



Co-funded by the  
European Union

New building blocks of the Bologna Process: fundamental values (NewFAV)

## New building blocks of the Bologna Process: Fundamental Values

**Assessment Report:** The extent to which existing indicators identified during Phase 1 (Mapping Report) can be integrated and used at the EHEA level for the purpose of monitoring the fundamental values of higher education

Authors: Daniela Craciun, Liviu Matei, Elizaveta Potapova

25 May 2023

This project has received funding from the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA) through the ERASMUS IBAs Budget-based + LS Type I and II under grant agreement Project 101060970 — NewFAV

*Disclaimer: Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.*



## Table of Contents

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>I. Why monitor the fundamental values of higher education in the EHEA .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>II. What to monitor? A monitoring framework for the fundamental values of higher education .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>III. How to monitor the fundamental values of higher education? Data sources .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>IV. Who should carry out the monitoring of fundamental values of higher education? .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Appendix 1: Monitoring framework and monitoring matrix (type of monitoring and preliminary dimensions to be monitored).....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Appendix 2: How existing indicators, tools and monitoring initiatives can be integrated and used at the EHEA level. ....</b>	<b>13</b>



## Executive Summary

The present report is submitted as the main **deliverable** according to the work plan for Phase 2 of the NewFAV project.

**Objectives** of this phase:

1. Analyse the extent to which existing indicators identified during Phase 1 (Mapping Report) can be integrated and used at the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) level for the purpose of monitoring the fundamental values of higher education.
2. Prepare the ground for developing a technical report including a proposal for a comprehensive and integrated system of indicators for the monitoring and assessment of the fundamental values of higher education in the EHEA.

To fulfil these objectives, the present report addresses the following questions:

- Why monitor the fundamental values of higher education in the EHEA?
- What to monitor?
- How to monitor?
- Who will carry out the monitoring?

In addressing these questions, the report:

1. Puts forward a proposal for a comprehensive and detailed **monitoring framework for the fundamental values** of higher education in the EHEA (in the main body of the report and *Appendix 1*)
2. Identifies a few additional indicators, monitoring tools and initiatives to those identified during Phase 1 (Mapping Report, submitted at the end of Phase 1).
3. Analyses this revised and expanded set of indicators, monitoring tools and initiatives in the context of the proposed monitoring framework to assess the extent to which they can be integrated and used in the EHEA context (*Appendix 2*).
4. The report also outlines preliminary answers to the questions that will be addressed in detail in the next phase: who should do the monitoring, and how.

**Methodologically**, this phase involved additional desk research by the project team and two series of consultations with five task forces (one for each fundamental value). The task forces comprised representatives of the NewFAV Associated Partners, individual experts, and representatives of the main European stakeholders. The task forces helped refine and complete the proposed monitoring framework; identify a few additional indicators, monitoring tools and initiatives; and assess the relevance and limitations of all existing indicators identified and the extent to which they can fit into a common EHEA framework for monitoring fundamental values in higher education. Members of the project's Advisory Board were extensively consulted. After the first round of consultations, an interim report was discussed with the members of the Working Group on the Fundamental Values of Higher Education and other experts and stakeholders attending a dedicated peer learning event.



## I. Why monitor the fundamental values of higher education in the EHEA

EHEA members have made explicit *commitments*, most recently in the Paris and Rome Ministerial Communiqués, to *protect* and *promote* the fundamental values of higher education. The fundamental values of higher education in the EHEA are: academic freedom and integrity, institutional autonomy, responsibility for and of higher education, and participation of students and staff in governance. For the purpose of monitoring, we propose to consider these as six distinct although related values.

The Rome Communiqué underlines the commitment of all EHEA members to “fully respect the fundamental values of higher education and democracy and the rule of law”. This commitment from EHEA members implies implementing the fundamental values in their respective education systems.

Moreover, EHEA members have made an explicit commitment to adopt *shared definitions* of these fundamental values and a *system of indicators* for monitoring their respect, which in turn will help with their implementation.

A shared definition of academic freedom was adopted in the 2020 Rome Communiqué; definitions of the remaining five values will be proposed for adoption with the 2024 Tirana Communiqué.

The need for, and legitimacy of, an EHEA-wide monitoring of the fundamental values is directly derived from these commitments.

## II. What to monitor? A monitoring framework for the fundamental values of higher education

The answers proposed to the question “what to monitor” (the most substantial part of this report) take into account the following elements:

- The explicit formal EHEA commitments with regard to the fundamental values of higher education.
- Efforts currently underway to adopt EHEA shared definitions for all fundamental values.
- An existing tradition and methods for monitoring the implementation of Bologna Process/EHEA commitments, initiated with the 2005 Stocktaking Report and now provided prior to all EHEA Ministerial Conferences in the Implementation Report produced by Eurydice.
- Other efforts to assess and monitor the fundamental values of higher education beyond the scope of EHEA or the European Union.

