



Task Force on Enhancing Knowledge Sharing in EHEA

Fourth meeting, Hosted by Italy, Online*

7 December 2022

14:00-17:00 CET

Minutes of meeting

List of Participants

Country	Name	Last Name
Belgium Flemish Community	Magalie	Soenen
EI-ETUCE	Petri	Mantysaari
European Students' Union (ESU)	Iris	Kimizoglu
European University Association (EUA)	Michael	Gaebel
European Commission	Pauline	Ravinet
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
United Kingdom	John	Reilly
BFUG Secretariat	Kristina	Metallari
BFUG Secretariat	Aida	Myrto
BFUG Secretariat	Enis	Fita

Albania, Germany, EURASHE, EQAR did not attend the meeting.

1. Adoption of the agenda

The meeting's agenda was adopted without any change.

For more detailed information, please see: [TF Enhancing knowledge sharing 4 Agenda](#)

2. Information on recent developments

The meeting began with a discussion focused on issues related to the action plan, its problematic circulation, and the general amendments and recommendations that the task force (TF) members hoped to contribute during the present meeting.

Michael Gaebel (EUA) mentioned that the action plan was discussed in the BFUG meeting in Strasbourg in April 2022. Subsequently, the revised version was circulated among TF members

via e-mail in August 2022, and were given 10 days for feedback. It was agreed that this 10-day period in August was insufficient and inconvenient. It was objected to the approval of the Action Plan following this email, as they did not have the opportunity to properly respond, review it and give feedback. As a result, Mr. Gaebel and other members expressed their wish to discuss the Action Plan during the meeting. Luca Lantero (Co-Chair) clarified that this circulation process was agreed upon in Strasbourg in April 2022 but that suggestions can nonetheless be made during this meeting. He expressed his objective to reach a final proposal approved by all members and called for members' strong commitment on the Action Plan.

Regarding the Action Plan, it was recommended that it be more reader-friendly but also more focused, dynamic and operational. Recommendations included using national teams of Bologna Process (BP) experts, as has been done in the past, organizing meetings and allocating budget for promotional activities that can help to truly change perceptions of the academic community in the 49 European Higher Education Area (EHEA) countries. It was underlined that the BP experts' method is effective in involving all HE stakeholders and promoting EHEA.

A clear distinction and division of tasks was requested to be made between the In-Global project consortium and the TF while considering that the changes to the Action Plan proposed should remain within the scope of the TF. Members agreed that there is a lack of clarity on the exact purpose of the main activities (MA) and the subsidiary activities (SA) as well as the actors responsible to carry them out.

It was clarified that the main promotion of the Bologna Process instruments should be realized at the national level and according to national needs. The possible elimination of the TF was mentioned but there were objections from majority of members, arguing that the TF must continue its work to reach its objectives. To this point, it was emphasized that the EHEA-level central coordination and international approach of the former BP experts was what made the method effective and impactful.

It was suggested that the current challenges should be tackled with updated and relevant promotion methods. The BP experts worked well in the past only in a few EHEA countries, so other methods should be sought that reflect the current state of affairs and each country's perception of the Bologna Process.

There was some amount of dissatisfaction expressed from the members and Co-Chairs on the progress made on the Action Plan. Amid requests to drive a more concrete discussion on specific amendments suggested by members on the Action Plan, Mr. Luca Lantero cited his own reservations about the TF work and announced his decision to step down as Co-Chair of the TF, but expressed that he will continue to represent the In-Global project.

3. Discussion of the Action Plan

Daniela Cristina Ghitulica (Co-Chair) began by addressing each specific activity included in the action plan. There were requests to focus on the revision of the main activities and how these relate to the subsidiary activities as well as to determine the actors responsible for each. It was decided that Mr. Petri Mantysaari's proposed edits to the text would be accepted with no further discussion, and that any further editing as well as details on methodology, countries involved and timeline would be done online and in writing at a later stage.

It was reiterated that, to begin real work on the Action Plan's activities, the methodology should clearly define the entities responsible for each task, establish a balanced level of engagement from the project consortium and the TF, and state who is expected to initiate action. It was noted that, while there are countries assigned to activities, there must be an individual who

can take the lead and initiate action.

