

Doc. Code: BFUGBoard_LU_LI_47_3b
Last modified: 01.06.2015

MEETING OF THE BOLOGNA FOLLOW-UP GROUP
Riga, 24 March 2015 - 25 March 2015
Draft Outcome of Proceedings

Participant list

Country / Organisation	Name
Albania	<i>Absent</i>
Andorra	Maria del Mar Martinez Ramirez
Armenia	Karine Harutyunyan
Armenia	Robert Sukiasyan
Austria	Gottfried Bacher
Azerbaijan	<i>Absent</i>
Belgium/Flemish Community	Noël Vercruysse
Belgium/French Community	Kevin Guillaume
BFUG Secretariat	Gayane Harutyunyan
BFUG Secretariat	Ani Hovhannisyan
BFUG Secretariat	Sahakanush Sargsyan
Bosnia-Herzegovina	Aida Durić
Bosnia-Herzegovina	Petar Marić
Bulgaria	<i>Apologies</i>
BUSINESSEUROPE	Anita Lîce
BUSINESSEUROPE	Irene Seling
Council of Europe	Sjur Bergan
Croatia	Ana Tecilazić Goršić
Cyprus	Despina Martidou-Forcier
Czech Republic	Lucie Trojanova
Czech Republic	Karolina Gondkova
Denmark	Jonas Husum Johannesen
Denmark	Jette Søgren Nielsen
EC	Adam Tyson
EC	Mette Moerke Andersen
EI	Jens Vraa-Jensen
EI	Guntars Catlaks
ENQA	Maria Kelo
EQAR	Colin Tück

EQAR	Eric Froment
Estonia	Janne Pukk
ESU	Fernando Miguel Galán Palomares
ESU	Elisabeth Gehrke
ESU	Erin Nordal
EUA	Lesley Wilson
EUA	Michael Gaebel
EURASHE	Andreas Orphanides
EURASHE	Johan Cloet
EUROSTAT	<i>Absent</i>
EUROSTUDENT	Martin Unger
EUROSTUDENT	Kristina Hauschildt
Eurydice	David Crosier
Finland	Maja Innola
France	Patricia Pol
France	Hélène Lagier
Georgia	Nino Kopaleishvili
Germany	Peter Greisler
Germany	Heide Ahrens
Germany	Katrin Fohmann
Germany	Peter Hassenbach
Greece	<i>Apologies</i>
Holy See	Friedrich Bechina
Hungary	Ernö Keszei
Iceland	Una Strand Viðarsdóttir
Ireland	Tim Cullinane
Italy	Marzia Foroni
Kazakhstan	Yekaterina Chernykh
Kazakhstan	Banu Narbekova
Latvia	Andrejs Rauhvargers
Latvia	Jolanta Silka
Liechtenstein	Daniel Miescher
Lithuania	Elena Armalyte
Luxembourg	Corinne Kox
Luxembourg	Leon Andre Diederich
Malta	Tanya Sammut-Bonnici
Moldova	<i>Absent</i>
Montenegro	<i>Absent</i>
Netherlands	Jolien van der Vegt
Norway	Tone Flood Strøm

Norway	Toril Johannson
Poland	Bartłomiej Banaszak
Portugal	Ana Mateus
Portugal	Inês Branco
Romania	Radu-Mircea Damian
Romania	Daniela Cristina Ghitulica
Russian Federation	Nadezhda Kamynina
Russian Federation	Svetlana Shvedova
Serbia	Mihajlo Babin
Slovak Republic	Josef Jurkovic
Slovenia	<i>Absent</i>
Spain	Luis Delgado
Sweden	Albin Gaunt
Switzerland	François Grandjean
"the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"	Borco Aleksov
Turkey	Yavuz Atar
Turkey	Abdullah Cavusoglu
Ukraine	Olexandr Smyrnov
UNESCO	<i>Absent</i>
United Kingdom	Pamela Wilkinson
United Kingdom	Ian Crombie
United Kingdom/Scotland	Rebecca Robinson

1. Welcome and Introduction to the BFUG Meeting by the Chairs

Mr. Andrejs Rauhvargers (Latvia), the BFUG Co-Chair, welcomed the BFUG members in Riga and wished the participants a successful meeting.

