



Ministry of Education, Culture and
Science of the Netherlands



Ministry of Education
of the Republic of Moldova

Doc. Code: BFUG_NL_MD_50_3a

Last modified: 31.03.2016

Bologna Follow-Up Group Meeting

8-9 September 2015

European Convention Centre, Luxembourg-Kirchberg

Draft Minutes (with documents)

0. List of Participants

Delegation	Surname	First Name(s)
ALBANIA	Pustina	Linda
ANDORRA	Martínez Ramírez	María del Mar
ARMENIA	Harutyunyan	Karine
ARMENIA	Harutyunyan	Gayane
AUSTRIA	Bacher	Gottfried
AZERBAIJAN	Humbatov	Ilham
BELARUS	Betenya	Elena
BELARUS	Rytau	Aliaksandr
BELGIUM FR	Guillaume	Kevin
BELGIUM VL	Vercruysse	Noel
BFUG SECRETARIAT	Profit	Françoise
BFUG SECRETARIAT	Scholle-Pollmann	Nikola
BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA	Duric	Aida
BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA	Maric	Petar
BUSINESS EUROPE	Seling	Irene
COUNCIL OF EUROPE	Bergan	Sjur
CROATIA	Tecilazić-Goršić	Ana
CYPRUS	Martidou - Forcier	Despina
CZECH REPUBLIC	Drbohlav	Jakub
CZECH REPUBLIC	Trojanova	Lucie
DENMARK	Johannesen	Jonas Husum

DENMARK	Nielsen	Jette Søgren
EDUCATION INTERNATIONAL	Roman	Agnes
EDUCATION INTERNATIONAL	Vraa-Jensen	Jens
ENQA	Walsh	Padraig
EQAR	Froment	Eric
EQAR	Szabo	Melinda
EQAR	Tück	Colin
ESTONIA	Pukk	Janne
ESU	Galan Palomares	Fernando Miguel
ESU	Meister	Lea Christina
EUA	Gaebel	Michael
EURASHE	Cloet	Johan
EURASHE	Lauwick	Stéphane
EUROPEAN COMMISSION	Mork Andersen	Mette
EUROPEAN COMMISSION	Tyson	Adam
EUROPEAN COMMISSION	Waters	Margaret
EUROSTUDENT	Hauschildt	Kristina
EURYDICE	Crosier	David
FINLAND	Innola	Maija
FINLAND	Vuorinen	Birgitta
FRANCE - VICE-CHAIR	Pol	Patricia
GEORGIA	Kopaleishvili	Nino
GEORGIA	Sharvashidze	Giorgi
GERMANY	Ahrens	Heide
GERMANY	Petrikowski	Frank
HOLY SEE	Bechina	Friedrich
HUNGARY	Keszei	Ernő
ICELAND	Vidarsdottir	Una
IRELAND	Cullinane	Tim
ITALY	Castellucci	Paola

KAZAKHSTAN	Idiyatova	Yuliya
LATVIA	Rauhvargers	Andrejs
LIECHTENSTEIN - CO-CHAIR	Miescher	Daniel
LUXEMBOURG - CO-CHAIR	Diederich	Léon
LUXEMBOURG	Kox	Corinne
MALTA	Sammut-Bonnici	Tanya
MOLDOVA	Nadejda	Velisco
NETHERLANDS	van der Vegt	Jolien
NETHERLANDS	van der Waarden	Jakob
NORWAY	Johansson	Toril
NORWAY	Strøm	Tone Flood
POLAND	Banaszak	Bartlomiej
POLAND	Czaja	Marcin
PORTUGAL	Mateus	Ana
PORTUGAL	Vasques	Inês
ROMANIA	Damian	Radu-Mircea
ROMANIA	Ghitulica	Daniela-Cristina
RUSSIAN FEDERATION	Kamynina	Nadezda
RUSSIAN FEDERATION	Kuznetsov	Alexey
RUSSIAN FEDERATION	Shvedova	Svetlana
SLOVAKIA	Jurkovic	Jozef
SLOVENIA	Skerlj	Marija
SPAIN	Delgado	Luis
SWEDEN	Gaunt	Albin
SWITZERLAND	Studinger	Silvia
UKRAINE	Rusnak	Olena
UKRAINE	Smyrnov	Olexandr
UNESCO	Simionescu	Liliana
UNITED KINGDOM	Crombie	Ian
UNITED KINGDOM	Wilkinson	Pamela

The representatives from Bulgaria, Greece, Turkey and United Kingdom/Scotland were excused.

