Working Group on Monitoring the Implementation of the Bologna Process discussion paper: Draft Proposal of Structure and Indicators for BPIR 2027

The purpose of this paper is to guide the finalisation of the selection of indicators for the 2027 report.

The structure for the 2027 report was approved by the BFUG at its last meeting in Warsaw, Poland. The Working Group on Monitoring agreed a draft proposal on the indicators for the 2027 report at its second online meeting. This proposal has since been shared and discussed with the chairs of the other BFUG working groups. This paper incorporates the suggestions from the BFUG working groups so far received and highlights the issues to be agreed.

The figure numbers refer to the 2024 report (so that they can be quickly located). It also mentions possible sources or additional indicators that may be needed.

The paper outlines the indicator, a short description of its purpose, and a preliminary assessment of whether it should be maintained in the 2027 report. The indicators that are highlighted in blue are those where further discussion is needed.

Comments are highlighted in yellow and written in *italics*.

Chapter 1 Degree Structures

Fig 2.1 Share of first-cycle programmes with a workload of 180, 210, 24 or another number of ECTS credits.

This figure is fundamental to assessing the implementation of the Bologna first cycle. The figure could be left in an annex, as the information will in any case need to be collected if the scorecard indicator on implementation of agreed Bologna structures is maintained.

Advice: keep the data in an annex

Fig 2.2 Share of second-cycle programmes with a workload of 60-75, 9à, 120 or another number of ECTS credits.

This figure is fundamental to assessing the implementation of the Bologna second cycle. The figure could be left in an annex, but the information will need to be collected for the scorecard indicator on implementation of agreed Bologna structures.

Advice: keep the data in an annex

Fig 2.3 Most common total workload of first and second cycle programmes

This figure illustrates differences in implementation patterns of the first and second cycle combined. However, as there are no formal commitments regarding these two cycles together, it could be left out.

Advice: drop this indicator

COMMENT The view of the TPG A Latvian Co-chair is that, although the logic for dropping indicators is clear, the indicator is nevertheless very important, as in many countries the total workload of the first and second cycles is considered in giving access to the third cycle, and the information also provides context for flexible pathways.

Figure 2.4 Presence of short-cycle programmes considered as part of higher education

This figure shows whether short-cycle programmes are considered as part of each country's higher education system. The short cycle is part of the EHEA Qualifications Framework (QF-EHEA), but no serious policy discussion has taken place regarding a coherent vision of the place of short cycle programmes in the EHEA.

Advice: drop this indicator

Figure 2.5 Presence of integrated/long programmes leading to a second-cycle degree and the percentage of students in these programmes

This indicator illustrates how comprehensively the Bologna 3 cycle system has been implemented, as it looks at the percentage of students that are not in Bologna programmes. It is also an element in the Scorecard indicator on implementation of agreed Bologna structures.

Advice: keep the data in an annex

COMMENT The suggestion of the TPG B Italian Co-chair is to exclude students enrolled in medicine from the statistics.

Figure 2.6 Programmes outside the Bologna degree structure other than integrated long programmes

This indicator shows whether national systems have programmes that do not correspond to the Bologna degree structures (in addition to the integrated/long programmes.) It is also used in the Scorecard indicator on implementation of agreed Bologna structures.

Advice: keep the data in an annex

Figure 2.7 Scorecard indicator 1: implementation of agreed Bologna degree structures

This is the main scorecard indicator on degree structures. Some elements/thresholds could be discussed but the indicator itself was a successful innovation of the 2024 report.

Advice: keep the figure

Figure 2.8: inclusion of microcredentials in national qualifications frameworks

This indicator has a high level of interest, and its evolution would be interesting to follow.

Advice: keep the figure

COMMENT from the WG on IM German Co-chair: in Germany it is not considered necessary to include microcredentials in the NQF. If other countries behave as Germany, it's not clear how the indicator should be interpreted. The proposal is have an indicator showing the % of HEIs that are offering microcredentials.

Figure 2.9 Scorecard indicator n°2: monitoring the implementation of the ECTS system by external quality assurance

ECTS is essential to the construction of Bologna degree programmes, and with the revision of the Users Guide taking place during this period, it should be kept in focus.

Advice: keep the figure

Figure 2.10 Scorecard indicator N°3 Stage of implementation of the Diploma Supplement

The DS is considered an important tool to aid recognition. According to the 2024 report only 9 (or 10 as the situation in Serbia was not reported) systems are failing to meet all criteria for its full implementation.