Ms. Una Strand Viðarsdóttir (Iceland), the BFUG Co-Chair, informed the BFUG that the last Board meeting was organised in Reykjavik the details of which are available in the Reykjavik draft minutes.

The BFUG was informed that there were 83 participants present at the meeting and the apologies were received from Bulgaria and Greece. The following countries/organisations were not present at the meeting: Albania, Azerbaijan, EUROSTAT, Moldova, Montenegro, Slovenia and UNESCO.

2. Adoption of the agenda

Documents: BFUG_LV_IS_45_2a [Draft agenda]

BFUG_LV_IS_45_2b [Draft annotated agenda]

The agenda of the meeting was adopted with the inclusion of three items in "AOB", which are:

- 1. Update from France on the structure and composition of the 2015-2018 BFUG Secretariat**
- 2. Request to the BFUG to review and update the document "BFUG_IE_HR_35_13_Information on BFUG proceedings"**
- 3. Information from ESU.**

3. Draft minutes of the BFUG Board meeting, Reykjavik, 24 February 2015 and draft outcome of proceedings of the BFUG meeting, Riga 26-27 January 2015

Document: BFUG_LV_IS_45_3a [BFUG Board Reykjavik draft minutes]

BFUG_LV_IS_45_3b [BFUG Riga draft outcome of proceedings]

The BFUG approved the Riga BFUG meeting draft outcome of proceedings and took note of the Reykjavik Board meeting draft minutes with the inclusion of some minor rephrasing.

4. Draft final reports from the WGs

4a. Reporting on the Bologna Process Implementation WG

Document: BFUG_LV_IS_45_4a [Pre-final draft of the 2015 Implementation report]

Mr. Andrejs Rauhvargers (Latvia), the Co-Chair of the Reporting WG noted that tremendous work had been done on the 2015 Bologna Process Implementation Report. The BFUG was advised that the EHEA countries still had the possibility to send in corrections to the Report by the end of March 2015. The Report would be finalised and print-ready in April 2015.

Mr. David Crosier (Eurydice) noted that the drafting team had been trying to make the Report as useable and user-friendly as possible. Moreover, the decision made at the Riga BFUG meeting in January concerning the inclusion of the 4 new scorecard indicators (SIs) was highlighted. The participants were advised that after the BFUG meeting in January the EHEA countries had had a chance to comment on the SIs. The comments received raised some issues with SI 8, which was later revised to eliminate the problems. The BFUG was asked to consider revising the SIs on portability and on mobility support to disadvantaged learners along the same lines as had been done in case of SI 8.

For more details concerning the revision of the SIs, please refer to the presentation below:



BFUG_Powerpoint_Ri
ga-2.pptm

The BFUG approved the suggested changes to the SIs and endorsed the Report.

4b. Social Dimension and Lifelong Learning WG

Documents: BFUG_LV_IS_45_4b [Draft Strategy_Widening Participation for Equity and Growth]

BFUG_LV_IS_45_4b_Annex [Draft Guidelines for National Access Plans or Strategies]

Ms. Elisabeth Gehrke (ESU), the Co-Chair of the SD&LLL WG noted that the WG met in Brussels at the beginning of March to revise the Strategy according to the comments received at the BFUG meeting in January. It was underlined that in the revised draft Strategy, teaching and learning, lifelong learning, as well as participation in and completion of HE were better highlighted. Moreover, the revised draft also took into account the situation in some EHEA countries where the social dimension is embedded in the overall higher education strategy.