1. Information by the Chairs

The delegates were welcomed by the Co-Chairs from Luxembourg, Dr. Léon Diederich (Ministry for Education and Research) and Liechtenstein, Dr. Daniel Miescher (School Education Authority of the Principality of Liechtenstein). A special welcome was given to the representatives from Belarus who joined the BFUG Meeting for the first time after Belarus' accession to the EHEA.

The Co-Chairs and the Vice Chair, Patricia Pol (Ministry of Education, Higher Education and Research of France) thanked the former Armenian Bologna Follow-up Secretariat and the former Co-Chairs (Latvia and Iceland) as well as all people involved in the preparation of the Ministerial Meeting in Yerevan and the preparation of the Yerevan Communiqué.

2. Adoption of the draft agenda

Documents: BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_1a [Draft agenda]

BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_1b [Draft annotated agenda]



BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_1a.pdf



BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_1b.pdf

The Co-Chairs informed about the inclusion of an update on information on EUROSTUDENT which would be given under "AOB". The delegates agreed on this amendment and adopted the agenda.

3. Taking note of the draft minutes of the BFUG Board meeting, Vaduz, 30 June 2015 and adoption of the draft outcome of proceedings of the BFUG meeting, Riga, 24-25 March 2015 and draft minutes of the BFUG extraordinary meeting, Yerevan, 14 May 2015

Documents: BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_3a [BFUG Board Vaduz draft minutes] (To be adopted)

The European Commission remarked that the Board minutes have not been sent for approval to the Board prior to their presentation to the BFUG. The Co-Chair proposed to do that retrospectively. Therefore, the BFUG did not formally take note of the Vaduz minutes. The Vaduz minutes should be sent as soon as possible to the Board members for their feedback and should be approved at the next Board Meeting in Chisinau. Approval by the BFUG should be sought during the BFUG meeting in Amsterdam.

Besides this point, Holy See asked for the revision of the text (deleting the sentence on page 4: *As a result the Yerevan Communiqué is a significant document*).

In the evaluation of the Yerevan conference, Education International asks that the number of students and teachers attending the conference shall also be mentioned, as they belong to the relevant stakeholders.

Document: BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_3b [BFUG March Riga draft outcome of proceedings]



BFUGMeeting_LU_LI
_48_3b.pdf

The document was approved by the delegates.

Document: BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_3c [BFUG Yerevan draft minutes]



BFUGMeeting_LU_LI
_48_3c.pdf

The document was approved by the delegates.

4. Information by the BFUG Secretariat

Document: BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_4 [draft ToR of the BFUG Secretariat_2015-2018]



BFUGMeeting_LU_LI
_48_4_ToR_Secretar

The Director of the new Bologna Follow-up Group Secretariat Françoise Profit briefly presented the revised ToR underlining that the Secretariat would give support to the two Co-Chairs and the Vice Chair as well as to the Bologna Follow-up Group and its Working Groups. She outlined very briefly that the Secretariat would work at the beginning with 5 full-time members. By now, three people were installed in the international unit.

The European Commission welcomed the secondment from Germany but at the same time asked for the involvement of more international staff members.

The Director of the BFUG Secretariat points out that the decision would be taken after the work programme and when the workload for the Secretariat is fixed. However, the willingness of Armenia and Spain to second staff is highly appreciated.