Advice: keep the figure

Figure 2.11 Scorecard indicator n°4: Implementation of national qualifications frameworks, 2022/2023

NQFs are an important tool to structure and ensure transparency of qualifications. While there has been little change on this indicator in recent reports, not all criteria are fully implemented everywhere.

Advice: keep the figure

COMMENT from TPG A Latvian Co-chair. There should be evidence of a renewed self-certification within the last 10 years (as NQF may be obsolete if this is not provided). So the indicator criteria should be revised to reflect this.

Chapter 2: Recognition

This chapter would include Scorecard indicators on the implementation of the Lisbon Recognition Convention and on Automatic Recognition. It could potentially also include indicators related to recognition of prior non formal and informal learning, and would potentially include information on work undertaken by TPG B and other relevant European level projects.

Figure 2.12: Principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention in national legislation This figure is fundamental to the EHEA consensus on recognition. It could, however, be presented in scorecard format, which may be more appropriate.

Advice: keep the figure

Figure 2.13: Implementation of Article VII of the LRC at national level, 2022/2023 This figure is interesting in relation to the recognition of qualifications of refugees (a topic mentioned in the Tirana Communiqué commitments). It is also noteworthy that a number of countries that claim to have fully implemented the LRC haven't introduced legal requirements in relation to this article.

Advice: keep the figure.

Figure 2.14: Use of tools for recognition of refugees' qualifications: the Council of Europe Qualifications Passport for Refugees (EQPR) and ENIC/NARIC's toolkit for recognition of refugees' qualifications, 2022/2023

This figure provides information on tools that can support the implementation of Art VII. It's not a Bologna commitment, but rather supplementary information.

Advice: drop this indicator

COMMENT: from the TPG B Italian Co-chair: Proposal to keep the indicator for 2 reasons: 1) EQPR is mentioned in both Rome and Tirana Communiqués 2) There may be countries without a legal commitment related to article VII but using tools to implement the article.

Figure 2.15: Scorecard indicator n°5: System level (automatic) recognition for academic purposes, 2022/2023

This figure is the main indicator for system level automatic recognition…

Advice: keep the figure

Figure 4.3: Recognition of prior learning in accessing and for the fulfilment of first-cycle higher education study programmes

This figure looks at recognition of prior non formal and informal learning, rather than recognition of formal qualifications. Moving it into the recognition chapter would broaden the concept of recognition.

Advice: keep the figure.

COMMENT TPG B Italian co chair: *would prefer the indicator to be in the social dimension chapter.*

Chapter 3: Quality assurance

This chapter would include Scorecard indicators on compliance with the European Standards and Guidelines, and on student and international representation in external quality assurance. It would also include information on the implementation of the European Approach to quality assurance of joint programmes, as well as on cross-border quality assurance. It would also potentially include information on work undertaken by TPG C and other relevant European level projects. The source for the majority of indicators would be EQAR.

Figure 2.16: Scorecard indicator n° 6: Stage of development of external quality assurance system

This is the main indicator on compliance with the ESG. It shows whether the higher education institutions in a country are assured by a quality assurance agency registered on the EQAR

Advice: keep the figure

Figure 2.17: Share of higher education institutions reviewed by an EQAR-registered quality assurance agency

This indicator shows in more detail the share of higher education institutions reviewed by an EQAR registered agency

Advice: keep the data in an annex

Figure 2.18: Scorecard indicator n° 7: Level of student participation in external quality assurance

Student participation is a core value of the EHEA and of the EHEA conception of quality assurance.

Advice: keep the figure

Figure 2.19: Scorecard indicator n° 8: Level of international participation in external quality assurance

International participation is also a core value of the EHEA and of the conception of QA.

Advice: keep the figure

COMMENT BICG EUA Co-Chair pointed out that international participation in QA is not mentioned in a normative way in the 2015 ESGs nor likely to be added. However, the Head of Secretariat pointed out that the inclusion of international participation as a commitment dates back to the 2003 Berlin Communiqué.

Figure 2.20: Scorecard indicator n° 9: Level of openness to cross border quality assurance of EQAR registered agencies, 2022/2023

The EHEA conception of quality assurance is that higher education institutions should have autonomy to be able to benefit from different approaches to quality assurance and enhancement that may be embodied in agencies outside the system. Some governments are reluctant to embrace this concept.

