



EUROPEAN  
Higher Education Area



MINISTRY  
OF NATIONAL RESOURCES

*eu* 2011.hu

**BFUG MEETING, GÖDÖLLŐ, HUNGARY, 17-18 MARCH 2011  
DRAFT OUTCOME OF PROCEEDINGS**

**BFUG List of participants**

<b>Country/institution/association</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>First name</b>
Albania	<i>Apologies</i>	
Andorra	Enric Manel	Garcia
Andorra	Martinez Ramirez	Mar
Armenia	Harutunyan	Gayane
Armenia	Mher	Melik-Bakhshyan
Austria	Bacher	Gottfried
Belgium / French Community	Bourdon	Françoise
Belgium / Flemish Community	Soenen	Magalie
Bologna Secretariat	Deca	Ligia
Bologna Secretariat	Geanta	Irina
Bologna Secretariat	Proteasa	Viorel
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Duric	Aida
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Maric	Petar
Bulgaria	<i>Apologies</i>	
BUSINESSEUROPE	Seling	Irene
Council of Europe	Bergan	Sjur
Croatia	Juros	Luka
Cyprus	<i>Apologies</i>	
Czech Republic	Stastna	Vera
Denmark	Nielsen	Helle Damgaard
Denmark	Otte	Helle
Denmark	Rasmussen	Torben Kornbech
Education International (EI)	Bennett	Paul
Education International (EI)	Vraa-Jensen	Jens
ENQA	Hopbach	Achim
EQAR	Tück	Colin
Estonia	Pöllo	Helen
European Association of Institutions in Higher Education(EURASHE)	Delplace	Stefan
European Association of Institutions in Higher Education(EURASHE)	Nielsen	Lars Lyng
European Association of Institutions in Higher Education(EURASHE)	Orphanides	Andreas G.
European Commission	Eriksson- Watershoot	Sophia

European Commission	Tyler	Adam
European Students' Union(ESU)	Malnes	Magnus
European Students' Union(ESU)	Santa	Robert
European University Association (EUA)	Gaebel	Michael
EURYDICE	Crosier	David
Finland	Innola	Maija
France	Lagier	Hélène
France	Manes	Chantal
France	Vallat	Yves
Georgia	<i>Apologies</i>	
Germany	Greisler	Peter
Germany	Hendriks	Birger
Germany	Herdegen	Andrea
Greece	<i>Apologies</i>	
Holy See	Bechina	Friedrich
Hungary	Gyöngyösi	Katalin
Hungary	Keszei	Ernő
Iceland	<i>Apologies</i>	
Ireland	Casey	Laura
Italy	Foroni	Marzia
Kazakhstan	<i>Apologies</i>	
Latvia	Rauhvargers	Andrejs
Latvia	Revalde	Gita
Liechtenstein	Konrad	Helmut
Lithuania	Labanauskis	Rimvydas
Luxembourg	Dondelinger	Germain
Malta	Calleja	Joachim James
Moldova	<i>Apologies</i>	
Montenegro	Miranovic	Predrag
Montenegro	Misovic	Biljana
Netherlands	Leegwater-van der Linden	Marlies
Norway	Johansson	Toril
Norway	Strøm	Tone Flood
Poland	Banaszak	Bartolomiej
Poland	Bołtruszko	Maria
Poland	Wojciech	Augustowski
Portugal	<i>Apologies</i>	
Romania	Mihalache	Augustin
Romania	Nicolescu	Luminita
Russian Federation	Chistokhvalov	Victor
Serbia	Dondur	Vera
Serbia	Vesovic	Mirjana
Slovak Republic	Plavcan	Peter
Slovenia	Komljenovič	Janja

Spain	Bonete	Rafael
Spain	Delgado	Luis
Sweden	Karlsson	Åsa
Sweden	Petri	Åsa
Switzerland	<i>Apologies</i>	
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	<i>Apologies</i>	
Turkey	Erdogan	Armagan
Ukraine	<i>Apologies</i>	
UNESCO	Glass	Anna
United Kingdom	Baldwinson	Peter
United Kingdom	Young	Alex

## **First day of the BFUG meeting, Thursday, 17 March 2011**

### **Welcome and introduction to the meeting**

The Chair, Ernő Keszei (Hungary), opened the meeting and welcomed the participants.

The Chair introduced the Secretary of State responsible for Education in the Ministry of National Resources in Hungary, who gave an introductory speech on the history, importance and future developments of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) and expressed the engagement of Hungary to foster future developments.