Delegations asked for several changes in the ToR and for revision of the text taking into account the following comments:

- The Secretariat should prepare draft reports of the Bologna Working Group;

- The Secretariat should not be in charge of revising the work programme adopted by the BFUG;
- The Secretariat should propose a new website concept and update the website regularly;
- The following formulation should be used: “The Secretariat prepares the Ministerial Conference in Paris and the Fifth Bologna Policy Forum under the supervision of the BFUG” (to be deleted: in order to propose strategic advances).
- With regards to the following sentence “It might propose a new website in order to provide a more efficient service”, one delegation asked to replace “might” with “shall”.

After revision of the ToR the text was approved by the delegates.

5. Evaluation report of the Yerevan Ministerial Conference and the Fourth Bologna Policy Forum

Document: BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_5 (Yerevan EHEA Ministerial Conference and Communiqué and Fourth Bologna Policy Forum Evaluation Report)



BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_5.pdf

The delegations took note of the two documents by underlining that the results of the Yerevan Conference and the strong commitment of all EHEA member countries concerning this Conference has reenergized the process as a whole. Delegations were active in the discussions and felt and conveyed a spirit of ownership. Feedback was very positive. All in all 68 responses from 66 delegations were received.

However, delegates felt that the format of the Bologna Policy Forum and the organization of bilateral meetings have to be reviewed. As the previous Bologna Policy Fora have only been attended by very few high level non-EHEA delegations a concise concept has to be developed.

One delegation pointed out that there are member countries with burdened relationships within the EHEA. This should be taken into account when choosing host countries for future Ministerial conferences.

6. Discussion on 2015-2018 BFUG Work Plan

6.1 Discussion on the 2015-2018 BFUG Organisation Chart

Documents: BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_6.1a [Explanatory note]

BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_6.1b [draft BFUG Organisation Chart]

BFUG_Meeting_LU_LI_48_6.1c [draft BFUG tentative schedule 2015-2018]



BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_6.1a.pdf BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_6.1cTentative sc_48_6.1b_BFUG_Org

The Co-Chair gave an overview on the explanatory note as well as on the BFUG Organisation Chart and asked the delegations for feedback.

Delegations asked for several changes in both documents and for revision of them taking into account the following comments:

- The organization structure seems to be too complex, too bureaucratic and not easily understandable. Despite the complexity of the Bologna Process, the types of groups/subgroups and actors (co-chairs and members only) should be limited. There is no clear distinction between the different groups (Working Groups and Board Committees);
- The role and reporting method of the Steering Committees (SC) to the BFUG is not transparent; if there is a need to install a SC, WG 1 should have a SC as well;
- A WG on Governance is missing, it is foreseen that this topic should be discussed by the BFUG based on the preparation by the Board;
- The work programme shall not give increased decision making power to the Board, but make it better fit to coordinate and prepare the BFUG. The BFUG itself should become more involved in content related issues rather than becoming an event managing unit;
- Delegations welcome the focus on peer learning which should be open to national and international stakeholders. BFUG should foster peer learning in the countries to catalyze implementation;
- Delegations welcome the proposal to encourage commitments of the parties joining the working groups. However, the question is whether this would have to be mandatory, as it would prevent smaller countries with limited capacity from attending;
- There is a need for coherent and outcome-oriented reporting from the main groups (reporting, implementation and new visions) directly to the BFUG; the WGs cannot take any political decision; in addition, WG3 should work on specific policy recommendations;
- The titles of the Working Groups should be changed;
- The BFUG members agreed to rename the Board Committees (BC) and call them Advisory Groups (AG);
- Discussions on the tentative schedule were postponed.

6.2 Discussion on the Terms of Reference

Documents: BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_6.2a [draft ToR of WG1 on Monitoring]

BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_6.2b [draft ToR of WG2 on Implementation of Structural Reforms]

BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_6.2c [draft ToR of WG3 on New EHEA goals]

BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_6.2d [draft ToR of BC1 on BPF]

BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_6.2e [draft ToR of BC2 on Support for the Belarus roadmap]

BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_6.2f [draft ToR of BC3 on Dealing with non-implementation]

BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_6.2g [draft ToR of PfG on Revision of the DS]

Following the discussion on the necessity of changing the BFUG explanatory note and organization chart, the Co-Chair asked for comments on the different ToRs for the Working Groups and Advisory Groups / Board Committees.

