



Task Force Enhancing Knowledge Sharing in EHEA

Third Meeting, Hosted by Italy, Online*
Monday, 14 March 2022
13:00-16:00 (Brussels time)

Minutes

List of Participants

Country	Name	Last Name
Belgium Flemish Community	Magalie	Soenen
EI-ETUCE	Petri	Mantysaari
European Students' Union (ESU)	Jakub	Grodecki
European University Association (EUA)	Gohar	Hovhannisyan
EURASHE	Stéphane	Lauwick
European Commission	Pauline	Ravinet
Germany	David	Akrami Flores
Italy (Co-Chair)	Luca	Lantero
Italy	Ann Katherine	Isaacs
Italy	Vera	Lucke
Malta	Adam	Liwak
The Netherlands	Robert	Wagenaar
Romania (Co-Chair)	Daniela Cristina	Ghițulică
Romania	Andreia	Cucuruz
United Kingdom	John	Reilly
BFUG Secretariat	Kristina	Metallari
BFUG Secretariat	Jora	Vaso

Albania and EQAR did not attend the meeting.

1. Welcome by the Co-Chairs

The Co-chairs welcomed everybody to the third TF meeting for the 2021-2024 work period and introduced the new member of the group from EI-ETUCE and informed on their respective roles within the institution they represented.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda of the meeting was adopted without changes.

For more detailed information, please see [TF Enhancing Knowledge FR AZ 3 Agenda](#).

3. Information on recent developments

Luca Lantero (Co-Chair) informed the participants about an instructive webinar on the higher education (HE) system and qualifications for people from Ukraine that was held in Italy. Following that, the Co-Chair proposed to organize a "Bologna webinar" to highlight features of Ukraine's HE system and information directives, which was well-received by the majority of the members, as it highlighted the importance and relevance of the EHEA community. This webinar would be beneficial not just for Ukraine, but also for students with Russian qualifications, in terms of assisting with the recognition and valuation of their qualifications.

It was reported that ESU has developed an information center for students on their [website](#), in addition to information on qualification recognition, by establishing contact with student unions throughout Ukraine. As a result, it was encouraged to offer information on any ongoing national initiatives that were not published on the organization's website.

For more information on the situation in Ukraine: [UNHCR - Help Belgium](#)
[Belgium - Help for Ukraine](#)
[ESU - Help for Ukraine](#)

For more information about a support program by DAAD for Ukrainian students and HEIs, please see: [DAAD: Großes Unterstützungsprogramm für deutsche Hochschulen nötig - DAAD](#)

4. Presentation of the IN-GLOBAL project

Luca Lantero (Co-Chair) presented the IN-GLOBAL project, under the direction of Italy and Romania, created specifically to support the activities and objectives of this TF. As such, it was emphasized that not all activities in the project are to be implemented by the TF and CG on GPD¹, but that the two groups remain critical to the organizational structure of the project and will be involved in activities according to their capacities.

Mr. Lantero mentioned that the project has recently passed the approval stage by the European Commission and is currently awaiting the official ratification of the contract. The IN-GLOBAL project consortium was presented, as well as its governance structure, work packages and respective activities. The TF members' experience and participation in the activities of the project, as well as assisting in the selection of experts projected for the future implementation of activities were sought. The main objective of the project was highlighted to effectively gauge the perception of the Bologna Process among stakeholders and serve to sensitize, inform and clarify any misperception among stakeholders on the critical function of the Bologna Process in the promotion of higher education (HE). Increased awareness among stakeholders of the continued work and role of the BFUG was also deemed necessary.

Interaction and discussion at both the national and international levels and the enhancement of multilateral and bilateral relations were also noted as key project objectives. As such, the importance of the strategic selection and active involvement of internal and external members, such as UNESCO members or agencies like DAAD, Nuffic, ACA, was discussed, as well as their roles in the effective dissemination of information and implementation of project activities.

One of the main discussion points was centered on the selection of suitable experts foreseen for the project. One of the main recommendations, expressed by several of the TF members, was for the project coordinator to draft a very specific and detailed job description for the suggested "Internationalization expert" position in the project. Several titles were suggested for the above position so that it may more accurately reflect the required expertise and expected duties. Members agreed that that the expert could be an expert in HE reform and that this should be explicitly stated and well-phrased in the job description.

In conclusion, it was decided that a job description would be drafted and circulated among members who would then make amendments. Further, it was ultimately agreed upon that the call for application be a closed tender among BFUG member representatives.

¹ Coordination Group on Global Policy Dialogue

5. Presentation of the draft action plan

Daniela Cristina Ghitulica (Co-Chair) provided a brief update on the important takeaways from the BFUG Board meeting on February 9, 2022 for the TF's Action Plan. The action plan was praised for its innovative aspect, but it was pointed out that it may encompass a large range of activities that would be unfeasible to implement in the given work period.