#### **1. Information by the Chairs (Hungary & Andorra)**

The Chair introduced the Hungarian EU Presidency's priorities in the field of higher education (HE) and explained the current and future priorities of the Hungarian National Bologna Board. For more details, see the PowerPoint presentation below.



BFUG\_HU\_AD\_Hungary Presentation.ppt

Enric Manel Gacia López (Andorra) presented the latest developments of the Andorran authorities in the field of HE.

The BFUG Secretariat announced that formal apologies had been received from Cyprus, Greece, Iceland, Moldova, Switzerland and Ukraine to the Bologna Follow-up Group (BFUG). Permission was asked to make an audio recording of the meeting for ensuring the accuracy of the outcome of proceedings and the BFUG members agreed on this matter.

#### **2. Adoption of the agenda**

Documents:           BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_2a [draft agenda]  
                               BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_2b [draft annotated agenda]

The Agenda was adopted with a small amendment, point 14 being moved earlier in the second day, before the written updates (point 13 of the agenda).

### **3. Outcome of proceedings of the BFUG meeting, Alden Biesen, 24-25 August 2010 and minutes of the BFUG Board meeting, Andorra la Vella, 11 February 2011**

Documents: BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_3a [BFUG Alden Biesen draft outcome of proceedings]  
BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_3a [BFUG Alden Biesen draft outcome of proceedings – detailed version]  
BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_3b [BFUG Board Andorra la Vella minutes]

The two versions of the outcome of proceedings of the BFUG meeting in Alden-Biesen (short version and detailed version) were presented and a discussion followed. It was concluded that **in general terms, the minutes of the BFUG meeting will be prepared in short version, not nominating the speakers and providing just a brief description of the main issues raised. They will be made available for the public on EHEA website. The audio recording of the present meeting and upcoming meetings will be kept for the exclusive use of the BFUG Secretariat and for the archive.**

**The BFUG endorsed the short version of the minutes. The detailed version was not endorsed, hence they will be erased from the archive.**

**The BFUG took note of the Board meeting in Andorra la Vella minutes.**

### **4. Information by the Bologna Secretariat & presentation of the EHEA website**

Document: BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_4 [EHEA website updates]

A short presentation of the main updates for the EHEA official Website was given by the BFUG Secretariat. Discussions followed on the main questions posed in the final section of the document.

On a further note, Turkey informed the members of the BFUG Secretariat about the [www.ehea.info](http://www.ehea.info) link that had been posted on the Turkish official website.

**The BFUG took note of the website updates.**

**The BFUG agreed that both logos (the Bologna Process and EHEA logo) will be used. The BFUG Secretariat will manage the distribution of the logo, based on guidelines that should be agreed by the BFUG in Cracow. The BFUG Secretariat will prepare the background discussion paper based on the general conditions for usage of the BP and EHEA logos which will be sent by the German and Hungarian delegations. The cases that do not fit into these general guidelines will be dealt by the BFUG Chairs on an individual basis.**

**The BFUG agreed that the regime (public or restricted) of the documents will be decided by the BFUG Chairs, with a view to ensure the transparency of the process, but also to preserve the open character of BFUG meetings.**

*Coffee break*

## **5. Transition from the Bologna Process to the consolidation to the EHEA**

Document: BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_5 [Transition from BP to the EHEA]

The comments and suggestions expressed on the transition from the Bologna Process to the EHEA by the BFUG members focused on the following aspects:

- At the BFUG meeting in Alden-Biesen, the BFUG Secretariat was asked to present a paper on the transition from BP to EHEA. The document included a series of questions aimed at clarifying some essential matters related to the process of transition from the BP to the EHEA, which would give a basis for any further changes in the terminology used or in the way the BFUG will function for the consolidation of the EHEA.
- It was proposed that for the time being nothing is changed, since it is not the right moment to discuss fundamental questions.
- Some BFUG members underlined that the Bologna Process is a "brand" and its promotion should continue, while the EHEA is something new and it would be difficult to communicate without creating confusion; there should be a transition period allowing for the use of both terms in parallel. The BFUG members should find new ways to promote its results.
- It was underlined that steps forward must be taken and there should be a consistency at EHEA level before agreeing on the terminology. More coherence on the policy level is required.
- More consultation and involvement of the national stakeholders is required, not necessarily at EHEA level, but in the domestic context.
- A clear distinction should be made between the Bologna Process and the EHEA, as there are two different things, a process vs. an area. If one takes into account that there is a process (BP) which led to a result (EHEA), it might be easier to define the terms (e.g. *Bologna* Follow-up Group, but *EHEA* ministers or *EHEA* members).
- A proposal was put forward to create a group establishing which issues belong to the BP and which to the EHEA. This group could also prepare a paragraph on the topic to be part of the Bucharest Ministerial Communiqué.
- The BFUG has the responsibility to communicate the Bologna Process message in a convincing way. The Bologna Process should focus on the main policy challenges. Another challenge is the way in which the BFUG members actually implement the tools at national levels.
- The society as a whole is under-informed about the Bologna Process. Efforts should be made on a more successful dissemination of the objectives of the process both at EHEA and national level.