Advice: keep the figure

Figure 2.21: Countries allowing the European Approach for quality assurance of joint programmes

The European Approach was adopted by all ministers in 2015. Yet many systems have not followed up on this commitment through enabling the EA to be used.

Advice: keep the figure

Figure 2.22: Countries using the European Approach for quality assurance of joint programmes

This figure shows whether or not the European Approach is actually used (not just whether it is permitted). This remains a relevant issue to monitor.

Advice: keep the figure

COMMENT BICG EUA Co-chair and TPG C French Co-chair pointed out that the title is not clear, as the indicator is about countries where HEIs have used the European Approach.

COMMENT The TPG C Armenian Co-chair: proposed adding an indicator regarding the quality assurance of Trans National Education, as it was explicitly mentioned in the Tirana Communique and is a topic of high interest. For TNE there was also reference in the Rome Communique, that the standards for QA of TNE should be the same as for the QA of domestic provision.

COMMENT The TPG C French Co-chair pointed to The Tirana Communique commitment regarding the quality assurance of flexible learning pathways. TPG C is trying to address it through a mapping exercise in order to know what countries do when it comes to QA of flexible learning pathways. They will update us on what they can gather.

Chapter 4 Fundamental Values

The Co chairs the monitoring and FV working groups met on 24 September to discuss the monitoring process and the issues regarding distribution of roles between the two working groups. The following points were agreed:

1) There will be full alignment between the work of the WGs on Monitoring and FV, as well as the Erasmus+ project on developing indicators for Fundamental Values.
2) The questions to be asked to public authorities on the de jure situation will be included in the questionnaire for the Bologna Process Implementation Report. The wording of these questions will be agreed by the WG on FV to align with the approach in the project. (At this stage further discussion is need on the wording of proposed indicators on public responsibility for and of higher education.)
3) The data gathered will be given to the WG on FV after it has been cleaned/finalised.
4) The decision on whether to include indicators on FV in the BPIR will be taken at a later stage. If indicators are included, they will be limited to the de jure situation and reflect the questions asked to public authorities The chapter will certainly include a narrative text from the FV WG on the process of developing a monitoring framework and the indicators that have been developed.

The information below therefore serves only to show the de jure indicators that may be collected from BFUG members.

Figure 3.1: Concept of academic freedom in national legislation

This indicator shows whether or not the concept of academic freedom is mentioned in the constitution, in higher education legislation or in other legislation. It is an essential de jure indicator.

Advice: keep the figure

Figure 3.2: Requirements for evaluation of academic freedom in higher education institutions

This figure shows systems where there are requirements for an external body to evaluate the exercise of academic freedom in higher education institutions. It is a clear de jure indicator that is necessary in an analysis of academic freedom.

Advice: keep the figure

Figure 3.3: Concept of academic integrity in national legislation

This indicator shows whether or not the concept of academic integrity is mentioned in higher education legislation or in other legislation. It is an essential de jure indicator

Advice: keep the figure

Figure 3.4: Legislative requirement to evaluate academic integrity

This figure shows systems where there are requirements for an external body to evaluate the exercise of academic integrity in higher education institutions. It is a clear de jure indicator that is necessary for an analysis of academic integrity.

Advice: keep the figure

Figure 3.5: Data collection on academic misconduct

This figure considers whether or not countries collect and publish data on academic misconduct in HEIs. While it is important, it could be argued that more in depth investigation is needed on this indicator.

Advice: keep the figure

Figure 3.6: Institutional autonomy in national legislation

This indicator shows whether or not the concept of institutional autonomy is mentioned in the Constitution, in higher education legislation or in other legislation. It is an essential de jure indicator

Advice: keep the figure

Figure 3.7: Government/public authority role in higher education institutions' programme offers

This indicator considers the role of public authorities in determining new programmes. It is one important aspect of autonomy.

Advice: drop the indicator

Figure 3.8: Evaluation of institutional autonomy in higher education institutions, 2022/2023

This indicator shows whether or not the concept of institutional autonomy is required to be evaluated in the EHEA systems. It is an essential de jure indicator

Advice: keep the figure

Figure 3.9: Required proportions of students and staff in higher education institutions' governing bodies, 2022/2023

This indicator shows whether there are legal requirements specifying the proportion of students and staff required in HEI governing bodies. It is thus an indicator of student and staff participation in governance.

Advice: keep the figure

Figure 3.10: Legal requirements for staff and students to participate in national HE policymaking, 2022/2023

This indicator outlines the requirement related to student and higher education staff associations for participation in national higher education policymaking.