## New building blocks of the Bologna Process: fundamental values (NewFAV)

- The list of indicators, tools and efforts identified in Phase 1 of the NewFAV project and refined in Phase 2.
- New monitoring mechanisms for academic freedom and freedom of research being developed separately in the European Research Area (ERA).

We propose that a workable and beneficial EHEA monitoring mechanism focus on **the specific commitments** made by the members and **on the state of respect for each value**. The parameters detailed below constitute a concrete, operational and comprehensive proposal for a monitoring framework for the fundamental values of higher education in the EHEA. Figures 1a and 1b presents succinctly this framework.

Figure 1a: Monitoring framework for rights/freedoms values

TYPE OF MONITORING		VALUES			
		Rights/Freedoms			
<b>De jure</b>		Outlook ( <i>negative, unchanged, positive</i> )	Academic freedom	Institutional autonomy	Participation of students and staff in university governance
Protection ( <i>adequate, intermediary, inadequate</i> )	Promotion ( <i>absent, limited, significant</i> ) <sup>1</sup>				
<b>De facto</b>					
Infringements					
Threats					
Positive developments					

Figure 1b: Monitoring framework for obligations/duties values

TYPE OF MONITORING		VALUES			
		Obligations/Duties			
<b>De jure</b>		Outlook ( <i>negative, unchanged, positive</i> )	Academic integrity	Public responsibility <i>for</i> higher education	Public responsibility <i>of</i> higher education
Protection ( <i>adequate, intermediary, inadequate</i> )	Promotion ( <i>absent, limited, significant</i> ) <sup>2</sup>				
<b>De facto</b>					
Degree of fulfilment					
Threats					
Positive developments					

<sup>1,2</sup> Promotion of fundamental values will also include significant elements of *de facto* monitoring.

## 1. Monitoring the implementation of commitments regarding fundamental values of higher education

The following relevant commitments assumed by EHEA members are formulated in the Rome Communiqué (2020):

- A. “The EHEA of our vision will fully respect the fundamental values of higher education and democracy and the rule of law. (...) We recognise that accomplishing this will require enacting policies and implementing measures in our national frameworks, some of which will go beyond our higher education systems and will entail alignment of wider national economic, financial and social strategies.”
- B. “We reaffirm our commitment to **promoting** and **protecting** our **shared fundamental values** in the entire EHEA through intensified political dialogue and cooperation as the necessary basis for quality learning, teaching and research as well as for democratic societies” (*emphasis added*).
- C. “We commit to upholding institutional autonomy, academic freedom and integrity, participation of students and staff in higher education governance, and public responsibility for and of higher education”.
- D. “We ask the BFUG to develop a framework for the enhancement of the fundamental values of the EHEA that will foster self-reflection, constructive dialogue and peer-learning across national authorities, higher education institutions and organisations, while also making it possible to assess the degree to which these are honoured and implemented in our systems”.

Considering these commitments, in particular point II.1.B above which is the most clear, precise and operational on the list (**protect** and **promote** the fundamental values of higher education), the following are proposed to be monitored as part of an EHEA-wide system:

### a. **Protecting the fundamental values of higher education.**

This part of the monitoring will focus on *de jure* aspects of fundamental values protection. It will involve 3 types of assessment: (1) analysis/monitoring of legal protection for the specific dimensions of fundamental values, (2) assessment of the overall degree of protection, and (3) assessment of the outlook in *de jure* protection.

(1) The first part of the monitoring will focus on *de jure* elements: the existence of a system of legislation and regulations to protect the shared fundamental values (as specifically defined in formal statements adopted by the EHEA ministerial conferences) in each EHEA country. The analysis of *de jure* protection of each value will follow specific dimensions for each value,

extracted from the shared definitions, once finalised and adopted (see indicative matrix proposal enclosed in *Appendix 1*).

(2) The degree of *de jure* protection in each member state shall be qualified as **adequate**, **intermediary** or **inadequate** (traffic light system), as evaluated against the specific commitments made in the respective communiqués (including when definitions for values are adopted). For systems where the degree of protection will be considered adequate overall, it will be indicated separately if there are particular dimensions or areas of concern.

(3) The **outlook** in *de jure* protection will characterise the expectations with regard to changes in legislation that might affect the current level of protection of fundamental values. The outlook will be qualified as: **negative**, **current level not expected to change**, or **positive**. For example, in a hypothetical case where in a given system repelling existing legislation that is restrictive for a specific value is under consideration but has not been formally adopted (e.g., if a draft was submitted to the Parliament that would create a better legal system for a particular value), that would count towards a **positive outlook**. If, on the contrary, in a given system, a discussion is taking place about adopting restrictive measures (which have not been passed at the time of the monitoring), that would count towards a **negative outlook**.