**The BFUG has agreed that the essence of the process remains unchanged, with a focus on key policy areas such as: mobility, social dimension, recognition, quality assurance and qualifications framework. The current structures are fit**

**for this purpose and it was deemed too early to set up a reflection group on the nature of the transition from the Bologna Process to the EHEA. All the structures of the Bologna Process will continue to be referred to by this term. The only agreed terminology change was replacing of the "Bologna Secretariat" with the "BFUG Secretariat".**

**In the end it was stressed that the BFUG members are primarily responsible with communicating the message of the Bologna Process.**

## **6. Criteria for accession to the European Higher Education Area**

Documents:           BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_6a [EHEA accession questionnaire]  
                          BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_6b [EHEA accession criteria]

A presentation on the accession questionnaire and the accession procedure prior to the Bucharest Ministerial Conference was given by the Council of Europe, underlining the main pieces of information required from countries that wish to adhere to the EHEA.



BFUG meeting -  
Information from app

The questionnaire was widely appreciated by the BFUG members and a discussion on it followed, which included the main elements below:

- It was proposed that, for the social dimension part of the questionnaire, information on the social support mechanism will be added.
- Concerns were raised on how to measure the real level of commitment for implementing the Bologna Process tools; it was suggested to introduce more concrete indicators.
- The application process by other countries could be an opportunity for the BFUG members to analyse the implementation at their own national level.

**The BFUG welcomed the questionnaire and agreed to its usage until the EHEA accession criteria are changed, if the case.**

**The BFUG agreed not to discuss the current accession criteria at this meeting, therefore the document BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_6b [EHEA accession criteria] was referred to the Bologna Process archives. Until a further discussion, the current accession criteria remain unchanged.**

*Lunch*

## **7. Guidelines for BFUG proceedings**

Documents:           BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_7a [Guidelines for BFUG proceedings]  
                          BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_7b [BFUG decision making and communication Procedures – BFUG members feedback overview]  
                          BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_7c [Guidelines for BFUG proceedings proposed way forward]

The BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_7a [Guidelines for BFUG proceedings] document was presented by the BFUG Secretariat as an information non-binding document describing the way in which the BFUG and its sub-structures conduct their proceedings. **The BFUG agreed to modify the title of the document BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_7a [Guidelines] into *Information on BFUG proceedings* and endorsed it as a document with pure informative purpose. In this respect, it will be posted on the EHEA website, after adding line numbering for easy reference.**

It was mentioned that the BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_7b [BFUG decision making and communication Procedures – BFUG members feedback overview] document encompasses all the feedback received so far via e-mail by the BFUG Secretariat. The specific questions posed there were discussed.

**The BFUG agreed on the following answers to the questions posed in documents 24\_7c:**

- **the current flexible status should be kept in terms of decision making and voting procedures;**
- **all BFUG sub-structures (working-groups and networks) must have terms of reference endorsed by the BFUG;**
- **the BFUG does not need formal terms of reference;**
- **the BFUG Board's current functions are well described in the document BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_7a [*Information on BFUG proceedings*], thus not needing further detailing or terms of reference;**
- **the calendar will be kept open and the BFUG Secretariat will decide on what events to include, based on the good practices handed over in written by the Benelux Secretariat;**
- **due to UNESCO's internal structural changes, any reference to UNESCO-CEPES is to be replaced with "UNESCO" in future Bologna Process/ EHEA documents and discussions, without the need for further formal procedures to make this change;**
- **the BFUG Chairs will decide on any change needed in the membership of a BFUG WG or network.**

#### **8. BFUG thematic sessions**

**Document: BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_8 [BFUG thematic sessions]**

On this point of the agenda, the BFUG members were informed that both Poland and Denmark would like to have thematic sessions connected to the future BFUG meetings.

**The BFUG members welcomed the organization of thematic sessions and agreed that the audience should be kept restricted for BFUG members only. If outside BFUG expertise is needed, then the organizers can decide to invite external experts. The thematic sessions should be organised in connection with the BFUG meetings, but without prolonging the overall meeting time when possible.**

For the **Cracow BFUG meeting**, the proposition for **a thematic session on quality assurance put forward by E4 was endorsed**. In this respect, a preparatory

background document circulated in advance to the BFUG members would be welcomed as early as possible.