Delegations asked for several changes in the respective documents and for revision of them taking into account the following comments:

- Liaison between members of the different WGs and AGs/BCs is necessary and should be more targeted;
- There must be a clear division of tasks between WG 1 and WG 2. Coordination between both groups must be ensured; the main working document for WG 1 is the implementation report; the previous implementation report (2015) should serve as the starting point of WG 2. The Secretariat is asked to contact countries interested in organizing activities to support the implementation of agreed key commitments, as soon as possible. Results from the WG 1 are just as important for WG 2 and AG/BC 3;
- The difference between WG 2 and WG 3 is not clear; it should be clearly pointed out that WG 2 should review and work on agreed goals of the Bologna Process so far, assess implementation gaps and seek ways to close them. While WG 3 should concentrate on new issues which will be tackled in the next period and lead to policy recommendations. However, the Chairs of the working groups have to prepare the TOR of their WGs that will be endorsed by the BFUG;
- The topics for WG 2 are not exhaustive. Activities offered by countries which are member in WG 2 should involve national and international stakeholders;
- The topics for WG 3 are exhaustive. It should be decided in the BFUG which topics are being put on the agenda. It should be established a link between the EHEA and ERA. Still, the reference document should be the Yerevan Communiqué;

- The name and mandate of AG/BC 1 (so far named “Bologna Policy Forum”) is too narrow. It should not only focus on the organization of the BPF; the strategy on global setting should be widened and reviewed. Looking into the reason why cooperation is not successful by now could be helpful. A roadmap how to cooperate with other regions in the world could be drafted. Peer learning activities could also be taken into account with other regions; a clear goal of what to achieve needs to be formulated and what could be done together with other regions. A continuous dialogue should be started now (not only with high level groups); all in all, AG/BC 1 should be practically oriented. This should be reflected in its ToR;
- According to the Belarus delegate, implementation of the work programme described in the ToR of AG/BC 2 has already started , including the introduction of a number of changes in the legislation;
- AG/BC 3 is the essential group to make recommendations on what to do with countries which do not implement (or do not correctly implement) the fundamental principles; it was suggested for the group to discuss and consider the development of minimum standards. Members of the AG/BC 3 should be committed and see beyond their national borders and the policy and political context; the Yerevan Communiqué asks for a targeted policy dialogue and concrete actions as well;
- It was suggested to rename the pathfinder group on the revision of the Diploma Supplement to Advisory group on the revision of the diploma supplement, because of its advisory role. This would avoid any confusion with the pathfinder group of the last period.

6.3. Participation in WGs and AGs/BCs

Document: BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_6.3 [declaration of participation]



BFUGdeclaration_participation.docx

The Co-Chair asked delegation members to nominate members and co-chairs to the WGs and AGs/BCs by filling in a form which will be revised according to the new Organisation Chart. The deadline for handing in the form will be put forward as the different groups need to start in the near future. Upon nomination by delegation members, the Co-Chairs will try to arrange a participation in the groups that reflect the declared interest of the individual BFUG members, but at the same time ensure that the groups do not become too large and that they reflect the diversity of the EHEA. To this end, the co-chairs may get back to individual BFUG members to discuss the issues with them.

7. Discussion on the amended 2015-2018 BFUG Work Plan

7.1 Discussion on the amended 2015-2018 BFUG Organisation Chart

Documents: BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_6.1a [Work Plan 2015 - 2018]

BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_6.1b [BFUG Organisation Chart]

BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_6.1c (draft BFUG tentative schedule 2015 – 2018)

The Co-Chair explained the changes and the simplification in the Organisation Chart and accordingly the changes in the Work Plan 2015 – 2018 (former: Explanatory Note). The Board and the BFUG would retain the role that they had in the previous period; the Working Groups are slightly renamed and the Board Committees are renamed into Advisory Groups; the pathfinder Group for the DS has been changed into an Advisory Group.

