate as members/observers in evaluation teams • international peers/experts participate in follow-up procedures
🟩	Three of the four aspects are met
🟨	Two of the four aspects are met
🟧	One of the four aspects is met
🟥	No international participation

Scorecard indicator n°7: Stage of development of external quality assurance system

Rationale to revise the indicator

The Monitoring Working Group proposes to change the wording to align with the text used by AG3 in their main commitment on Quality Assurance:

"*External quality assurance (be it at programme or institutional level) is performed by Agencies that have demonstrably complied with the standards and guidelines stipulated in the current ESG. This is best ensured where only those agencies registered on the European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education (EQAR) are allowed to operate in the country.*"

(https://media.ehea.info/file/20160307-08-Amsterdam/23/0/BFUG_NL_MD_50_8a_AG3_working_paper_I_615230.pdf)

	Proposal for the 2018 report
🟩	A fully functioning quality assurance system is in operation nationwide, in which all higher education institutions are subject to regular external quality assurance by an agencythat has successfully demonstrated compliance with the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the EHEA (ESG) through registration on EQAR.
🟩	A fully functioning quality assurance system is in operation nationwide, but only SOME higher education institutions are subject to regular external quality assurance by an agency that has successfully demonstrated compliance with the ESG through through registration on EQAR..
🟨	A quality assurance system is in operation nationwide and is aligned to the ESG, but the agency/ies performing external quality assurance are not registered in EQAR..
🟧	A quality assurance system is in operation nationwide, but has not (yet) been fully aligned to the ESG..
🟥	No quality assurance system is in operation.

Scorecard indicator n°6: Level of openness to cross border quality assurance activity of EQAR registered agencies

Rationale to revise the indicator

The Monitoring Working Group proposes to slightly change the wording, putting "suitable QA agency from outside of the country" instead of "foreign QA agency".

	Proposal for the 2018 report
🟩	**All institutions and programmes** can choose to be evaluated by a suitable QA agency from outside the country to fulfil their obligations for external QA, while complying with national requirements. EQAR registration serves as a criterion for agencies to be allowed to carry out cross-border evaluation/accreditation/audit.
🟩	**In some cases, institutions and/or programmes** can choose to be evaluated by a QA agency from outside the country to fulfil their obligations for external QA, while complying with national requirements. EQAR registration serves as a criterion for agencies to be allowed to carry out cross-border evaluation/accreditation/audit.
🟨	**In some or all cases, institutions and/or programmes** can choose to be evaluated by a QA agency from outside the country to fulfil their obligations for external QA, but **EQAR registration is not a criterion** used to determine which agencies are allowed to carry out such cross-border evaluation/accreditation/audit.
🟧	Discussions are on-going or plans have been made to establish a legal framework allowing EQAR-registered agencies to operate in the country.
🟥	Institutions and programmes cannot be evaluated by QA agencies from outside the country to fulfil their obligations for external QA, and no plans are being discussed.

NEW: Scoreboard indicator on system level (automatic) recognition for academic purposes

Rationale for the indicator

The working group was requested by the BFUG to develop a scoreboard indicator on automatic recognition for the 2015 Implementation report. However, this proved not to be possible as the request came after the data collection had been launched, and the necessary information proved not to be available. The data collection this year has been undertaken with the need for this indicator in mind.

The proposed indicator is based on the Bologna commitment of making progress towards automatic recognition of the qualification level. Thus for the green category, all higher education qualifications issued in other EHEA countries are recognised on an equal level with qualifications in the home country without additional procedures by recognition authorities or higher education institutions. Automatic recognition of some EHEA country qualifications is also a requirement for the light green and yellow categories. The distinction between these categories is based on how extensively they have implemented the other measures that can be considered as steps towards automatic recognition. These are measures identified by the Pathfinder group report. Countries where there are recognition procedures for all EHEA countries will inevitably find themselves in either the orange or the red categories. If they have implemented fewer than two of the steps towards automatic recognition they will be in the red category. This indicator has already been successfully piloted in Eurydice's Mobility Scoreboard.