**For the 2012 BFUG meetings, Denmark embraced the suggestion to organise one thematic session on the link between higher education, research and innovation, in cooperation with the European Institute of Innovation & Technology (EIT) and another thematic session on qualifications frameworks, in cooperation with the Council of Europe.**

Several issues were brought to the attention of the BFUG members:

- Since a conference on quality assurance will be organised by Belgium/Flemish Community jointly with the European Commission in the beginning of December, it is important that the two events do not overlap content wise.
- The Transparency Tools Working Group will organize a mini-seminar open to all BFUG members in November.

### **9. 2009-2012 Work Plan**

Documents: BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_9a [calendar of events 2009-2012]  
BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_9b [BFUG work plan 2009-2012]  
BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_9c [Bologna Seminar - Denmark]

The 2009 – 2012 EHEA Work Plan was put forward for endorsement by the BFUG members.

The EHEA Calendar of events reflected a small addition compared to the version circulated via e-mail, as an international conference on financing the Higher Education will be held in Yerevan, Armenia, on 8-9 September 2011.

Poland asked to include one more conference in the Calendar of events, namely a Conference on the Modernisation of Higher Education, to take place on 24-25 October 2011.

Denmark presented the Bologna Seminar planned for 21-22 September 2011 in Copenhagen, open for all EHEA members, with the invitation to be sent out soon.

**The revised work plan was endorsed. The calendar was endorsed with two minor additions. The BFUG took note of the information on the Danish Bologna Seminar.**

*Coffee break*

### **9.1 Reporting on the Implementation of the Bologna Process**

Documents: BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_9.1a [Reporting timeline]  
BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_9.1b [Reporting WG update]

Chairs of the Working Group (WG) on Reporting introduced the topic:

- The reporting exercise is on schedule and work is in progress.



- The WG meeting on 16 November 2010 focused on the statistical evidence from various chapters.
- The different chapters of the report were mentioned as a reminder, in particular Chapter 7 on international mobility of students and staff, where the WG attempted to systematise different types of mobility and what balanced mobility could mean. This is work in progress.
- No major changes in the data overview on mobility are expected in 2012, but it is more likely there will be a full comprehensive new set of data in 2015.
- There is also no clear indication on how the new reporting scorecard will look like, as this is also work in progress, but there will be a draft presented to the BFUG in the following meeting in Cracow.
- The various chapters of the report were discussed. The indicators were endorsed by the BFUG in the previous meetings.

Participants praised the work done so far, while making some comments, as follows:

- The selected mobility indicators will be used in the Mobility WG as well, in an adjusted form, to fit the specific needs.
- The way the exercise has been done at national level raised the question whether the stakeholders have been involved enough, as there were signals the national student associations have not been consulted. The BFUG members were urged to consult national students' representatives, as it may give balance to the answers provided in the questionnaire.

**The BFUG took note of the information provided by the Reporting WG / the data collectors and endorsed the plans and timeline for preparing the 2012 Report.**

## **9.2 Mobility**

Documents: BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_9.2a [Mobility WG update]  
BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_9.2b [Mobility timeline]

The Chair of the Mobility Working Group noted that the main goal of the WG is to develop an EHEA mobility strategy for the Ministerial Conference in Bucharest in 2012.

The EHEA mobility strategy should be put on the EHEA official Website, in its final more concise form. A new draft of the document will be available for the BFUG meeting in Cracow.

There are several issues of particular importance to be taken into account:

- There is a need to implement national / international mobility strategies with measurable indicators.
- In addition to the quantitative target, a target for balanced mobility inside the EHEA is also deemed necessary.
- Since imbalances can be useful for both parts, the partners are the ones who should find the reasons and solutions for these imbalances.
- The EHEA member states are also encouraged to strive for more balanced mobility of the EHEA with countries outside the EHEA.

- Measures not to have additional barriers at studying abroad should be taken by member countries.
- The BFUG members, alongside the European Commission, should check if the regulations for professions are being followed.
- Increased mobility should be achieved through improved information on study programmes. A forum where universities and students can correspond with each other on this topic should be created.
- Numerous issues decided upon can only be implemented by universities and all HEIs should become aware of the existing possibilities in global educational cooperation. In accordance to their profile, the HEIs should be encouraged to adopt and implement their own strategy for internalisation and the promotion of mobility.
- HEIs should be encouraged to pay attention to the mobility and international competence of their staff.
- It is important to think about students who, for various reasons, cannot be academically mobile, so it is desired to enable all students to have an international experience at home (internationalisation at home).