As a rule, an evaluation of the degree of realization of the estimates regarding outlook will be undertaken and reported in the subsequent monitoring round.

Overall, the proposal in this section of the monitoring framework is to concentrate on assessing the implementation of the commitment regarding the *de jure* **protection** of the fundamental values of higher education in EHEA member states. *De facto* aspects are discussed below separately.

### b. Promoting the fundamental values of higher education

The Rome Communiqué (II.1.B above) also includes a commitment to actively **promote** fundamental values, not just “passive” protection through legislation and regulations. The implementation of this commitment will be monitored looking at the presence/absence (adoption and implementation) of policy and other initiatives to promote fundamental values in practice. This involves measures that do not change the legal frameworks but constitute important practical measure to further the fundamental values of higher education, such as funding policies, committing policy statements such as White Papers, institutionalised



## New building blocks of the Bologna Process: fundamental values (NewFAV)

dialogues with higher education institutions, student and staff organisations, etc. Particular attention could be given to the existence and participation in activities of “self-reflection, constructive dialogue and peer-learning across national authorities, higher education institutions and organisations” (commitment II.1.D, above)

The degree of implementation of this commitment (“actively promote the fundamental values”) could be qualified as **absent, limited, or significant**.

Here too, the **outlook** in promoting the fundamental values could be added: **negative, current level not expected to change, or positive**.

### **2. Monitoring the state of respect of each fundamental value in EHEA systems (*de facto*)**

Based on the current definition of academic freedom and draft statements for the other values, the EHEA fundamental values can be grouped into two categories, depending on whether they are defined primarily as rights/freedoms, or duties/obligations.

**Rights** and **freedoms** include academic freedom, institutional autonomy, and participation of staff and students in governance. **Duties** and **obligations** include academic integrity, and public responsibility *for* and *of* higher education. Based on this taxonomy, the monitoring framework will focus on different aspect depending on the type of value assessed.

**For values defined as rights and freedoms (separately for each)** monitoring of *de facto* situation can focus on:

- i. Infringements of the respective rights/freedoms
- ii. Threats to the respective rights/freedoms
- iii. Positive developments.

**For values defined as duties or obligations (separately for each)** monitoring of *de facto* situation can focus on:

- i. Degrees of fulfilment of the obligations resulting from the adoption of shared definitions for the respective values.
- ii. Threats to the fulfilment of these obligations.
- iii. Positive developments.





Exact aspects, dimensions and conditions for monitoring each value are extracted from the respective statement/definition (see *Matrix* in Appendix 1).

### **3. Monitoring synergies and tensions among values**

The EHEA monitoring system can and must take advantage of the existing set of reinforcing values. It should not be limited to the individual and separate monitoring of each value. The presence of a set of values can be helpful both conceptually (better understanding and definition of values) and instrumentally (more effective monitoring). For example, the fact that EHEA values include both academic freedom, and student and staff participation in governance could help to avoid the trap that is evident in other monitoring exercises focusing on academic freedom alone, where it is not clear whether governance is a dimension to be included into the scope of academic freedom or not.

It is essential to recognise that there could be both synergies and tensions in the codification and implementation of the fundamental values, which may have a corresponding positive or negative impact. For this reason, the EHEA monitoring system for the fundamental values should pay attention to and indicate in each *de jure* and *de facto* category whether tensions and/or synergies are identified.

## **III. How to monitor the fundamental values of higher education? Data sources**

A technical report including a detailed proposal for a monitoring mechanism will be developed in the next phase of the NewFAV project. However, already at this time, it is possible to project the anchor elements of such a mechanism based on the monitoring framework outlined above in section II of this report, which provided an answer to the question “what to monitor”. A further question to be addressed in this regard is how to monitor, including what data to use.

Monitoring of commitments implementation/*de jure* (II.1 a-b above) could rely on:

- Document analysis (system-level legislation and regulations, primarily), cross-checked with experts. This could be done by Eurydice or similarly to how Eurydice monitors the implementation of other Bologna commitments.
- The document analysis will also be completed/cross-checked with other existing reports and monitoring initiatives, such as the Academic Freedom Index, EUA Autonomy Scorecard, ESU



## New building blocks of the Bologna Process: fundamental values (NewFAV)

“Bologna with Student Eyes” reports, EUA Trends report, etc. Both long-lasting and one-off monitoring initiatives of this kind will be useful to complement document analysis.

- self-reporting by national/system-level authorities cross-checked in all cases with experts, and other reports.

