

Reflections after the Bergen Ministerial Meeting

Toril Johansson



Work of the BFUG and Board

+ Timetable/programme for work: Early decision necessary

- + Priority actions should be defined as projects, and planned separately as specific BFUG tasks.
 - Qualifications framework
 - Stocktaking
 - ENQA project



Work of the BFUG/Board cont.

- + If an activity is decentralised, BFUG-B should have a representative in the project group
- + Seminars: More categories.
 - Seminars with direct relevance to the working programme should be planned in close contact with the Board in order to secure focus – to avoid overlapping
 - National or regional seminars for dissemination and development
 - Discussion in BFUG on preliminary conclusions



Communiqué

- + The process: Good experiences with drafting group and interaction with Board and BFUG.
- + After open consultation revised proposal should
 be presented
- + How to embed the final BFUG proposal stronger nationally? Many last minute interventions

 But: Ministers want to have a direct say in their meeting.



The Ministerial Conference

- + The outline of the meeting:
 - Total length
 - The split in two formats
 - The parallell sessions relevant and suitable?
 - BFUG/Board meetings
- + Principles of representation
 - Mandatory representation of universities and students
 - Is it wise to maintain strict limitations to participation (5-6-7-8....)?
 - Researchers, NGO's....
- + Participation from outside observers
 - Who should decide?
 - Principles for selection

In Bergen: Kosovo, USA, Australia (In addition : Canada, Nigeria, Egypt, Mexico)



The dilemma

- + Keeping the focus on the ministerial meeting while at the same time...
 - ...securing broad participation of stakeholders
 - taking advantage of high interest and the possibility for dissemination
 - Openness to the rest of the world
 - The answer is probably more complex than simply finding larger meeting facilities?
- + Good luck!