Luca Lantero (Co-Chair) indicated that the [2019 survey](#) includes a summary of outcomes, as well as a clear indication of BFUG members' recommendations for Activity 1.1² He emphasized that the survey results can be utilized and the TF can create a preliminary draft based on these recommendations.

It was suggested that for Activity 1.2³, a doctorate candidate be subcontracted because there is a significant quantity of literature research and review to be conducted. Furthermore, timelines indicated in the Action Plan would be changed as a result of the project's starting point being later than anticipated. It was suggested to form a subgroup on this activity to prepare an initial draft by the end of April 2022 (new proposed timeline).

Romania was added to the 'Countries/Organizations involved' column of Activity 1.3⁴, and together with Italy, were tasked with compiling a draft of the survey and presenting it to the TF members. Because this activity is dependent on the outcome of Activity 1.2, it was agreed to postpone the survey until July or September, to produce a comprehensive version.

The countries and institutions to be involved in Activity 1.4⁵, namely Romania, Belgium Flemish and the European Commission were added to the 'Countries/Organizations involved' column.

In relation to Activity 5.3⁶, ESU reported that it has launched two podcasts, which have been positively received. To match the priorities of the Bologna Process and enhance the knowledge sharing concept, ESU offered to assist in the organization of this activity.

It was mentioned that in Activity 5.6⁷, putting the live chat function into practice may be difficult. As a result, it was suggested that this be converted to a FAQs section.

It was suggested that Activity 5.8⁸ be removed due to a lack of resources. Nonetheless, ESU recommended that this action be applied as a national guideline. Furthermore, this teachers' award task should be included in the recommendations report and best practice research.

A discussion was made on Activity 5.9⁹ on how to revitalize and optimize the usefulness of Bologna expert networks. From previous experience, it was discovered that these networks were beneficial in some countries but not in others. Nonetheless, several members suggested that these networks be reactive, so that best practices and knowledge sharing can be utilized again in a national and international/European context, as well as give momentum again to the Bologna Process. These expert networks were also suggested for identifying obstacles and assisting in the resolution of issues in HEIs. Nonetheless, it was suggested that instead of just

² Reviewing the material resulting from the BFUG 2019 survey on "The Future of the EHEA".

³ Inventory of specific studies / reports / articles / books about how the Bologna Process is perceived and understood, or that refer to the perception or consequences of the implementation of Bologna commitments and objectives or other initiatives related to the Bologna objectives that are not part of the BFUG work.

⁴ Developing and carrying out a survey.

⁵ Inventory of results and deliverables, with focus on dissemination activities, of projects funded within the dedicated Bologna Process calls of the ERASMUS+ project.

⁶ Series of TV/radio reportages on topics related to the Bologna process.

⁷ Developing a section within the EHEA website or/and social media destined to specific information for students, teachers, staff, researchers or the general public, which might include a live chat function.

⁸ The "Bologna professor" competition.

⁹ Guidance for activating Bologna experts networks.

replicating from previous Bologna Process networks, a new method of work and a new version/structure be developed to invest in peer learning and new ways of cooperating. It was also recommended that suggestions for this activity could be derived out of Task 3¹⁰.

The Bologna Process reforms and tools should be multidirectional, and networking is essential to prevent a top-down approach. Furthermore, it was noted that nationalism is corrosive, particularly in higher education, and the EHEA appears to transcend this with its tool, principles and guidelines. It was suggested that Activity 5.9 be restructured, breaking down the introspective national perspective and including an international dimension.

It was also highlighted that local hubs are considered inward-looking and mostly beneficial on a local setting. As EHEA is a network, these hubs were proposed to be collaborative and mutually supportive as a network, as opposed to being an internal activity. Consequently, the term 'network' was proposed to be added in Activity 5.10¹¹.

As an additional Action Plan activity, it was decided to establish a *newsletter*, as one of the tools for disseminating information, that would be used in the CG on GPD as well. On this matter, it was suggested that other communication forms and/or special software be investigated so that the newsletter is not prohibited as a result of mass emailing.

The Co-Chairs concluded that they would send a new version of the Action Plan via email with all of the comments from today's meeting incorporated, and that members would offer further comments on this revised version so that a final document could be presented at the upcoming BFUG meeting. Members were encouraged to join in and contribute to a variety of activities that they found of interest, and were instructed to submit an email expressing their interest to participate in these activities.

For more information, please see: [Draft Action Plan](#)

6. AoB

No other business was brought forward, therefore, the Co-Chairs thanked everyone for their contribution and the third meeting of the TF was concluded.

¹⁰ Propose to the BFUG ways to make the Bologna Process and its reform goals better understood and more transparent at national, institutional and individual level; as well as innovative ways of knowledge sharing, attractive and accessible for all, encouraging the sector to contribute proactively to the process.

¹¹ Guidance for starting local level Bologna hubs.