*De facto* state of affairs (II.2-3) could rely on:

- Existing databases and reports, including relevant one-off reports prepared during the monitoring period.
- Analysis of media reports.
- Self-reporting by national/system-level authorities cross-checked in all cases with experts, and other reports.
- Reports by higher education institutions and organisations and civil society organisations.

A precise grid of data collection and analysis will need to be developed for each value.

## **IV. Who should carry out the monitoring of fundamental values of higher education?**

This question is also to be addressed in a further phase of the NewFAV project. Several scenarios will be proposed to the EHEA WG on Fundamental Values. Based on the projections in sections II and III, it is clear that Eurydice could play a key role in implementing an EHEA-wide mechanism for monitoring the fundamental values. At present, of course, Eurydice alone does not have the physical staff capacity to undertake such an extensive, recurring, and time-consuming monitoring exercise. Alternatively, Eurydice could play a key role in coordinating the monitoring of the fundamental values of higher education in the EHEA. It is conceivable that a consortium or coalition could be put together to carry out monitoring, with a membership that reflects the need to ensure methodological accuracy and legitimacy of the monitoring.



## Appendix 1: Monitoring framework and monitoring matrix (type of monitoring and preliminary dimensions to be monitored<sup>3</sup>)

- I. Rights or freedoms
- II. Obligations or duties
- III. Synergies and tensions between and among values

### I. Rights or freedoms

<i>Type of monitoring</i>	<i>Value and its dimensions (as per shared definition)</i>		
	<b>Academic freedom<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Institutional autonomy</b>	<b>Participation of students and staff in university governance</b>
<b>De jure</b>	<p>“Freedom of thought and inquiry for students and staff to advance knowledge through <b>research</b> and to exchange openly, as well as the freedom to <b>communicate</b> the results of research within and outside of the framework of academic institutions and programmes.”</p> <p>“Academic freedom designates the <b>freedom of the academic community</b> - including academic staff and students - in respect of <b>research, teaching and learning</b> and, more broadly, the</p>	<p><b>Organisational and strategic autonomy, financial autonomy, staffing autonomy and academic autonomy</b> (sub-dimensions detailed in draft definition).</p>	<p>Student and staff participation in higher education governance encompasses their rights to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. organise autonomously without pressure or undue interference from public authorities, governing bodies or other stakeholders;</li> <li>b. elect and to be elected to the governing bodies in open, free and fair elections and without any discrimination;</li> <li>c. initiate debates and table proposals in all governing bodies and participate in discussing and deciding on them;</li> <li>d. be heard and have a vote on the internal organisation and administration of higher education institutions and all issues for higher education governance.</li> </ol>
Protection ( <i>adequate, intermediary, inadequate</i> )			
Promotion ( <i>absent, limited, significant</i> )			
Outlook ( <i>negative, current level unchanged, positive</i> )			

<sup>3</sup> To be finalized based on the final statements with the definitions of fundamental values.

<sup>4</sup> Related **freedoms** mentioned in the Rome Statement on Academic Freedom should be monitored as part of other the values in this category, namely institutional autonomy and student and staff participation in governance, and also under the values in the second category (**duties** and **obligations**). For example, adherence to standards mentioned in the Statement should be monitored under integrity.



## New building blocks of the Bologna Process: fundamental values (NewFAV)

<b>De facto</b>	<p><b>dissemination</b> of research and teaching outcomes both within and outside the higher education sector. In essence, the concept ensures that the academic community may engage in <b>research, teaching, learning and communication in society without fear of reprisal.</b></p>		
Infringements			
Threats			
Positive developments			