Advice: keep the figure

Figure 3.11: Legal requirements for staff and students to participate in HEIs' internal steering bodies, 2022/2023

This indicator outlines legal requirements for student and/or student union, and staff and/or staff trade union representatives to be included in higher education institutions' internal steering bodies.

Advice: keep the figure unless a better alternative is proposed by the FV working group

Regarding indicators on public responsibility (which were not considered feasible for the 2024 report) the FV Values WG Co-chairs propose adding indicators on:

1) Legislation and regulations that support achieving the purposes of higher education as detailed in the EHEA definition of public responsibility for higher education
   - Preparation for the labour market
   - Preparation for life as active citizens of democratic societies
   - Personal development
   - The development and maintenance of a broad and advanced knowledge base
2) Frameworks as detailed in the EHEA definition of public responsibility for higher education (some of which will be gathered from other parts of the questionnaire)
   - qualifications framework of the higher education system (e.g., NQF aligned with QF-EHEA; BPIR #2)
   - frameworks for quality assurance(e.g., ESG-compliant; BPIR #3-7)
   - recognition of foreign qualifications (e.g., LRC/system-level automatic; BPIR #8)
   - information on higher education provision (e.g. information about the study programmes about admission requirements etc.)
   - funding frameworks
   - frameworks for the social dimension of higher education (e.g., equity strategies; BPIR social indicators)
3) Legislation and regulations that require HEIs to fulfil the following functions
   - pursue truth and the production, transmission, dissemination, curation, and use of knowledge as a public good
   - uphold and develop the standards of teaching, learning, and research within and across academic disciplines.
   - systematically inform broader society of its work and results
   -

- foster and disseminate, and be guided by a culture of democracy, solidarity, and ethics;
- equip graduates with general, specialized and ethical knowledge, understanding, support them in developing the ability to act and to decide what action to take and what action to refrain from taking.
- offer access to higher education to qualified candidates without regard to their economic, social, ethnic, or other background and provide support in order to enable those admitted to complete their studies with success
- contribute to addressing major challenges of modern societies, (e.g., the survival of our planet, issues of war and peace, democracy, and living together) through research, learning and teaching, societal outreach and innovation and technology transfer
- engage in and with the public sphere, including in public debate, to ensure that our societies be developed and governed on the basis of factual knowledge as well as critical and constructive thinking
- help improve opportunities for all members of society uphold and develop the standards of teaching, learning, and research within and across academic disciplines.
- systematically inform broader society of its work and results
- foster and disseminate, and be guided by a culture of democracy, solidarity, and ethics;
- equip graduates with general, specialized and ethical knowledge, understanding, support them in developing the ability to act and to decide what action to take and what action to refrain from taking.
- offer access to higher education to qualified candidates without regard to their economic, social, ethnic, or other background and provide support in order to enable those admitted to complete their studies with success
- contribute to addressing major challenges of modern societies, (e.g., the survival of our planet, issues of war and peace, democracy, and living together) through research, learning and teaching, societal outreach and innovation and technology transfer
- pursue truth and the production, transmission, dissemination, curation, and use of knowledge as a public good
- uphold and develop the standards of teaching, learning, and research within and across academic disciplines.
- systematically inform broader society of its work and results
- foster and disseminate, and be guided by a culture of democracy, solidarity, and ethics;
- equip graduates with general, specialized and ethical knowledge, understanding, support them in developing the ability to act and to decide what action to take and what action to refrain from taking.
- offer access to higher education to qualified candidates without regard to their economic, social, ethnic, or other background and provide support in order to enable those admitted to complete their studies with success
- contribute to addressing major challenges of modern societies, (e.g., the survival of our planet, issues of war and peace, democracy, and living together) through

research, learning and teaching, societal outreach and innovation and technology transfer

- engage in and with the public sphere, including in public debate, to ensure that our societies be developed and governed on the basis of factual knowledge as well as critical and constructive thinking
- help improve opportunities for all members of society

Chapter 5: Social Dimension

The content of this chapter will be discussed with the Thematic Peer Group on the Social Dimension on 12 November (dedicated session at TPG D meeting). It could include up to 5 of the scorecard indicators used in the 2024 report (with data for the other scorecard indicators to be collected in the period leading up to the 2030 report). It would also potentially include information on work being undertaken by TPG SD and other relevant European level projects.