The main points of the discussion that followed are summarised below:

- To better consider the situation in all the EHEA countries, it would be appropriate to replace the main idea of developing 'national access plans or strategies' with one of developing 'national policies for the social dimension'. At the same time, it would be desirable to highlight the importance of coherence of such national policies.
- The opening sentence of the Strategy should be reformulated to make clear whom the subject 'we' refers to. There were also doubts expressed as regards subject "we" in the following parts of the Strategy, e.g. in the part "We encourage member countries to use these guidelines [...]".
- To the inquiry whether the Guidelines would be presented to the EHEA Ministers in May, it was explained that the document on guidelines was designed to assist member countries in devising national access plans and was not therefore part of the Strategy to be presented to the Ministers for adoption.

The Co-Chair, Ms. Una Strand Viðarsdóttir (Iceland) concluded that the Strategy would be amended in line with the comments received and, in particular, making clear that there is not a need for designing a separate/new plan for the social dimension in the EHEA countries. The revised document would be circulated to the BFUG in a week's time.

5. Yerevan Ministerial Communiqué (Draft 2)

Documents: BFUG_LV_IS_45_5a [Cover note_ revised draft of the Yerevan Communiqué]
BFUG_LV_IS_45_5a.1 [Work at Communiqué]
BFUG_LV_IS_45_5b [Yerevan Ministerial Communiqué_draft 2]
BFUG_LV_IS_45_5c [Draft outline of the 2015-2018 EHEA work programme]

Mr. Andrejs Rauhvargers (Latvia), the Co-Chair recalled the BFUG's decision in January that following the BFUG meeting the comments from the countries would be incorporated into the draft Communiqué; afterwards the redraft would be circulated for obtaining further comments. The BFUG was informed that many EHEA countries had submitted suggestions and two proposals from EUA and EC with suggestions for more extensive rewriting were also received. The Communiqué was redrafted again taking into account the feedback from the countries. However, as the proposals from EUA and EC considerably diverged not only from the draft sent for consultation but also from each other, and were very extensive, they were not integrated in the revised draft but presented separately. The Communiqué was redrafted based on the three drafts received. As a result, draft 2 was produced.

Following that, draft 2 of the Communiqué was discussed and the following comments were received:

- A stronger political message was deemed necessary for highlighting the role of higher education in enhancing the democratic culture and civil society.
- In addition, a stronger message on the collective ambition of the EHEA to achieve the goals laid out in the Communiqué is required.
- A pathfinding group could be established on the professional recognition.
- There is a need to reaffirm the public responsibility for HE within the Communiqué.
- The work of the academic staff to meet the more diverse needs of the more diverse student population should be continued and academic freedom, institutional autonomy and academic integrity should be reaffirmed.
- The link between teaching, learning and research should be more stressed, which should not be limited only to the issue of employment. Also, there is a need to mention strengthening of the links between the European Research Area (ERA) and the EHEA.
- The issue of mobility opportunities for student and staff from conflict areas, which has been left out from the draft 2, should be brought in again. It should also be added that efforts would be made to make it possible for them to return home once conditions allow.
- Lifelong learning should be included since it is crucial to, amongst others, recognition and employability agenda.
- In the Communiqué, there is a reference to automatic recognition, but there is not a reference to the activities carried out by the pathfinder group on automatic recognition (PfG). The work of PfG should be recognised in the document.

The reference to the guidelines on portability of loans and grants was questioned due to procedural reasons. It was suggested that the way it appeared in the draft was not transparent as the document was not properly discussed in the BFUG and at the first BFUG the clear willingness to include it to the draft was not expressed. Concerning the paragraph on the priority on enhancing the quality and relevance of learning and teaching, it was noted:

- The ambition regarding the students' involvement in the quality assurance procedures and curriculum design should be raised.
- There is a need to be more specific on who will perform the actions described in the paragraph. The paragraph could be rephrased to use the wording 'we will work with HEIs', 'we will cooperate', 'we will incentivise', etc.

Concerning the paragraph on the priority on employment, it was noted:

- The sentence regarding teaching and learning is inappropriate and should be removed from the paragraph and inserted in the previous paragraph.
- In the first sentence of the paragraph, 'employability' might be more suitable than 'employment'.
- It was acknowledged that the idea of 'rewarding' or 'supporting' the HEIs for reaching the goals mentioned in the paragraph is important. To reach the goals strengthening of the HEIs' dialogue with employers and other stakeholders is necessary.