The questions and comments raised on this topic were, as follows:

- The report did not mention mutual recognition of academic performance (grading systems). The WG Chair underlined that this topic was previously discussed and it will be an important part of the Mobility Strategy paper.
- In regard to the imbalanced mobility in EHEA, although it could be considered useful for both parties involved, there is the question of who pays for it. The WG Chair agreed that a fair compensation system cannot be developed.
- The effect of imbalances over a longer period of time can be dramatic, although short-term imbalanced mobility is acceptable. The imbalances should be first identified and then the affected countries should discuss with each other and try to identify the causes and possible solutions.

### **The BFUG took note of the information provided by the Mobility WG.**

#### **9.3. Recognition**

Document: BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_9.3 [Recognition WG update]

The Chair of the Recognition Working Group addressed the invitation to the "Stakeholders' Conference on Recognition in the European Higher Education Area" to be held in Riga, Latvia, on 28-29 April 2011, while underlining the main reasons why participation is important:

- Quality assurance has great importance for recognition and it should be discussed how to use internal and external quality instruments to improve the recognition practices within higher education institutions.
- The role of qualifications frameworks should be discussed, as they did not solve all recognition problems.
- The ways in which EHEA could further cooperate with other parts of the world to improve recognition should to be identified.
- Recognition of professional qualifications and of study periods will be approached.
- Stakeholders will participate in the conference along with the BFUG members.

## **The BFUG took note of the information provided by the Recognition WG.**

### **9.4 Social Dimension**

Document: BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_9.4 [Social Dimension WG ToR]

The Chair of the Social Dimension Working Group introduced the newly selected Co-Chair, Mr. Brian Power (Ireland).

The next Social Dimension Working Group meeting was confirmed for July 2011 in Berlin, in connection to the "Development of the Social Dimension" Conference organised by DSW with support from the German Federal Ministry for Education and Science (11-13 July 2011).

Moreover, the Chair mentioned the European Observatory on Social Dimension of Higher Education project, which may become soon a reality, as ways of ensuring its financial sustainability are being explored.

## **The BFUG took note of the information provided by the Social Dimension Working Group.**

### **End of the first day**

## **Second day of the BFUG meeting, Friday, 18 March 2011**

### **9.5 International Openness WG and the IPN**

Document: BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_9.5 [Int. Openness WG update]

The WG Chair presented a brief update on the activity of the International Openness Working Group (IO WG) and on the progress made in relation to the content and draft agenda for the Third Bologna Policy Forum (BPF). The main ideas underlined by the WG Chair were:

- The Romanian Ministry of Education, Research, Youth and Sports will organise the 2012 Ministerial Conference and the Third Bologna Policy Forum, with help from UNESCO in selecting the participant countries.
- After extensive consultations via e-mail, in the IO WG meetings and within the online EHEA Forum, it was agreed to have an overarching BPF theme and four sub-themes held in parallel sessions.
- For the overarching BPF theme, three proposals were put forward in the annex to the BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_9.5 [Int. Openness WG update] document (one as a result of the IO WG meeting in Vienna, 18 January 2011, the other two proposed by IAU, EUA respectively via e-mail); the BFUG members were asked to endorse the preferred overarching theme.
- For the proposed sub-themes, the BFUG was asked to give feedback and indicate the preferred sub-themes for the third BPF (maximum four) to the IO WG.

From the discussions that followed the presentation, the main ideas expressed are mentioned here:

- The overarching themes proposed seem to be different formulations of the same idea.
- The situation in Africa could be discussed, so maybe a regional approach at the Bologna Policy Forum could be considered. The IO WG Chair took note of this suggestion, which is to be tackled in the May IO WG meeting.

**The third proposal, “*Beyond the Bologna process: Creating and connecting national, regional and global higher education spaces*” was preferred by most BFUG members and it was endorsed as the BPF overarching theme.**

With the overarching theme already selected, the debates focused on the possible sub-themes:

- It was suggested to select sub-themes in connection to the overarching theme or close to what happens in the EHEA.
- The IO WG was asked to phrase the sub-themes in such a way as to be inspiring for the Ministers.