This first consideration of indicators takes into account a number of different factors. In particular, it follows the advice to limit the number of indicators to a maximum of 5 scorecard indicators, and hence does not include indicators representing an element of a scorecard indicator. Secondly, it has tried to include indicators where the performance in the 2024 report was relatively strong, middling and relatively weak.

During the discussion with the Co-chairs, ESU, co-chairing TPG D, expressed a preference for keeping indicator 4.10 and identifying another to be dropped.

Figure 4.1: Strategic commitment to the social dimension of higher education:top-level targeted strategies, action plans and measures, 2022/2023

Advice: drop this indicator

Figure 4.2: Strategic commitment to the social dimension of higher education: requirement for quality assurance agencies to monitor higher education institutions' (HEIs') strategies on the social dimension, 2022/2023

Advice: drop this indicator

Figure 4.3: Recognition of prior learning in accessing and for the fulfilment of first-cycle higher education study programmes, 2022/2023

Advice: include this indicator in Chapter 2 on recognition

Figure 4.4: Scorecard indicator n°10: P & G 2: Enabling flexible modes of lifelong learning in higher education, 2022/2023

Advice: drop this indicator

Figure 4.5: Top-level coordination structures and mechanisms between different levels of education, 2022/2023

Advice: keep the data in an annex

Figure 4.6: Scorecard indicator n°11: P & G 3: Facilitating synergies for an inclusive lifelong learning, 2022/2023

This indicator a middle position indicator (in terms of performance) in 2024.

Advice: keep the figure

Figure 4.7: Monitoring student characteristics other than age and gender at higher education (HE) entry, at the completion of the first cycle, and at the end of the first year of the first cycle, 2022/2023

Advice: keep the data in an annex

Figure 4.8: Scorecard indicator n°12: P & G 4: Monitoring and data collection, 2022/2023

Performance on this indicator was relatively strong in the 2024 report.

Advice: keep the figure

Figure 4.9: Legal requirement for free guidance and counselling services for actual and/or potential students in higher education, 2022/2023

Advice: drop this indicator

Figure 4.10: Scorecard indicator n°13: P&G 5: Effective guidance and counselling services, 2022/2023

Performance on this indicator was relatively strong in the 2024 report. If indicator 4.8 is included, this one could be left out.

Advice: drop this indicator

Comment: ESU would like to keep this indicator.

Figure 4.11: Grants awarded in the first cycle of higher education, 2022/2023

Advice: keep the data in an annex

Figure 4.12: Scorecard indicator n°14: P & G 6: Sustainable funding for equity, inclusion and diversity in higher education, 2022/2023

Performance on this indicator was among the strongest in the 2024 report.

Advice: keep the figure

Figure 4.13: Support to higher education institutions (HEIs) for staff training on equity, inclusion and diversity, 2022/2023

Advice: keep the data in an annex

Figure 4.14: Scorecard indicator n°15: P&G 7: Inclusive learning environment and institutional culture, 2022/2023

Performance on this indicator was middling in the 2024 report.

Advice: keep the figure

Figure 4.15: Top-level measures supporting vulnerable, disadvantaged or underrepresented students in international learning mobility, 2022/2023

Advice: Advice: keep the data in an annex and move to Chapter 6 on internationalisation and mobility

Figure 4.16: Scorecard indicator n°16: P&G 8: Supporting vulnerable, disadvantaged or underrepresented groups of students and staff in participating in international mobility, 2022/2023

Advice: move to Chapter 6 on internationalisation and mobility

Figure 4.17: Top-level funding of higher education institutions (HEIs) for community engagement activities, 2022/2023

Advice: only Scorecard indicators should be selected for this chapter

Figure 4.18: External quality assurance requirements for community engagement activities, 2022/2023

Advice: drop this indicator

Figure 4.19: Participants in policy dialogue to implement the principles and guidelines on the social dimension, 2022/2023

Advice: keep the data in an annex

Figure 4.20: Scorecard indicator n°17: P & G 10: Policy dialogue on implementation of principles and guidelines, 2022/2023

This indicator considers action taken by governments to set up policy dialogue on implementing the P&Gs.Performance on this indicator was weak in the 2024 report.

Advice: keep the figure

Chapter 6: Internationalisation and mobility

For this chapter, some quantitative data may be extracted from the European Higher Education Sector Observatory (EHESO) - although not every EHEA system may be included. The chapter would also include information on work being undertaken in different European-level projects (drafted by the working group on internationalisation and mobility).