Concerning the paragraph on making our systems more inclusive, it was said:

- The fourth sentence in the paragraph on the need 'to develop more effective policies for the recognition of credits gained abroad, etc' would fit more in the next paragraph, and hence should be moved there.

- The points on the mobility of teacher education students and the mobility of students and staff from conflict areas could be added in this paragraph.
- The need to improve permeability and articulation between different education sectors should be included in the paragraph.
- In the third sentence, 'the social dimension of higher education' should be stated clearly.

Concerning the paragraph on implementing agreed structural reforms, it was said:

- To add an introductory paragraph that would speak about the three goals of structural reforms.
- When referring to joint programmes, to mention also joint degrees.
- The reference to the "more in-depth reporting" should be softened and clarified in the way the commitment is about more precise measurement of performance and refers to reporting from member countries.

In the light of the BFUG's decision concerning Belarus accession to the EHEA, the respective paragraph in the Communiqué would be rephrased.

As for the section on endorsing the reports of the 2012-2015 BFUG structures, it was proposed to reformulate the first sentence so as it would read " [...]we take note with approval of the reports [...]" and add the report of the Pathfinder group on automatic recognition.

The following was suggested towards revising the commitments in the appendix:

- The first commitment could be rephrased in line with the wording used in the SRWG final report. The reference to recognition of short cycle qualifications, including the systems which do not comprise such qualifications, should be added. It was clarified that, as regards the systems which do not comprise short cycle qualifications, such a commitment does not refer to the need of recognizing short cycle qualification as higher education qualification but aims at recognition of learning outcomes gained while the short cycle programme for the purpose of progression, e.g. in the framework of RPL.
- To add a commitment concerning establishing a pathfinder group on professional recognition.
- It could be recognised that in certain national higher education systems there are limitations to RPL.
- Should there be specific recommendations an EHEA country does not agree with, it would be left to the Ministers to make a final decision.
- As for the commitments on following the guidelines for staff mobility and portability of grants and loans, they could be reformulated in the way they refer to "promoting" staff mobility and portability "taking into account" the guidelines. Moreover, the reference to the portability should be included in the brackets. The Ministers would decide whether to commit to "promoting the portability of grants and loans taking into account the guidelines" in Yerevan.
- There should be a commitment to ensure that qualifications from other EHEA countries are recognized at the same level as domestic ones.
- Another commitment could be added concerning enabling HEIs to use a suitable EQAR registered agency for their external quality assurance process. The wording could follow the one found in SRWG report or in EQAR's input for the Yerevan MC.

The Co-Chair concluded that the draft Communiqué would be revised according to the discussion and sent to the BFUG with the purpose to clarify that the revised draft reflected the feedback received at the BFUG meeting in Riga. However, no further major comments or substantial revision proposals could be accepted by the drafting group.

Draft outline of the 2015-2018 BFUG work programme

Mr. Andrejs Rauhvargers (Latvia), the Co-Chair underlined that the BFUG usually discusses its work programme at the beginning of each work period in autumn. It was further explained that with the aim to save some time for other issues at the BFUG meeting in autumn 2015, the draft outline of the 2015-2018 BFUG work programme had already been developed. However, it was stressed that the outline would be changed according to the feedback from the BFUG and its Board after the Yerevan Ministerial events.

In the discussion that followed, the BFUG noted that some restructuring of the working groups (WGs) was needed. They should be grouped in a way to reflect the priorities identified in the Communiqué that the Ministers would commit to in May.

Moreover, the WGs should be clear on their purpose and should not replace the responsibility of the BFUG to work on the political issues. Instead, the main focus of the WGs should be on the implementation of the Bologna action lines. This could be achieved through inter alia the organisation of peer learning activities and dialogue on the themes under each WG's remit with the countries that would need and would have asked for the support. The WGs would be expected to report back to the BFUG on their activities. On this basis the BFUG would draw conclusions on the different themes.

