

# Monitoring the implementation of the P&Gs: BPIR 2024 social dimension chapter

Anna Horvath and David Crosier

24 October 2023

# Presentation overview

- 1) Developing indicators to monitor P&Gs
- 2) Examples (Funding and Mobility)
- 3) Challenges in data collection
- 4) Findings/State of play

# How to monitor implementation?

Two related processes:

- SD WG develops indicators to support implementation
- Eurydice pilot project 'Equity and inclusion in higher education'

➔ 2024 BPIR draws on both sources to develop indicators

# Working with two sources

Indicators from Eurydice pilot + SD WG indicator proposal as it stood in autumn 2022

- Approach: if it was feasible, follow SD WG proposal (majority of indicators adopt the proposal)
- But in some cases, a different option was taken...
- Two examples: Funding and Mobility

# Funding (P&G 6)

## SD WG proposal – 4 elements

- Public funding to higher education institutions that meet targets in widening access... to underrepresented, disadvantaged and vulnerable groups ✓
- universal or need-based grants for first-cycle students ✓
- Public authority provides top-level student financial support for indirect costs of study ✓
- Public authority provides information, assistance and communicates effectively on available student financial support to all students, in particular to underrepresented, disadvantaged and vulnerable groups of students x

# Why was this indicator not pursued?

- How to formulate a clear-cut, simple question that would reveal how effectively top-level authorities disseminate information on available student financial support?
- All ministries likely to answer that information on financial support is available. So what supporting information would we require, and how could we verify if it was easily accessible to particular groups?
- High risk of information being incomparable and unreliable.
- Alternative option used: whether part-time students have equal treatment with regard to fees and support.

# Mobility (P&G 8)

## SD WG proposal – 3 elements

- Existence of top-level mobility policy focused on vulnerable, disadvantaged or underrepresented students and staff.
- Public authority has measures in place to support vulnerable, disadvantaged or underrepresented students and staff in international learning mobility.
- Public authority has a standardized methodology to collect data and monitor the participation and experiences of beneficiaries in all types of international mobility programs, including their background characteristics (e.g. disadvantaged, vulnerable and underrepresented groups).

# How the indicators were changed

- ➔ Separated policies concerning students and staff
- ➔ For students, separated physical and blended mobility/internationalisation at home
- ➔ Harmonised some of the indicators with elements of the Mobility Scoreboard



# Mobility (P&G 8)

## Scorecard indicator – 4 elements

- Top-level measures supporting vulnerable, disadvantaged or underrepresented **students in international learning mobility** (targeted grants, targeted policies, quantitative targets).
- Top-level mobility policy focused on vulnerable, disadvantaged or underrepresented groups of **staff**.
- Top-level support to higher education institutions to foster **blended learning mobility and/or internationalisation at home**.
- Monitoring the participation and experiences of beneficiaries in all types of international mobility programmes, including their background characteristics (gender, age and at least one other student characteristic) based on a standardised methodology.

# Data collection challenges

- Long questionnaire, and ministries tended to involve few people in task
- Many countries failed to respect deadlines
- Many answers not justified with supporting documentation
- Internal coherence issues (contradictory information)
- Not enough time to resolve all data issues...

# Findings

Considerable variety between scorecards in policy areas:

- Funding, and guidance and counselling show best results
- Monitoring and flexible learning follow
- Strategy, lifelong learning and inclusive learning environments are weaker
- Mobility, community engagement and policy dialogue are the weakest...

Overall: a long way to go...

# Thank you



© European Union 2020

Unless otherwise noted the reuse of this presentation is authorised under the [CC BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license. For any use or reproduction of elements that are not owned by the EU, permission may need to be sought directly from the respective right holders.