**An agreement for mobility (sub-themes 1a and 1b) and quality assurance (sub-themes 6a and 6b) was reached amongst the BFUG members, but also for a combination of social dimension and international public responsibility and a combination of employability and transparency. It was also agreed that the IO WG has to refine the sub-themes and present them to the BFUG at the following meeting.**

An update on the Information and Promotion Network (IPN) activity was also given:

- The main tasks of IPN, deriving from the Terms of Reference, were briefly presented, as well as the activities undertaken by each IPN sub-Working Group. Although sub-WG1 and sub-WG3 started their activities, there seems to be little interest in the activities of sub-WG2 so far.
- A catalogue of questions was elaborated by OeAD (Austrian Academic Exchange Service), which encompasses the various pending matters emerging from previous IPN meetings (or those of its sub-WGs) with regard to the IPN main aims and work-plan.
- The experts’ roundtable foreseen in the IO WG ToR was organised on 10 March 2011 as a meeting between Academic Cooperation Association (ACA), the European Commission, the IPN Steering Committee and the Bologna Secretariat.
- A task-force chaired by Ireland was set up, with the following objectives: to define 3-5 key messages for EHEA promotion and to define the key data that is needed for EHEA information provision purposes. The possible feasibility study for an EHEA promotion strategy was postponed for discussion to the next IPN meeting.
- The next IPN meeting will take place on 18 May 2011 in Brussels, organised back-to-back with the IO WG meeting on 19 May 2011.
- The IPN will prepare an update to be presented at the following BFUG meeting in Cracow.
- The BFUG members were asked whether the results of the DAAD survey can be made public and the response was affirmative.

**The Chair concluded that the IPN survey results analysis made by DAAD can be made public and the BFUG took note of both the IO WG and IPN reports.**

## **9.6 Qualifications Frameworks**

Documents:           BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_9.6a [QF WG/ Network update]  
                          BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_9.6b [QF WG ToR update]  
                          BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_9.6c [QF Network ToR]

The WG Chair provided a brief update on the activity of the Qualifications Frameworks Working Group (QF WG) and presented the WG Terms of Reference update, while also introducing the NQF Terms of Reference.



BFUG meeting - QF  
update.ppt

The WG Chair brought to the attention of the BFUG members the following matters:

- In Strasbourg in October 2010, the first joint meeting of the National Correspondents and the National Coordination Points (NCPs) of the European Qualifications Framework for Lifelong Learning (EQF) was held.
- In regard to the NQFs, the goal is for all EHEA members to develop NQFs by 2012 and prepare for self certification. So far, self certification and referencing against the two overarching frameworks was completed for a number of EHEA countries, while for others it is still in progress.
- The progress recorded so far by member countries can be considered satisfactory.
- Fewer answers were received to the September 2010 questionnaire.
- Amongst the anticipated challenges to be addressed, there can be listed:
  - Role and availability of international experts;
  - Self certification and referencing against the two overarching frameworks: joint or separate?
  - Should the report cover the whole system or only a part of it?
  - What are the competent authority/-ies?
- In regard to the WG report to be presented at the Bucharest Ministerial Conference, the potential issues to be addressed will depend on the state of developments. If most countries are close to implementing NQFs, a question to be asked is whether what needs to be developed at national and institutional level will still be sufficiently coherent to be compatible with the overarching frameworks. The changing relationship between the European, national and institutional level will be at the core of the report.

The WG chair invited the BFUG members to give feedback or advice on the upcoming report and other issues, to adopt changes proposed for the QF WG ToR and to adopt the ToR for the network of correspondents. Moreover, countries which have not sent the recent developments on this topic yet were invited to activate the national QF correspondents and provide updated and reliable information.

Following the presentation, a number of suggestions and comments were provided by the BFUG members:

- Poland mentioned that it also has a joint process of referencing against both the QF-EHEA and the EQF.
- Montenegro announced that their NQF is currently on the official site of Montenegro and soon to be translated and thanked the Council of Europe for the help provided in the creation of NQF.

**The BFUG took note of the information provided by the Qualifications Frameworks Working Group and endorsed the QF WG and NQF Terms of Reference.**

### **9.7 RPL network**

Document: BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_9.7 [RPL Network update]

A brief presentation of the work done so far by the Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) Network was given, pointing out the following:

- The first meeting took place on 5 November 2010 in Glasgow.
- The main purpose of the network at present is to share information and good practice that can be used further on in each national context.
- More information on the RPL best practices can be found at the following link: <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/scotland/DEG/RPLcasestudies.asp>
- The next RPL meeting will be on 23 June 2011, in Glasgow and the BFUG members are welcome.