### II. Obligations and duties

<i>Type of monitoring</i>	<i>Value and its dimensions (as per shared definition)</i>		
	<b>Academic integrity</b>	<b>Public responsibility for higher education</b>	<b>Public responsibility of higher education</b>
<b>De jure</b>	<p>a. "Public authorities, higher education institutions and the academic community have the <b>joint responsibility to provide framework conditions</b> that ensure academic integrity in higher education. This involves <b>establishing transparent frameworks that set regulations, standards and guidelines regarding academic integrity</b> which are to be implemented at the level of higher education institutions <b>and providing for independent bodies to monitor the implementation.</b>"</p> <p>b. Specifically for public authorities: "Public authorities should <b>ensure</b> that all <b>organisational, cultural, legislative, financial or other measures</b> promote a healthy working environment and error culture, while</p>	<p>a. "Public responsibility for higher education (...) includes political, public policy, regulatory and legal obligations, including with regard to funding, and is in its details defined by each EHEA member in accordance with the principles that have been agreed jointly through the EHEA and other relevant contexts."</p> <p>b. "It is exercised with due regard to the other fundamental values of the EHEA and involves the responsibility to help safeguard all the fundamental values of higher education."</p> <p>c. "It includes the core responsibility for the proper functioning of the higher education system, for the benefit of the broader society and individual development, as well as to the members of the higher education community."</p> <p>d. "Public authorities, at their respective levels, have the primary responsibility for putting in place supportive regulatory frameworks that enable higher education institutions to effectively pursue their educational, research and outreach missions. Public responsibility may be exercised through legislation and other regulations but also through other means such as policies or funding."</p>	<p>a. "Through its own actions, internal regulation and policies, the higher education community should ensure that the fundamental values of higher education are respected, furthered, and implemented. It should pursue truth and the production, transmission, dissemination, curation, and use of knowledge as a public good by upholding and developing the standards of teaching, learning, and research within and across academic disciplines.</p> <p>b. The higher education community should continuously inform broader society of its work and results.</p> <p>c. It should engage in the identification, analysis, and understanding of the problems that confront broader society and individual constituencies. The higher education community should also participate in designing solutions to these problems and provide expertise to meet these challenges, in accordance with its own standards and values.</p> <p>d. The higher education community should seek to foster and disseminate, and should itself be guided by a culture of democracy, solidarity, and ethics. It should provide information publicly about societal risks related to action or</p>
Protection <i>(adequate, intermediary, inadequate)</i>			
Promotion <i>(absent, limited, significant)</i>			
Outlook <i>(negative, current level unchanged, positive)</i>			



## New building blocks of the Bologna Process: fundamental values (NewFAV)

<b>De facto</b>	avoiding regulatory loopholes that allow impunity for academic misconduct.”	e. “Public authorities should exercise this responsibility in consultation with the higher education community and other stakeholders. They should specifically ensure that legal and regulatory frameworks foster and enable institutional autonomy, academic freedom, and self-governance by the higher education community. Public authorities should consult and seek input from the higher education sector, all internal university constituencies, and relevant external stakeholders regarding the configuration and substance of these frameworks. They should, however, assume exclusive responsibility to ensure that the frameworks within which higher education is conducted are put in place and function adequately, including the legal framework, the qualifications framework of the higher education system, the frameworks for quality assurance, the recognition of foreign qualifications, information on higher education provision, the funding frameworks, and the frameworks for the social dimension of higher education.”	inaction, when such risks can be determined on the basis of research and scholarship. The higher education community should design and pursue its policies and activities in ways that are consistent with fairness, non-discrimination, and transparency. It should 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. (...)The higher education community should therefore contribute to the development of society on the basis of scholarship and research, and teaching and learning.
<b>Degrees of fulfilment of obligations</b>	Specifically for HEIs: “Higher Education institutions should <b>empower</b> their members <b>through proper training, adequate guidance and support</b> for their members to develop their understanding of academic integrity, and their skills to apply it.”	f. Public authorities should assume leading responsibility for ensuring that all qualified candidates enjoy effective equal opportunities to undertake and complete higher education, irrespective of their background. They should assume a substantial responsibility for financing and ensuring provision of higher education. All higher education within an education system should be provided and funded within the framework established by the public authorities responsible for that system, regardless of whether the provision and funding are public or private.	e. The higher education community should 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. It should work with the society of which it is part, including with its local community, to help improve opportunities for all members of society, in accordance with the democratic and social missions of higher education.
<b>Threats</b>			
<b>Positive developments</b>		Public authorities should further all major purposes of higher education: preparation for the labor market, preparation for life as active citizens of democratic societies, personal development, and the development and maintenance of a broad and advanced knowledge base.	The higher education community should equip its graduates with general, specialised 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.”

### III. Synergies and values between and among values

Synergies and tensions between and among values are proposed to be monitored in the de facto and de jure categories by inventorying and analysing (qualitatively) existing instances/cases of synergies and/or tensions (including under “outlook”)



## Appendix 2: How existing indicators, tools and monitoring initiatives can be integrated and used at the EHEA level.

### 1. Fundamental value: **ACADEMIC FREEDOM**

### Possibilities of use as considering the parameters of the proposed monitoring framework

<i>Indicator/tool/monitoring exercise/study</i>		<i>Type of tool/measurement</i>	<i>Indirect or direct assessment</i>	<i>Does it address this value as defined in the EHEA?</i>	<i>Implementation of commitments: Protection (de jure)</i>	<i>Implementation of commitments: Promotion</i>	<i>Situation of the ground: Infringements (de facto)</i>	<i>Situation of the ground: threats (de facto)</i>	<i>Situation of the ground: positive developments (de facto)</i>
1.	Academic Freedom Index (Varieties of Democracy -V-Dem Dataset)	Composite Index	Direct	Partially	Provides excellent information to cross-check the results of document analysis and the assessment of the degree of implementation	Provides excellent information to cross-check the results of the analysis in this area and the assessment of the degree of implementation	Numerical indication about the presence and magnitude of infringements (not a direct source of data)	Indication about the presence and magnitude of threats (not a direct source of data)	No
2.	Changing Academic profession (CAP)	Survey	Indirect	No	Heuristic value only. Provides insights about ways of measuring academic freedom				
3.	Freedom in the World (Freedom House)	Report with numerical ratings and descriptive text	Direct	Partially	Heuristic value. Provides insights about ways of measuring academic freedom				