Other specific suggestions were also received:

- The proposed WG on Learning and Teaching could be merged with the one on Research and Teaching.
- On the one hand, the WGs should be smaller and if needed, there should be a possibility for setting-up ad-hoc WGs, pathfinder groups, task forces, etc.
- The profiles and the application process/selection of the WG members should be given a careful consideration.
- On the other hand experience shows that it is not always easy to establish small WG in which all members are fully committed to its work. Smaller groups and bigger number of groups raise the dilemma of whether less affluent countries with smaller capacities will be properly represented in the Bologna Process.
- BFUG meetings should be more devoted to content-related discussions. All matters being a subject of commitments by the Ministers should be properly discussed beforehand by the BFUG.
- For the upcoming period, there is a need to better involve the stakeholders and practitioners in the activities of the BFUG structures.
- From the practical point of view, the WGs should send in documents in time to enable good discussions in the BFUG.
- Issues concerning short cycle qualifications should be included in the work plan.
- In the first bullet point on page 3 it should be noted that the coordination with the

programmes of UNESCO should be improved as well.

- Last but not least, the ad-hoc group for drafting the roadmap to be implemented by the Belarusian authorities should also be included in the work plan.

The Co-Chair concluded that the draft outline of the 2015-2018 BFUG work programme would be revised in line with the feedback received and, in particular, the WGs would be grouped according to the priorities in the Yerevan Communiqué.

6. Fourth Bologna Policy Forum Statement (Draft 1)

Document: BFUG_LV_IS_45_6 [Fourth BPF Statement_draft 1]

The first draft of the Statement of the Fourth Bologna Policy Forum (BPF) was presented by Ms. Karine Harutyunyan (Armenia) who noted that the current document had been modified according to the comments made by the BFUG Board during its meeting on 24 February 2015 in Reykjavik.

Thus, the BFUG made the following comments:

- There is a need for the clarification in the lines 13-18.
- The protection of staff and students in ensuring the academic freedom, integrity and autonomy of higher education institutions is suggested to be added in the line 18.
- It is suggested to use the same wording as in the Communiqué in the lines 25-28.
- There is a problem in the lines 62-65 since putting Lisbon and Tokyo Conventions in this sentence implies the indication of the African one as well. Moreover, the next text of the Tokyo Convention is on the way to be ratified, hence it should be used with the caveat. Thus, there is a need to either mention all the initiatives or be more specific.
- In the lines 69-72 there is a need to underline the importance of continuing cooperation between higher education institutions and commitment of the BPF participants to support exchanges of students and staff and joint projects to strengthen the capacity of higher education institutions in the EHEA and in partner countries to contribute to democratic developments based on high quality education and research in the light of recent political instability and attacks on democracy and the rule of law in a number of countries.
- It is suggested to add that the involvement of the academic community, including students and academics, as well as other key stakeholders, is essential in developing and supporting the reforms in the line 72.
- It should be added in the line 85 that the next BPF will be organised in 2018 in France in conjunction with the Ministerial Conference.

The Chair noted that all the comments made were rather specific; therefore, the BFUG was asked to send their written comments to the Secretariat.

7. Update on the preparation of the Ministerial Conference and Fourth Bologna Policy Forum in Yerevan in 2015

Documents: BFUG_LV_IS_45_7a [Programme for Yerevan MC and 4th BPF]
BFUG_LV_IS_45_7b [Programme for Yerevan MC and 4th BPF]

Ms. Karine Harutyunyan (Armenia) informed the BFUG that preparations were in full swing for the Yerevan Ministerial events. The EHEA delegations were encouraged to register for the events and make hotel reservations by the established deadline of 1 April 2015. As for the bilateral meetings, the delegations wishing to hold such meetings could submit their requests to the Secretariat indicating the name of the counterparts they would like to meet.

As for the programme of the Yerevan Ministerial Conference and Fourth Bologna Policy Forum (BPF), the BFUG was advised that the document had been revised based on the discussions at the Riga BFUG and Reykjavik BFUG Board meetings and two options were put forward: option A allowed for the Communiqué discussions on both days of the Conference and option B had time allocated for these discussions only on the second day of the Conference.