Proposal for the 2018 report
■ Automatic recognition is in place, meaning that all higher education qualifications issued in other EHEA countries are recognised on an equal level with comparable[1] academic qualifications in the home country and give the right to be considered for entry to a programme of further study at the next level. The following conditions are also met:..   • National legislation has been reviewed and, if necessary, modified to ensure that the principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention (LRC) are respected   • Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) or recognition bodies receive clear guidance on properly implementing the principles of the LRC   • Recognition decisions are taken within a 4 month limit   • Appeals procedures are in place, and decided within a clear and reasonable time limit   • Recognition practice in HEIs is monitored by external Quality Assurance (QA) in line with the ESG 2015
■ Automatic recognition is in place for a subset of EHEA countries, meaning that all higher education qualifications issued in these countries are recognised on an equal level with comparable[2] academic qualifications in the home country and give the right to be considered for entry to a programme of further study at the next level.   ,All of the following conditions apply to recognition practice: • National legislation has been reviewed and, if necessary, modified to ensure that the principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention (LRC) are respected   • Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) or recognition bodies receive clear guidance on properly implementing the principles of the LRC   • Recognition decisions are taken within a 4 month limit   • Appeals procedures are in place, and decided within a clear and reasonable time limit   • Recognition practice in HEIs is monitored by external Quality Assurance (QA) in line with the ESG 2015
■ Automatic Recognition takes place with a subset of European countries   For qualifications from other countries some, but not all of the following conditions apply to recognition practice: • National legislation has been reviewed and, if necessary, modified to ensure that the principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention (LRC) are respected   • Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) or recognition bodies receive clear guidance on properly implementing the principles of the LRC   • Recognition decisions are taken within a 4 month limit   • Appeals procedures are in place, and decided within a clear and reasonable time limit   • Recognition practice in HEIs is monitored by external Quality Assurance (QA) in line with the ESG 2015

---

[1] The term "comparable" implies that foreign qualifications are treated in the same way as national degrees (eg a first cycle degree from an EHEA country vs a national first cycle degree) for the purpose of further study without additional procedures

🟧	There is no automatic recognition. At least 2 of the following conditions apply to recognition practice: • National legislation has been reviewed and, if necessary, modified to ensure that the principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention (LRC) are respected • Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) or recognition bodies receive clear guidance on properly implementing the principles of the LRC • Recognition decisions are taken within a 4 month limit • Appeals procedures are in place, and decided within a clear and reasonable time limit • Recognition practice in HEIs is monitored by external Quality Assurance (QA) in line with the ESG 2015
🟥	There is no automatic recognition. Less than 2 of the conditions apply to recognition practice • National legislation has been reviewed and, if necessary, modified to ensure that the principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention (LRC) are respected • Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) or recognition bodies receive clear guidance on properly implementing the principles of the LRC • Recognition decisions are taken within a 4 month limit • Appeals procedures are in place, and decided within a clear and reasonable time limit • Recognition practice in HEIs is monitored by external Quality Assurance (QA) in line with the ESG 2015

Scorecard indicator n°11: Recognition of prior learning

Rationale to revise the indicator

The proposed amendment aims to clarify the issue raised by the working group: instead of looking at whether procedures are "demonstrably applied in practice", the indicator could contain the element whether recognition procedures are monitored regularly by top-level authorities.

	Proposal for the 2018 report
🟩	There are nationally established procedures, guidelines or policy for assessment and recognition of prior learning as a basis for 1) access to higher education programmes, and 2) allocation of credits towards a qualification and/or exemption from some programme requirements, AND these procedures are monitored regularly by top-level authorities.
🟩	There are nationally established procedures, guidelines or policy for assessment and recognition of prior learning as a basis for 1) access to higher education programmes, and 2) allocation of credits towards a qualification and/or exemption from some programme requirements, BUT these procedures are not monitored regularly by top-level authorities. **OR** There are nationally established procedures, guidelines or policy EITHER for 1) OR for 2) (see above), AND these procedures are monitored regularly by top-level authorities.
🟨	There are nationally established procedures, guidelines or policy EITHER for 1) OR for 2) (see above), BUT these procedures are not monitored regularly by top-level authorities.
🟧	There are no specific procedures/national guidelines or policy for assessment of prior learning, but procedures for recognition of prior learning are in operation at some higher education institutions or study programmes.
🟥	No procedures for recognition of prior learning are in place EITHER at the national OR at the institutional/programme level.