### New building blocks of the Bologna Process: fundamental values (NewFAV)

4.	Criterion referenced approach	Numerical assessment of (legal) compliance levels	Direct	Partially	Potential technical value as an applicable tool as well heuristic value. One off initiative but can be re-used	No	No	No	No
5.	Measurement of the Right to Academic Freedom	“Multidimensional picture” re legal perspective	Direct - potentially	Partially	Heuristic re. how to assess legal protection. Insight about the multidimensional nature of AF and relationship with other values.	No	No	No	No
6.	Assessment of quality of academic freedom protection (UK)	Survey re.self-assessment of institutional <i>de jure</i> and <i>de facto</i> protection of AF	Direct	Very partially	Limited heuristic value. Focused on the institutional, not system level		No	No	No
7.	Survey about academic freedom in Germany	Survey	Direct	Partially	A more limited version of Afi				
8.	SAR academic self-censorship survey	Survey regarding extreme restrictions	Indirect (inventory of incidents rather than measurement)	Very partially	No	No	Heuristic. Insights regarding inventorying extreme infringements of academic freedom	No	No
9.	SAR Academic Freedom	Monitoring violations of AF and/or	Direct	Partial	No	No	Heuristic. Insights regarding inventorying	No	No



### New building blocks of the Bologna Process: fundamental values (NewFAV)

	Monitoring Project	human rights of HE communities' members					extreme infringements of academic freedom		
10.	Magna Charta Universitatum application form	Questionnaire for institutions applying for MCU membership	Indirect	Quite largely	No	No	Defines types of conduct that represent violations of AF and human rights in HE	No	No
11.	Inventory of data sources on academic freedom	Inventory of measurements based on data sources	Direct and indirect (inventory)	Partially	Heuristic value. Provides insights on the benefits and challenges of existing tools				
12.	Research Guidelines for Country Case Studies on Academic Freedom	Guidelines for qualitative assessment	Direct	Partially	Contains a set of guidelines for qualitative country-level assessments. Needs to be modified in line with EHEA definition				





## New building blocks of the Bologna Process: fundamental values (NewFAV)

### 2. Fundamental value: INTEGRITY

### Possibilities of use as considering the parameters of the proposed monitoring framework

Indicator/tool/measuring exercise/study		Type of tool/measurement	Indirect or direct assessment	Does it measure this value as defined in the EHEA?	Implementation of commitments: Protection (de jure)	Implementation of commitments: Promotion	Situation of the ground: Degree of fulfilment of obligations in this area (de facto)	Situation of the ground: threats (de facto)	Situation of the ground: positive developments (de facto)
1.	Magna Charta Universitatum application form	Questionnaire for institutions applying for MCU membership	Indirect	Draft statement not finalised	No	No	No	No	Yes, although unsystematic information and source of data for very few institutions only
2.	“Core commitments: Educating Students for Personal and Social responsibility” Initiative	Survey (USA)	Indirect		No Mainly heuristic value. Provides insights about the understanding and operationalisation of participation as self-governance	No	No	No	No
3.	Five core elements of Exemplary Academic Integrity Policy	System-level policy (Australia)	Indirect; rather not even measurement		No	No	No	No	No
4.	IAU/MCO Guidelines for an Institutional Code of Ethics	Not a measurement tool but a detailed guide for	None		No	No	No	No	No



### New building blocks of the Bologna Process: fundamental values (NewFAV)

	in Higher Education	operationalizing integrity						
5.	ENQA survey on academic integrity	Survey (QA agencies)	Indirect	No	No	No	No	No
6.	Bologna with Stakeholder Eyes	Stock-taking report based on online survey	Direct	No	No	Mainly heuristic value. The tool considers who are the stakeholders responsible for safeguarding academic integrity.		
7.	NAIN Academic Integrity Guidelines	Not a measurement tool but a detailed guide for operationalizing integrity (Ireland)	None	No. But some heuristic value related to operationalisation of academic integrity	No	No	No	No
8.	UA Academic Integrity best practice principles	Not a measurement tool but a detailed guide for operationalising	None	No. But some heuristic value related to operationalisation of academic integrity	No	No	No	No



