

WORKING GROUP 1: MONITORING

Progress Report November 2016

Working Group 1 has focused its activities on developing a coherent structure for the 2018 Implementation Report. This process began with an evaluation of the 2015 report, identifying strengths, weaknesses and information gaps that could be addressed. This work led to a draft proposal that was circulated to all BFUG members in August 2016 for comments. The working group then discussed and agreed how to take account of comments received. The proposal outlined in document *BFUG_SK_ME_52_6* therefore consolidates outcomes of all these discussions, and is presented as a basis for the data collection to begin early in 2017.

The key points that the new structure attempts to address are:

1. Ensure that the priorities of the Yerevan Communiqué are well addressed;
2. Maintain coherence with previous reports so that progress and developments can be tracked;
3. Add new sources of information to enrich the reporting where appropriate;
4. Ensure that the overall length of the report does not exceed the 2015 edition – by shortening or removing less relevant sections to make room for new issues;
5. Add country sheets in an appendix to provide a picture of core implementation issues.

To ensure that new policy challenges outlined in the Yerevan Communiqué are addressed, new information needs to be collected; and a number of new (?) indicators will be developed for the report. The issues to be tackled are indicated, while precise indicators will be developed and finalised during and after the data collection phase.

The topics of scoreboard indicators have been identified in this document. The data collectors may, however, propose some amendments to the construction of some of these indicators to improve their relevance, and to align them with other activities (e.g. comparable indicators in the European Commission's Mobility Scoreboard). Amendments to scoreboard indicators will be a subject of future discussion in Working Group 1. The final form of scoreboard indicators will therefore be submitted for approval to the BFUG at a later stage, and will not be decided until after the data collection.

A number of new indicators will be developed using information collected by ESU and EUA, while Eurostat, Eurostudent and Eurydice will continue to be the primary sources of data for the report. This wider use of source material should enable the Implementation Report to address certain issues from different perspectives, and to reflect better the stakeholder cooperation at the heart of the EHEA.

The question of improving the visibility of indicators concerning core Bologna commitments has been considered. One possibility would be to include a separate chapter on "implementation of key commitments" which would pick up key indicators. However, these indicators would then need to be duplicated in the thematic chapters – thus breaking the logical coherence of the report and adding duplicated material. The alternative solution – preferred by the WG1 Co-Chairs - would be to produce a stand-alone document on implementation of key commitments which would be derived from the Implementation report. This document would reproduce agreed indicators and present country performance clearly, without introducing a different organisational logic to the Implementation report itself.

Working Group 1 has advanced as much as possible to produce this proposal. It should be understood as a flexible framework with space for further change and improvement, rather than as a binding commitment to produce everything precisely in the form currently outlined.