**The BFUG took note of the information provided by the RPL Network.**

### **9.8 Transparency Tools**

Documents: BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_9.8a [Transparency Tools WG update]  
 BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_9.8b [Transparency Tools WG ToR]  
 BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_9.8c [Transparency Tools Work plan]

The BFUG Secretariat conveyed the apologies of the Transparency Tools Working Group (TT WG) Chair and presented the WG update, focusing on the following:

- The WG meeting on 11 October 2010, with debates on the questionnaire and the conclusions deriving from it.
- The meeting of the Directors General in Higher Education (DGHE), held in Namur, on September 13-14th 2010, where it was concluded that Europe needs to have strong HEIs that are accountable to the society and transparency is needed to show their strengths and weaknesses.
- As the TT WG has to put forward a separate report for the Ministerial Conference in 2012, the following elements will be outlined: the concept and the geographical borders of the TT included in the report, the information function of the TT, the accountability functions of TT, transparency tools as quality mechanisms and the methodological aspects of TT. The draft report will be discussed by the TT WG in its autumn 2011 meeting.
- A mini-seminar on transparency tools will be organised by Belgium/Flemish Community in November.
- The TT WG Terms of Reference and Work plan have been amended accordingly.

**The BFUG took note of the information provided by the Transparency Tools Working Group, endorsed the Terms of Reference and the work plan.**

### **9.9 Discussion on the Hungarian EU Presidency proposal for an EHEA wide HE programmes database**

Document: BFUG(HU/AD) 24\_9.9 [ EHEA wide programme database]

The background document constituted the starting point of the discussion, as follows:

- There was scepticism among the BFUG members in regard to the feasibility and the practicability of the proposal.
- Other similar initiatives have already been put in place across Europe, with various degrees of success.
- Universities may be required to put in additional effort that might not lead to the estimated results in the future.
- There is a risk that students who use the database might be provided with filtered information which will affect their final decision.
- The financial and operational aspects should be taken into consideration, as these are extremely important.
- Additional questions were raised by BFUG members, in regard to the language diversity, the cost benefit of the project, as well as the complementarity with other similar initiatives.

The proponent clarified that:

- The database should be similar to the Google system, while requiring slightly increased efforts from the universities.
- The concerns on overburdening the HEIs, on the operational and financial aspects and on information being filtered were dismissed due to the envisaged software design.

**It was agreed that Hungary will provide further details in the next BFUG meeting on the technical aspects of collecting data from individual HEIs, on the costs incurred and on the linguistic problems, as well as on the structure needed to manage such a database. The issues of data provision workload on behalf of HEIs and of data processing were ruled as being solved by the software design.**

*Coffee break*

### **10. Possible additional working methods**

Documents: BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_10a [Additional working methods]  
BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_10b [Overview of feedback from BFUG members]  
BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_10c [Additional working methods – way forward]

The BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_10a [Additional working methods] document was presented as a non-exhaustive list of possible working methods to be taken up by BFUG members, according to the specific national context. **The document was endorsed by the BFUG members. It was agreed that it will be made public on the EHEA website.**

It was mentioned that the BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_10b [Overview of feedback from BFUG members] document encompasses all the feedback received so far via e-mail by the BFUG Secretariat.

The discussion turned to the questions raised in the BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_10c [Additional working methods – way forward] document.

**It was agreed to ask EUA and EURASHE to provide information on good practices in terms of Bologna Process implementation in HEIs.**

**It was agreed to circulate the matrix with preferred working methods by EHEA members again until the next BFUG and to expect more information from BFUG members.**

**The discussion on financial support for different working methods will be postponed for further discussions.**

**On the proposal to set up repository of research papers on the Bologna Process, the EHEA and related subjects, the BFUG members were informed that in the BFUG Board meeting, the Flemish Community of Belgium announced its willingness to organise a meeting between the BFUG Board members and the representatives of various networks of researchers on HE in November 2011.**

#### **11. Language regime for ministerial conferences**

Document: BFUG (HU/AD) 24\_11 [Language regime]

The Chair introduced the document prepared by the BFUG Secretariat and proposed the "Stockholm agreement" on the language regime for Ministerial Conferences to be used as well in the future, while asking if there are any BFUG members opposing this option.

**Two countries were against maintaining the "Stockholm agreement". However, France insisted that the matter is discussed by the ministers. It was agreed that:**

- **The BFUG Secretariat will prepare a one page briefing note for the ministers. The briefing note will be circulated over email to the BFUG and the members will have the opportunity to provide their input. The document will be endorsed by the BFUG at the next BFUG meeting in Cracow. The document will be sent to the ministers for decision-making before the Bucharest Ministerial Conference, so this issue will not be on the agenda of the event.**
- **The briefing note will include an annex describing the logistical implications of the options proposed to the ministers, based on the document 24\_11. Another annex listing the history of languages used in previous Ministerial Conferences will be prepared, including the motivation of the chosen arrangements. The previous host countries will be asked to provide the BFUG Secretariat with the reasons for their choice of language arrangement.**