The new BFUG Organisation Chart as well as the Work Plan 2015-2018 were approved.



150909_BFUG_Org_
chart.pdf



BFUGMeeting_LU_LI
_48_6 1a_WP_def.pc

The draft BFUG tentative schedule has been postponed and will be discussed as soon as the composition of the Working Groups and Advisory Groups are fixed.

7.2 Discussion on the amended Terms of Reference

The Co-Chair explained that the ToRs for the Working Groups have not yet been changed according to the delegates' comments because of time constraints. The revised ToRs should be ready by 21.9.2015 and will be circulated to the BFUG members by the Secretariat for comments. It has not yet been decided whether a further BFUG Meeting might be necessary. An indicative date would be the 12 November 2015. The meeting would take place in Brussels.

Documents: BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_6.2a [draft ToR of WG 1 on Monitoring]



BFUGMeeting_LU_LI
_48_6.2a_ToR_WG_1

To be circulated by the Secretariat by 23.9.2015

BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_6.2b [draft ToR of WG 2 on Implementation - Fostering implementation of agreed key commitments]



BFUGMeeting_LU_LI
_ToR_WG_2_Impleme

To be circulated by the Secretariat by 23.9.2015

BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_6.2c [draft ToR of WG 3 on New goals – Policy development of new EHEA goals]



BFUGMeeting_LU_LI
_ToR WG3_new goal

To be circulated by the Secretariat by 23.9.2015

Documents: BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_6.2d [draft ToR of AG 1 EHEA international cooperation]



BFUGMeeting_LU_LI
_48_6.2f_ToR_AG 1_

After revision of the ToR, the text was approved by the delegates.

BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_6.2e [draft ToR of AG 2 on Support for the Belarus roadmap]



BFUGMeeting_LU_LI
_48_6.2e_ToR_AG 2_

The ToR was approved by the delegates.

BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_6.2f [draft ToR of AG 3 on Dealing with non-implementation]



BFUGMeeting_LU_LI
_48_6.2f_ToR_AG 3_

After revision of the ToR, the text was approved by the delegates.

BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_6.2g [draft ToR of AG 4 on the Revision of the DS]



BFUGMeeting_LU_LI
_48_6.2g_ToR_AG 4_

After revision of the ToR the text was approved by the delegates.

7.3. Participation in WGs and AGs

Document: BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_6.3 [declaration of participation]

Delegates are asked to submit its proposals for membership of Working and Advisory Groups to the Secretariat by 30.9.2015. The Co-Chairs will circulate a list of participants and Co-Chairs of all WGs until the end of October.



BFUGdeclaration_participation.docx

8. Next BFUG Board meeting, Moldova, January 2016 and next BFUG meeting, Netherlands, 7-8 March 2015

Documents: BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_8_1 [Moldova_BFUG Co-Chairmanship]



BFUG-Meeting_LU_LI_48_8.1 .pdf

BFUGMeeting_LU_LI_48_8_2 [Netherlands_BFUG Co-Chairmanship]

The delegates from Moldova and Netherlands briefly presented their countries and education systems. Delegates were invited to stay after the BFUG in Amsterdam for the conference on Open online education (Wednesday 9 March). In order to get input for the conference, delegates were asked to fill in a short questionnaire. Link to the questionnaire (open until 21st of September):

<https://survey.surfnet.nl/index.php/657523/lang-en>

Furthermore, the Dutch representative informed about the conference on the assessment of learning outcomes which is organized by the NVAO (accreditation organization) and takes place 29-30 October, in The Hague, NL.

9. AOB

EUROSTUDENT gave an update on the EUROSTUDENT VI project and invited the delegates to react on the project and/or to join the project.

EQAR briefly reported that it is examining the feasibility to protect the ESG via a trade mark so to prevent misuse of the concept. In this context, EURASHE informed the BFUG that it is coordinating an Erasmus+ funded project carried out by the stakeholder organisations involved in preparing the ESG that aims to promote the use of the ESG. As part of this project for ex. a series of regional conferences and peer learning activities will be organised.

END OF THE MEETING