



MINISTERUL EDUCAȚIEI NAȚIONALE



Ministry of Education and Science

Governance and Thematic priorities after 2020 Outcomes of the online survey

The Survey

The online survey was carried out in October 2018 under the aegis of the BFUG Co-chairs Austria and Switzerland. The invitation to answer the online questionnaire was sent to the BFUG members and Consultative members (<https://ec.europa.eu/eusurvey/runner/63a9891e-b9dc-7ef0-5fec-7ef5ddb9a288>). 40 answers were received (32 from members, 8 from consultative members).

A. Priorities post-2020

1. Priorities in the next decade

Six priorities were suggested in the questionnaire. These were:

- Promoting active and responsible citizenship
- Linking the EHEA and the ERA
- Using digital technologies
- Supporting students from non-traditional backgrounds
- Enhancing teacher support
- Improving professional recognition

According to the opinions expressed, five out of the six were confirmed as being priorities, whereas the suggested topic "improving professional recognition" received about 10 mentions. Respondents were asked to suggest additional topics if desired. These suggestions in some cases appear only once and are not connected closely with the six suggested priorities. In some cases, the additional priorities mentioned are linked to the 5 priorities already proposed. The rest, might be grouped under the following:

- innovation in L&T
- fundamental/core values
- mobility.

It was emphasized that "implementation of key commitments" should always be seen as a priority.

2. Quantitative goals for 2030

About one out of two respondents did not suggest topics which might allow setting quantitative goals, or else they stated that such goals should not be set, because of the many external and national context-related factors that would need to be taken into consideration.

Only three goals were mentioned as quantifiable with a certain frequency. These are:

- mobility
- students having non-traditional backgrounds
- teacher support.

Some respondents emphasized that any identification of quantitative goals should be coordinated with the indicators identified for EU post-2020.

B. Governance and working methods post-2020

3. Modification of working methods and working structure

Responses stating that no substantial changes should occur along with respondents who did not answer slightly prevail over those who indicate that some changes should be made. Amongst the latter, suggestions for changing specific aspects are far more numerous than those that indicate a desire for general changes in the organization and/or the methods of the work structure. Most frequent are suggestions for the following modifications:

- greater involvement of stakeholders, researchers, practitioners;
- organization of Bologna seminars/events, open to different audiences;
- more space for peer review activities;
- BFUG meetings based on more interactive work methods;
- creation of online workspaces for WG/AGs.

Some suggestions focused on whether it is opportune or even feasible to establish a Permanent BFUG Secretariat; pros and cons were identified; a task force to address this issue was also proposed.

Many respondents strongly recommended ensuring that the documents to be discussed be made available well in advance the BFUG meetings, to have enough time to carry out consultations at national level as appropriate.

4. Proposals to optimize the EHEA Governance with respect to BFUG Board

A large majority of respondents did not give answers or did not make proposals with regard to this topic. The following proposals were made more than once:

- reduce the number of Board members;
- give the Board more coordination and decision-making power, to relieve the BFUG of work on details, leaving more time for the BFUG to deal with strategic matters;
- organize online/virtual meetings to increase opportunities for discussion.

5. Proposals to optimize EHEA Governance with respect to the BFUG Secretariat

A large majority of respondents did not give answers or did not make proposals with regard to this topic. About one half of the proposals made focused on creating a permanent secretariat, multinational and professional. There are pros and cons; the creation of a task force to investigate the feasibility of the proposal was suggested. Other proposals focused on increasing the number of Secretariat staff, ensuring the Europe-wide composition of the Secretariat, carrying out open and transparent selection and recruitment processes.

6. Proposals to optimize the EHEA Governance with respect to BFUG

More than half of the respondents did not give answers or make proposals.

Some proposals focused on:

- the role of the BFUG as such;
- the organisation of the BFUG meetings.

A number of responses underlined the opportunity for the BFUG to focus on a few strategic issues and long-term strategies and policies, with less procedural discussions. As regards the BFUG meetings, proposals focused on:

- organising discussions in small groups or parallel sessions, targeted to promote in-depth discussions;
- inviting stakeholders to the meetings;

- facilitating info sharing and synergies among WG/AGs during the meetings.

Some responses recommended that members participate more actively and that they maintain, closer relations with their respective ministers/organisation leaders, ensuring that they have a clear mandate to take positions and make decisions.

