



*Last modified: 18.01.2018*

## **PLANNING OF 2020 IMPLEMENTATION REPORT**

### **Introduction**

The BFUG took two important decisions with regard to the 2020 Bologna Process Implementation Report at its meeting in Gozo, Malta:

- 1) The first decision is that there should be an implementation report in 2020.
- 2) The second decision is that, as there will only be two years between the 2018 and 2020 conferences, "a full Implementation Report encompassing all the present as well as new issues cannot be prepared for 2020". (Minutes, BFUG meeting, Gozo)

From these decisions, this short paper makes a first attempt at outlining some elements to shape the 2020 Implementation report.

### **Logic to guide the development of the report**

Ahead of the outcomes and decisions of the Paris Ministerial Conference, it is impossible to outline the political priorities where the Implementation report may focus. However, it is possible to set in place some guidelines for the Working Group that will oversee the development of the report.

#### *A) Length*

The three editions of the Bologna Implementation Report so far produced (or currently in the process of being produced) have many strengths. However, brevity is not among them. Indeed each edition of the report has been developed through agreement in the BFUG and the relevant working group on the many issues that need to be covered. This has resulted in a pattern whereby there is often agreement that topics previously covered need to remain, while new issues should be added in order to respond adequately to evolving political priorities. As this approach is clearly not feasible for the 2020 report, a different logic needs to be found.

Two scenarios could be imagined to produce a more concise report.

- i) The first scenario would be that all the main themes and chapters remain. If this approach is followed, the only way to produce a concise report is to significantly reduce the number of indicators used to assess progress in that area.
- ii) Alternatively, the second scenario would be that only a subset of themes are subject to analysis. In this way the overall scale of the project would be reduced, enabling a more concise report to be produced.

For both of these scenarios, the shared point is that the amount of material and indicators needs to be reduced. As a purely quantitative criterion; the Working Group overseeing the report could consider that no more than 100 indicators should appear in the final report.

#### *B) Nature of the report*

Until now, the Implementation Report has focused upon producing a snapshot of the state of the EHEA in a given reference year, with different thematic issues covered. The reports assess change and progress since the previous reporting exercise/Ministerial Conference. Such an approach will not make sense for the 2020 report.

If the first scenario mentioned above is considered, then minor changes taking place between 2017 and 2019 (the two reference years) on a limited number of indicators would not be satisfactory. Indeed the report would add little value compared to the 2018 report, and as there would be fewer indicators, it would also be less informative. Equally, if the second scenario above is followed, simply updating information on some themes while cutting others; could also be considered as a rather ineffective exercise.

So a second element to the proposal is that the report could take a longer term view of changes in the EHEA brought about through the Bologna period. Key indicators could be identified to try to assess change throughout the Bologna period (2000 – 2020).

It should be recognised already that relevant and comparable data will not be available in a time series for all topics. Equally for policy objectives that were developed later in the Bologna Process it would only be possible to report on what has happened since the objective was set. For example, while ECTS use can be tracked since 2000 to the present day, the development of National Qualifications Frameworks would only be considered from 2003 (when the objective was outlined in the Berlin Communiqué) while the European Approach to Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes would be considered from 2015 when it was adopted in Yerevan, 2015. The general approach would therefore be to report on how Bologna commitments have progressed since they were set.

### *C) Data Sources*

At this stage it should be possible already to agree that the report would draw upon data produced by Eurostat, Eurydice and Eurostudent, and also supplemented by other relevant stakeholder data (e.g. EUA, ESU).