Finally, the BFUG was asked for assistance in suggesting keynote speakers and moderators for some sessions of the Conference and BPF.

The participants discussed the two options of the programme and made the following suggestions and comments:

- It would be reasonable to give a chance to the heads of delegations to choose one of the four suggested parallel sessions on the first day rather than to gather them in a single parallel session.
- The stakeholders of higher education should be actively involved in all the sessions.
- On a practical note, in order to facilitate the delegations' plannings for the bilateral meetings, it was suggested to make available the names of the Ministers/heads of delegations who would have registered for the events at the Backoffice restricted area.

The BFUG adopted the programme option A and agreed that the interactive panel, which had been already envisaged in the programme, would provide the stakeholders with an excellent opportunity to present their views.

8. BFUG opinion on the applications to the EHEA accession

Documents: BFUG_LV_IS_45_8a [Kosovo¹ EHEA accession_elements for discussion and recommendations]
BFUG_LV_IS_45_8b [Belarus EHEA accession_elements for discussion and recommendations]
BFUG_LV_IS_45_8c [Belarus - options paper for the BFUG]

¹ All reference to Kosovo, whether to the territory, institutions or population, in this text shall be understood in full compliance with United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244 and without prejudice to the status of Kosovo.

BFUG_LV_IS_45_8d [Report_Visit by the BFUG members to Minsk_
Organised by the CoE]
BFUG_LV_IS_45_8e.1 [Belarus_roadmap_eng]
BFUG_LV_IS_45_8e.2 [Belarus_roadmap_rus]

The Chair, Ms. Una Strand Viðarsdóttir (Iceland) reminded the BFUG that during its meeting on 27-28 November 2014 in Rome the BFUG decided to set up an ad-hoc committee for the analysis of the EHEA accession applications of Kosovo and Belarus and prepare the corresponding recommendations for the BFUG's discussion.

Moreover, the recommendations of the ad-hoc committee were discussed during the BFUG Board meeting in Reykjavik and the details are available in the draft minutes of the meeting.

Mr. Sjur Bergan (CoE) informed the BFUG that although Kosovo had announced publicly that it intended to apply both for membership of the CoE and accession to the European Cultural Convention some time in March 2015, no application had been submitted and no information was available as to when and whether Kosovo would apply for accession to the European Cultural Convention.

In light of the information provided by the CoE, the Chair concluded that there was no need to consider the EHEA accession application of Kosovo in haste and this issue should be put aside at the moment.

With regards to the EHEA accession application of Belarus, Mr. Sjur Bergan (CoE) reminded the BFUG that the country is a party to the European Cultural Convention thus fulfilling the first criterion for the EHEA membership. Therefore, the BFUG needed to consider the second criterion, i.e. the extent to which Belarus complies or intends to comply with values, goals and key policies of the EHEA. The analysis of the Belarusian application for the EHEA accession prepared by the ad-hoc committee was based on the application of the country as well as the alternative report submitted by the Belarusian Independent Bologna Committee.

Afterwards, the BFUG was informed about the visit, organised by the CoE, by members of the BFUG to Minsk on 3-4 March 2015. The visit comprised a seminar on the EHEA for the members of the Belarusian academic community on 3 March and a series of meetings on 4 March. The BFUG delegation was composed of the representatives from the Bologna Secretariat, CoE, EC, ESU, Germany, the Holy See, Latvia and Poland. Initially it was planned that the EI would also participate in the meeting, however the EI representative was unable to participate in the end.

The findings of the visit including the prospects and consequences of the decision on the application by Belarus are available in the report presented by the CoE inserted below:



BFUG_LV_IS_45_8d_
Report_Visit by the B

The Chair, Ms. Una Strand Viðarsdóttir (Iceland) suggested that the best way to take the discussion on the EHEA accession of Belarus forward was to work in relation to the document "BFUG_LV_IS_45_8c_Belarus-options paper for the BFUG". The option paper draws on 1)

documents submitted (official Belarus application and the alternative report by the Belarusian Independent Bologna Committee, submitted to the BFUG Secretariat on 10 December 2014), 2) evaluations of the ad-hoc committee, 3) findings of the mission to Minsk.