### New building blocks of the Bologna Process: fundamental values (NewFAV)

		integrity (Australia)						
9.	Scorecard for Acad. Integrity Development (SAID)	Self-evaluation questionnaire for institutions	Direct		No	No	Yes	Yes

### 3. Fundamental value: **INSITUTIONAL AUTONOMY**

#### Possibilities of use as considering the parameters of the proposed monitoring framework

Indicator/tool/measuring exercise/study		Type of tool/measurement	Indirect or direct assessment	Does it measure this value as defined in the EHEA draft?	Implementation of commitments: <i>Protection (de jure)</i>	Implementation of commitments: <i>Promotion</i>	Situation of the ground: <i>Infringements (de facto)</i>	Situation of the ground: <i>threats (de facto)</i>	Situation of the ground: <i>positive developments (de facto)</i>
1.	Autonomy scorecard	Multidimensional scoring of systems	Direct	Yes	Yes	Yes (partially)	No	Yes (partially)	Yes (excellent source of data)
2.	Academic Freedom Index (Varieties of Democracy -V-Dem Dataset)	Index	Direct	Partially; different definition (autonomy is part of academic freedom)	Provides information to cross-check the assessment of the degree of implementation	Provides information to cross-check assessment of the degree of implementation	Numerical indication about the presence and magnitude of infringements (not a direct source of data)	Indication about the presence and magnitude of threats (not a direct source of data)	No
3.	Freedom in the World (Freedom House)	Report with numerical ratings and descriptive text	Direct	Partially	Heuristic value. Provides insights about ways of measuring academic freedom				



### New building blocks of the Bologna Process: fundamental values (NewFAV)

4.	Criterion referenced approach	Numerical assessment of (legal) compliance levels	Direct	Partially	May not add much to Autonomy Scorecard	No	No	No	No
5.	Magna Charta Universitatum application form	Questionnaire for institutions applying for MCU membership; not numerical	Direct	Partially	Heuristic value. Provides insight about how to understand IA and operationalise its measurements.				
6.	Systems approach for better education results in tertiary education (SABER-TE)	System level, comparative benchmarking	Direct	Largely	Heuristic. Draws attention to two dimensions not addressed by the Autonomy Scorecard: overall “governance autonomy” and private sector influence in higher education				
7.	Operationalisation of university autonomy in Russia	Theoretical model for potentially developing and adapted measurement tool	Direct (if actual)	Partially	No	No	No	No	No
8.	School autonomy, leadership and learning	(New) Research framework	Not a tool yet	Largely, if transformed into a tool;	No	No	No	No	No
9.	Indicators of university autonomy according to	New conceptualisation to help identify	Not a tool yet	Largely, if transformed into a tool	Draws attention to the notion of “groups of stakeholders” as a basis on which to develop indicators. May complete in this regard that the Autonomy Scorecard.				



### New building blocks of the Bologna Process: fundamental values (NewFAV)

	stakeholders' interests	indicators for IA							
10.	Procedural university autonomy	(Older) model for identifying indicators	Not a tool	Very partially	No	No	No	No	No
11.	Campus autonomy	Surveys (US)	Direct	Partially	No	No	No	No	No
12.	Research Guidelines for Country Case Studies on Academic Freedom	Guidelines for qualitative assessment	Direct	Partially	Contains a set of guidelines for qualitative country-level assessments. Needs to be modified in line with EHEA definition				

#### 4. Fundamental value: PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS AND STAFF IN GOVERNANCE

#### Possibilities of use as considering the parameters of the proposed monitoring framework

<i>Indicator/tool/measuring exercise/study</i>		<i>Type of tool/measurement</i>	<i>Indirect or direct assessment</i>	<i>Does it measure this value as defined in the EHEA draft?</i>	<i>Implementation of commitments: Protection (de jure)</i>	<i>Implementation of commitments: Promotion</i>	<i>Situation of the ground: Infringements (de facto)</i>	<i>Situation of the ground: threats (de facto)</i>	<i>Situation of the ground: positive developments (de facto)</i>
1	Ex-post evaluation of university governance	Survey (Netherlands)	Direct	Yes	Heuristic. Proposes a model regarding how to operationalize participation and indicators to measure it				
2.	Changing academic profession (CAP)	Survey	Indirect	Partially (thematically and in terms of constituencies); does not	Heuristic. Provides insight about how to understand staff participation.				