Scorecard indicator n°10: Measures to support the participation and completion of under-represented groups

Rationale to revise the indicator

The proposed amendments to this indicator aim to improve the presentation and precision of the indicator. In addition, the Working Group clearly felt it was important politically for this indicator to cover both participation and completion. Given the importance of policy measures concerning both access and completion, the Working Group proposes splitting the indicator into two, one focusing on access and one on completion. This way both elements get the same weight.

	Proposal for the 2018 report - Access	Proposal for the 2018 report - Completion

■ (dark green)	The following measures are undertaken to support the access to or increase the participation of under-represented groups in higher education:
	 1. The composition of the student body is monitored based on gender and at least one other under-represented category at entry.
	 2. There are longer-term quantitative policy objectives for the access/participation of students from under-represented groups.
	 3. Under-represented student groups' access to higher education is supported in at least two of the following three ways:
	   ○ Preferential treatment of specific groups of students during the standard admission process;
	   ○ Learners are supported in getting the standard higher education entry qualifications;
	   ○ Learners can access higher education without the standard higher education entry qualifications.
	 4. There is financial support targeted at under-represented groups of students **OR** mainstream support is provided to more than 50 % of students.
		The following measures are undertaken to support the higher education completion of students from under-represented groups:
		 - Monitoring the composition of the student body based on gender and at least one other under-represented category during studies and at graduation;
		 - Longer-term quantitative policy objectives for the attainment/completion of students from under-represented groups;
		 - Top-level measures targeting the retention of first-year students and/or financial incentives for HEIs to improve completion rates;
		 - Top-level measures targeting the completion of students from under-represented groups specifically.

■ (light green)	Three out of the four types of measures are undertaken.	Three out of the four types of measures are undertaken.
■ (yellow)	Two out of the four types of measures are undertaken.	Two out of the four types of measures are undertaken.
■ (orange)	One out of the four types of measures is undertaken.	One out of the four types of measures is undertaken.
■ (red)	None of the four types of measures are undertaken.	None of the four types of measures are undertaken.

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

Rationale to revise the indicator

Minor modifications are proposed to update the indicator in line with the indicator used in Eurydice's Mobility Scoreboard.

	Proposal for the 2018 report
■ (dark green)	**Full portability** across the EHEA of all available domestic 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.
■ (light green)	**Portability** of available domestic student support measures – grants and/or loans – for credit and degree mobility, but **with some restrictions** related to geography (country limitations), and/or types of programme, and/or field of study or time.
■ (yellow)	**Portability for credit mobility**, without restrictions. No portability for degree mobility OR not all major support measures with portability for degree mobility.
■ (orange)	**Portability for credit mobility** but **with some restrictions** related to geography (country limitations), and/or types of programme, and/or field of study or time. No protability for degree mobility OR not all major support measures with portability for degree mobility
■ (red)	**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).

Scorecard indicator n°13: Supporting the mobility of students from under-represented groups

Rationale to revise the indicator

This indicator has been modified to improve it in line with an indicator on the same topic in the Eurydice Mobility Scoreboard.

	Proposal for the 2018 report

🟩	The following measures are undertaken to increase the mobility participation of students from under-represented groups:
	- Quantitative policy objectives on the mobility participation of students from under-represented groups;
	- Comprehensive monitoring of the participation of students from under-represented groups in mobility programmes;
	- Financial support in the form of:
	    ○ Targeted specific mobility grants **OR**
	    ○ Portable targeted grants **OR**
	    ○ Mainstream portable grants provided to more than 50 % of students;
	- Top-level recommendations/incentives to HEIs to implement targeted measures supporting the participation of students from under-represented groups in mobility programmes.

🟩	Three out of the four types of measures are undertaken.
🟨	Two out of the four types of measures are undertaken.
🟧	One out of the four types of measures is undertaken.
🟥	None of the four types of measures are undertaken.