Moreover, this document presents 3 options (these options were agreed by the BFUG during its meeting on 26-27 January 2015 in Riga) for the EHEA accession of Belarus to be considered by the BFUG, which are as follows:

1. Rejection of the application
2. Membership
3. Conditional access, which could take one of the two forms. Either:
 - a) Commitment to future accession: Permitting access at a future date on condition of the completion of the key reforms set out in the roadmap. In the meantime, Belarus would be invited to participate in all appropriate peer learning activities and to observe the proceedings of the BFUG.
 - b) Accession now, accompanied by a commitment by the Belarusian authorities to agreeing the roadmap with the BFUG and implementing it over the next three years.

The deliberations that followed revealed that none of the BFUG members were for the options 1 and 2. Therefore it was agreed to organise a secret ballot for the eligible 47 EHEA member countries and the EC in order to identify whether the BFUG would recommend option 3a or 3b to the EHEA Ministers.

Moreover, it was stressed that the BFUG was informed that at this very meeting the BFUG would make its recommendation to the EHEA Ministers concerning the EHEA accession application of Belarus, however no information was received from the countries absent regarding their position on this issue.

Furthermore, the BFUG was reminded that each member country and the EC would have two votes and two ballot slips would be provided for this purpose. The outcome will be based on a simple majority of the number of votes cast.

Thus, after the voting, the Chair, Ms. Una Strand Viðarsdóttir (Iceland), announced that 76 ballot papers were distributed and 73 votes were received. For the option 3a 27 votes were received while for the option 3b 46 votes were received. Thus, based on the results of the voting the BFUG would recommend option 3b to the EHEA Ministers. Moreover, no discussion would follow the result of the voting.

Last but not least the BFUG was informed that the ad-hoc group set-up for drafting the roadmap to be implemented by the Belarusian authorities over the next three years would be composed of the CoE, the BFUG present Co-Chairs (Latvia and Iceland), EC, EI, ESU, Germany, the Holy See, Poland and UK Scotland. Moreover, the roadmap would be circulated electronically to the BFUG members.

9. AOB

1. Ms. Patricia Pol (France) gave an update about the upcoming Bologna Secretariat to be set-up by France after the mandate of Armenia is over. Hence it was noted that the French Bologna Secretariat would be operational from 1 July 2015 to 30 June 2018.

The overall outline for the French Secretariat is a team of 6 full-time people, including a Secretary-General as the Head, 4 policy officers (with at least 1 for the Bologna Policy Forum and 1 for the webmaster), and 1 assistant.

On the basis of ongoing bilateral negotiations, Germany, together with Armenia, are 2 partner countries willing to support 1 full-time position. Any other country willing to support is welcome.

For more information, please, see the PPT below:



Bologna
secretariat.ppt

2. Mr. Ernő Keszei (Hungary) asked the BFUG to review and update the document "BFUG_IE_HR_35_13_Information on BFUG proceedings" which was adopted by the BFUG on 14-15 March 2013 during the Dublin BFUG meeting and use it more as a procedural document.

3. Mr. Fernando Miguel Galán Palomares (ESU) recalled the recommendation of the Board that after the endorsement of the minutes/draft outcome of proceedings of the meetings, documents which were also endorsed at meetings of the BFUG/Board as well as the structures of the 2012-2015 Work Plan, should be made freely accessible in the Archive except for the documents containing information on the application of the countries for the EHEA membership and draft versions of the Communiqués.

Moreover, the BFUG was informed that the General Assembly of ESU would be held in Yerevan before the Ministerial Conference and since there is a requirement of the student participation in the delegation for the Ministerial Conference, the students can contact ESU concerning the financial aspects for the participation to both events.

The Chair thanked the BFUG members for their fruitful discussions and contributions.