Quantitative indicators currently on EHESO:

- Share of mobile students at ISCED 5-7
- Share of students with mobility abroad at ISCED 5 -7
- Share of students with previous degree abroad at ISCED 7
- Share of mobile students at ISCED 8
- Share of foreign academic personnel

Qualitative indicators

Figure 6.9: Portability of public grants, first and second cycle, 2022/2023

This indicator follows up a longstanding commitment of the Bologna process – to ensure that student support funding is portable. In this case the focus is on public grants.

Advice: keep the data in an annex

Figure 6.10: portability of publicly subsidised loans, first and second cycle, 2022/2023

This indicator follows up a longstanding commitment of the Bologna process – to ensure that student support funding is portable. In this case the focus is on publicly subsidised loans.

Advice: keep the data in an annex

Figure 6.11: Scorecard indicator n°18: Portability of public grants and publicly funded loans

This indicator combines the information portability of grants and loans in a scorecard format.

Advice: keep the figure

Figure 4.15: top-level measures supporting vulnerable, disadvantaged or underrepresented students in international learning mobility

This figure (from the Social Dimension chapter) provides information on policy measures to support inclusive mobility.

Advice: keep the data in an annex

Figure 4.16: Scorecard indicator n°16: P&G 8: Supporting vulnerable, disadvantaged or underrepresented groups of students and staff in participating in international mobility, 2022/2023

This indicator covers measures, policy, monitoring and support to higher education institutions regarding inclusive mobility and internationalisation.

Advice: keep the figure

In addition to these figures, an indicator should be developed on the existence of national internationalisation strategies, also investigating greener mobility and blended learning.

Comment WG IM Dutch Co-chair:

1) *Concerned that there should be trends data regarding statistics.*

   Answer: this is possible from EHESO/Eurostat data…

2) *Concern about discrepancy between measuring mobility between country of residence or nationality. And also whether first or secondary enrolment of international students is measured. Within the Netherlands, different institutions use different measurement methods, which makes comparability of these data very difficult. So I'm quite curious to hear what your approach is to these measurement differences.*

   Answer: Eurostat has developed mobility definitions which are appropriate. But not every country collects and delivers data following the agreed definitions.

3) *Reporting has more focus on outgoing mobility and less on incoming mobility. And it would be very interesting to be able to look at the push and pull factors, e.g. the share of foreign language teaching in higher education systems and then also to look at the share of international students who are enrolled in an English taught program or in a domestic language program, also as a factor analyzing unbalanced mobility streams. Different elements are also between different costs for students in different countries. So these push and pull factors directly impact balance mobility.*

   Answer: These kind of issues can be reflected in future reporting if policy commitments are adopted.

4) *Staff mobility is an interesting one, and it might be interesting to look at joint, double or multiple degrees, and to what extent these are actually implemented.*

   Answer: As for point 3, these are topics for the future. To date there are no reliable data sources of joint, double and multiple degrees..

As for the specific questions that you put in the document, for the portability of public grants, it's fine to move towards a scorecard indicator and we're more than happy to welcome the indicators coming from the chapter of social dimension, as inclusive mobility is one of the things that we'll be looking at in the working group.

Additional: Will there also be a possibility to make a distinction between mobility within the EHEA region and mobility from outside the EHEA region? My understanding is that there are a lot of differences between countries as to what sort of international students they are attracting. And again, that would be a very interesting thing to look at.

Answer: This is noted, and will be discussed with the EHESO consortium when the geographical scope is expanded to EHEA countries.

- ***TPG C French Co-chair:*** *I think it's a very good idea to use the EHESO. And this makes me think of whether there are maybe some topics in this report where we could also draw on the work that is done within the ERA. For example, regarding* ***Figure 3.5: Data collection on academic misconduct****, maybe that's something in which the ERA has some data to share, and in that way, that could also alleviate a bit of burden of data collection. And specifically regarding mobility, if we do use the EHESO, we should contact the countries that are not included to make sure we have a more comprehensive overview, building both on the Observatory and on the additional data we would collect in order to be sure that we cover the EHEA.*

  Answer: We can reference any relevant data collected in the ERA context, but it will only cover EU countries. For EHESO (and mobility data), the intention is to expand the scope for Bologna-relevant indicators to all EHEA countries. However, this work has not yet been established, and hence the data may not be available for the 2027 edition of the report.