- **Two language regime options for the EHEA Ministerial Conferences will be put forward to the Ministers: the „Stockholm agreement“ and the French proposal with the amendments made during the meeting, namely that this option will include Russian and Spanish to the initial French proposal (English, French, German plus the language of the host country), at the request of the respective BFUG delegates.**

**It was reminded by the Chair that the „Stockholm agreement“ will be used for the Bucharest Bologna Process Ministerial Conference.**

## **12. Information on the preparations of the 2012 EHEA Bucharest Ministerial Conference and Third Bologna Policy Forum**

Romania, as organiser of the 2012 Ministerial Conference and third Bologna Policy Forum, presented the two versions of agenda resulted from the IO WG meetings: version 1 – lasting one day and a half, and version 2 – lasting only one day.

The BFUG members were asked to endorse one of the two versions, as organisational preparations must move forward based on this decision.

**The short version of the agenda (lasting one day, from 26 April 2011 at lunchtime to 27 April 2011 at lunchtime) was endorsed.**

## **13. Updates from EC, consultative members, EQAR (written contributions)**

**EUA added one more event to the EHEA calendar, “Getting to grips with rankings: A high-level seminar for European university leaders”, to be held on 17 June 2011 in Brussels.**

**EQAR introduced the respective update and announced the EQAR GA, to take place after the BFUG meeting.**

## **14. Next BFUG meeting, Poland (Cracow), 13-14 October 2011 and next BFUG Board meeting, Armenia, 6-7 September 2011 (moved for discussion after point 9.7 of the agenda)**

Poland presented the priorities for the upcoming Polish EU Presidency, with particular focus on:

- The BFUG meeting in Cracow (13-14 October 2011);
- The Conference on the Modernisation of Higher Education (24-25 October 2011).



BFUG\_HU\_AD\_Poland Presentation.ppt

Armenia also presented their priorities for the upcoming BFUG Co-Chair-ship, mentioning:

- The BFUG Board meeting (Yerevan, 6-7 September 2011).
- The International Conference on Funding of Higher Education (Yerevan, 8-9 September 2011), having financing mechanisms, equity, financial students support loans as key topics.
- A conference on Student Participation in HE Governance organised in cooperation with the Council of Europe and ESU on 6-8 October 2011.
- A one week Summer Camp (July 2011, tbc).

**The BFUG took note of the priorities presented by Poland and Armenia for their upcoming BFUG Co-Chair-ship.**

### **15. AOB**

1. The Chair proposed that the BFUG Secretariat keeps the BFUG meeting audio recordings for the Bologna Process archives.
2. The BFUG members took note of the Belarus situation.
3. The Chair announced that Sophia Eriksson (European Commission), Lars Lyng Nielsen (EURASHE) and Helle Otte (Denmark) would leave from their position as BFUG members. The Chair presented the departing BFUG members with the best wishes on behalf of the entire BFUG.
4. The Andorran BFUG Chair thanked the BFUG Secretariat and the Hungarian hosts for organising the BFUG meeting.

Finally, the Chair declared the meeting closed and thanked the BFUG members for their participation and contributions.

### **Used abbreviations**

ACA	<u>Academic Cooperation Association</u>
<u>Benelux</u>	Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg
BFUG	Bologna Follow-up Group
BPF	Bologna Policy Forum
BP	Bologna Process
CoE	Council of Europe
DAAD	German Academic Exchange Service (Deutscher Akademischer Austausch Dienst)
DGHE	Directors General of Higher Education
E4 group	EUA + ENQA + EURASHE + ESU (in context of cooperation on quality assurance)
EHEA	European Higher Education Area
EI	Education International
ENQA	<u>European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education</u>

EQF	European Qualifications Framework
EQAR GA	<u>European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education</u> General Assembly
ESU	<u>European Students' Union</u>
EU	European Union
EUA	<u>European University Association</u>
EURASHE	<u>European Association of Institutions in Higher Education</u>
HE	Higher Education
HEI	Higher Education Institution
IPN	Information and Promotion Network
IO	International Openness
NCP	National Contact Person
NQF	National Qualifications Framework
OeAD	Österreichische Austauschdienst (Austrian Agency for International Cooperation in Education and Research)
RPL	Recognition of Prior Learning
QA	Quality Assurance
QF	Qualifications Framework
QF-EHEA	Overarching framework of qualifications of the European Higher Education Area
ToR	Terms of Reference
TT	Transparency Tools
UNESCO	<u>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</u>
UNESCO-CEPES	<u>UNESCO's European Centre for Higher Education</u> (Centre Européen pour l'Enseignement Supérieur)
WG	Working Group