### New building blocks of the Bologna Process: fundamental values (NewFAV)

				include students					
3.	Model of student participation in university governance (I)	Comparative study (two universities in Nepal)	Direct	Partially (thematically and in terms of constituencies – students only)	Heuristic. Provides insight about how to understand student participation.				
4.	Model of student participation in university governance (II)	Case study (Portugal)	Direct	Partially (thematically and in terms of constituencies – students only)	No	No	No	No	No
5.	Magna Charta Universitatum application form	Questionnaire for institutions applying for MCU membership; not numerical	Direct	Partially	Heuristic. Provides insight about how to understand student participation.				
6.	Freedom in the World (Freedom House)	Report with numerical ratings and descriptive text	Indirect	Partially	Yes, partially	No	Yes, partially	Yes, partially	No
7.	Criterion referenced approach	Numerical assessment of (legal) compliance levels	Indirect	Partially	Heuristic value. Provides insights about the understanding and operationalisation of participation as self-governance	No	No	No	No



### New building blocks of the Bologna Process: fundamental values (NewFAV)

8.	Assessment of quality of academic freedom protection (UK)	Survey re. self-assessment of institutional <i>de jure</i> and <i>de facto</i> protection of AF	Indirect	Partially	Heuristic value. Provides insights about the understanding and operationalisation of participation as self-governance				No
9.	Bologna with Student Eyes 2020 (chapter 4)	Stock-taking report based on online survey	Direct	Partially	Yes, partially	No	Yes, partially	Yes, partially	Yes, partially
10.	Degrees of intensity of student participation in governance	Criteria for assessment of students' participation	Direct	Partially	No	No	Yes, partially	Yes, partially	Yes, partially



5. Fundamental value: **PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION**

Possibilities of use as considering the parameters of the proposed monitoring framework

Indicator/tool/measuring exercise/study		Type of tool/measurement	Indirect or direct assessment	Does it measure this value as defined in the EHEA draft?	Implementation of commitments: <i>Protection (de jure)</i>	Implementation of commitments: <i>Promotion</i>	Situation of the ground: <i>Degree of fulfilment of obligations in this area (de facto)</i>	Situation of the ground: <i>threats (de facto)</i>	Situation of the ground: <i>positive developments (de facto)</i>
1.	Toolkit for collecting and analysing data on attacks on education	Toolkit for collecting and analysing data regarding attacks on education	Indirect	Partially	No	No	Mainly heuristic. Provides insights about the understanding and operationalisation/measurement public responsibility for higher education.		No
2.	University Impact Ranking	Ranking	Indirect	Very partially. Implies that public responsibility is about policies to guarantee AF	Heuristic. A limited attempt at operationalising and measuring public reasonability for higher education. Implies that public responsibility is about policies to guarantee AF		No	No	Yes (partial source of information)
3.	Criterion referenced approach	Numerical assessment of constitutional protection of academic freedom	Indirect	Very partially	No	No	No	No	No
4.	Systems approach for better education results in tertiary education (SABER-TE)	System-level benchmarking	Indirect	Very partially	Heuristic. Provides insight about measurement methodology and benchmarking with regard to public responsibility for higher education.		No		No





6. Fundamental value: **PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY OF HIGHER EDUCATION**

					<b>Possibilities of use as considering the parameters of the proposed monitoring framework</b>				
<i>Indicator/tool/measuring exercise/study</i>		<i>Type of tool/measurement</i>	<i>Indirect or direct assessment</i>	<i>Does if measure this value as defined in the EHEA draft?</i>	<b>Implementation of commitments: Protection (de jure)</b>	<b>Implementation of commitments: Promotion</b>	<b>Situation of the ground: Degree of fulfilment of obligations in this area (de facto)</b>	<b>Situation of the ground: threats (de facto)</b>	<b>Situation of the ground: positive developments (de facto)</b>
1.	Systems approach for better education results in tertiary education (SABER-TE)	System-level benchmarking	Indirect	Very partially	Heuristic. Provides insight about measurement methodology and benchmarking with regard to public responsibility of higher education.			No	No
2.	“Core commitments: Educating Students for Personal and Social responsibility” Initiative	Inter-campus survey (USA)	Indirect	Partially	Heuristic. Insight about operationalising public responsibility for and of HE.				
3.	Measuring social accountability of universities	Thematic literature analysis (social accountability in medical education)	Rather direct if not explicit, although not a tool proper	Largely	Excellent insight about understanding, operationalising and measuring public responsibility for and of HE.				
4.	Evaluation model of societal and economic	Framework for assessing societal and economic	Model, not a tool. Quite	Partially but, in that,	Excellent insight about understanding, operationalising and measuring public responsibility of HE.				



Co-funded by the  
European Union

## New building blocks of the Bologna Process: fundamental values (NewFAV)

	engagement of universities	engagement of universities; and for outcome measurements	direct otherwise	very precisely	
--	----------------------------	--	------------------	----------------	--