7. Proposals to optimize the EHEA Governance with respect to the Chairing arrangements

The large majority of respondents did not give answers or did not make proposals with regard to this topic. Several responses judged positively the current chairing arrangements, which appear to work well, be efficient and ensure ownership to all member countries; strong commitment by the Co-chairs in the pre- and post-chairing semester was recommended. Some revision of the role of vice-chairs was suggested by a few respondents: different pros and cons were indicated (e.g. continuity vs power given to a single country) and providing a third co-chair instead of vice-chairs was proposed (no further operational indications were given).

8. Proposals to optimize the EHEA Governance with respect to the Bologna Policy Forum

Comments and proposals collected are in some cases conflicting. While the need for holding BPFs was mentioned by some, difficulties in identifying issues and targets of common interest among ministers from EHEA/non-EHEA countries were underlined by others. The focus and scope of the Forum consequently appeared to be unclear, while the lack of targeted resources for the Forum follow-up makes it difficult to ensure continuity. Finding different ways of cooperating with non-EHEA countries was also suggested. The idea of involving regions, as well as transnational organizations, and not just individual countries gathered a broad consensus. Each BPF should indicate themes and priorities for an action plan to be implemented as a follow-up; the preparation of the next Forum should include communication and cooperation events on a regional basis, also involving stakeholders and regional experts. It was also suggested to organize the BPF the day before the Ministerial Conference, or to foresee one more day in the event, and to broaden the participation of academic staff in national delegations.

9. Timing of the Ministerial Conferences

Clear preference was expressed for holding Ministerial Conferences once every three years; in fewer cases, an interval of 3-4 years between conferences was suggested. Shorter or longer intervals were preferred by a limited number of respondents. Only in a few cases was there no answer.

10. Suggestions for more fruitful connections with HE practitioners

A wide variety of proposals, often argued in detail, were made with regard to this topic. The suggestions may be grouped as follows:

✓ EHEA/BFUG level:

- Thematic/parallel session in BFUG meetings to be open to practitioners, and practitioners invited to PLAs, BICG/Thematic groups, etc.
- Regular consultation of practitioners to be included in the BFUG working methods, thematic networks of practitioners created for specific issues
- Events between Ministerial Conferences open to/targeted on practitioners (or practitioners' events recognized as Bologna Events)
- E-community platform in the BFUG website based on lists of national practitioners to support visibility, communication, and cooperation

- Enhancement of the use of social media for communication and dissemination among practitioners (e.g. “BFUG friends” Facebook page).
- ✓ National level:
 - Involvement of practitioners in national implementation/dissemination activities
 - Re-invigoration of the experience of the Bologna expert teams (widespread positive assessment of the model) for dissemination and PLAs at national (but also sub/regional) level
 - Appointment of national practitioners as country representatives in the WG/AG/CG/TPGs
 - Appointment of two BFUG country representatives: ministry + national expert.

11. Concrete suggestion for more Bologna events between Ministerial Conferences

Most respondents support the idea of organizing more Bologna events at EHEA and at national level. The suggested formats for these events are primarily: practically oriented workshops/seminars, involving practitioners/stakeholders, focused on the priorities that emerge from the Ministerial Communiqués and the BFUG workplan; PLAs; virtual conferences. Some respondents suggest organizing events in non-EHEA countries related to the Global Policy Forum work plan (see also Point 8). A minority of respondents is against the idea having of more Bologna events. They observe that the current work plan is broad enough, and that new activities would require additional (and in some cases unsustainable) workload and resources.

12. Formal inclusion of other stakeholders in the Bologna Process

A number of respondents suggested the inclusion of stakeholders primarily at national level, through participation in events or the appointment of stakeholders as national co-representatives. The ENIC-NARIC Networks, employers, students, and universities were proposed for inclusion as new stakeholders. A number of respondents suggest to involve stakeholders better through communication and dissemination activities (at both EHEA and country levels). About one out of two respondents did not make suggestions.

13. Additional ideas for thematic and procedural innovations after 2020

The large majority of respondents did not give answers or did not make proposals. Part of the responses basically confirm issues already mentioned in this report. Among other procedural innovations, it was suggested to enhance digital collaboration, as well as electronic consultation and decision. Looking at possible thematic innovations, it was suggested to pay more attention to the arts and humanities sector, and to the topic of future skills for new jobs.