Regarding Main Activity (MA) 1, it was recommended that the 2019 consultation on "The Future of the EHEA" be revisited in order to distill any information that can enrich the structure of the recommendations. However, it was argued that this information should be updated and supplemented with current practical suggestions. A discussion session at the BFUG on how countries communicate on the Bologna Process at the national level and what works and the feedback received from HEIs, was suggested. It was decided that the project consortium is mainly responsible for carrying out MA 1.

On MA 2, an edit in the methodology was suggested, which gives the main responsibility of the activity to the project consortium "with the input of the task force," as the task force cannot provide the communications expert. It was confirmed that the project consortium has the capacity to make an expert available as soon as the activity is approved. A question was raised on who will prepare the brief of the communications and what the job description will entail. There was also a suggestion not to edit out the phrase "*taking into consideration the specific needs of countries*" as there are some singularities in countries' Higher Education (HE) sectors which the project should take into account.

On Subsidiary Activity (SA) 1, it was reiterated that the translation of the Rome Communiqué in all EHEA languages will be the responsibility of the project consortium.

Regarding SA 3, it was recommended that some helpful best practices may be gathered from Germany, which have already implemented similar broadcasting-related activities, as well as from the project consortium with the EURONEWS channel. There was a question on what comes after the TF develops the concepts of the TV series, podcasts, and other media content, and who will be in charge of implementing these concepts. It was suggested that the methodology should include recommendations on how to reach and involve all stakeholders in HE, government and civil society through media.

Concerning SA4, an idea was put forth to have an inclusive meeting where researchers, teachers, students and other stakeholders can make recommendations to the ministers what to push as the country's policy. It was commented that developing general guidelines for coordinating events may be too far-reaching as an objective and that input on topics would be sufficient.

On SA 5, there was a question regarding the methodology, specifically on what is to be expected after the concept is developed by TF members.

On SA 6, it was agreed that the live-chat option may be an expensive option to add to the website. It was also clarified that the project's website will not be part of the EHEA website, but that it will be a separate page accessed from the EHEA website via a link. It was emphasized that having an attractive website is crucial and a priority in terms of effective communication with stakeholders. There were questions on the target audience of the site and whether this includes internal BFUG stakeholders or the wider HE community.

On SA 7, there was a request to clarify and give examples on the specific types of organizations expected to collaborate and organize common activities.

Suggestions on SA 8 were to have an online award, like the Bologna Professor of the Week, on the website, in order to lend it a human element and make it more attractive. To increase website traffic, there can be articles or podcasts on professors who benefit from the values of the EHEA. It was emphasized that students should be at the core of all of the suggestions made

on the action plan and that the proposal should avoid activities that have been done in the past. It was underlined that the TF decided in the past to eliminate this activity so it is not clear how it appeared in the revised version.

Regarding SA 9, members asked questions on the focus groups, and whether they are national, international, online or physical and the number of focus groups projected. It was clarified that these groups do not consist of BP experts but include a variety of stakeholders and experts from selected countries. The focus groups, it was explained, are a method of collecting information to use for the organization and coordination of the BP expert groups. It was suggested that countries that already have expert teams can share their experiences and best practices at the BFUG. It was argued that non-EU EHEA countries may be given particular attention.

Lastly, regarding the Bologna hubs of SA 10, there was a proposal to expand these hubs to include different stakeholders, especially students. Some members opted to delete this activity as the consultative members are already an effective BP hub, which can be supported by the project to reach stakeholders at the national level in their countries. A suggestion was to set up a sustainable grassroots structure that encourages continuous active participation. It was emphasized that a strong infrastructure is key in maintaining stakeholders' interest over time. Finally, was decided to propose one activity that encapsulates SA9 and SA10.

It was signaled that in a previous meeting the TF decided on the inclusion of a newsletter, that is not part of the revised version. It was decided to include it again.

It was reiterated that participation of all stakeholder groups should be at the core of this draft action plan and enshrined in every single recommendation that is being prepared. The TF should think of creative indirect approaches to discuss the Bologna Process and make it attractive and relevant to stakeholders, by promoting specific aspects of it separately, such as recognition, fundamental values, and other topics that are particularly relevant to stakeholders.

4. Conclusions

The issue of the long gaps in communication among TF members was brought up. It was emphasized that the loop needs to be improved in terms of the flow of information between members. The members requested that they be kept regularly updated on the progress of the action plan and that the BFUG Secretariat should share all comments and feedback with the entire TF as they receive them. An online collaboration platform would be extremely beneficial.

In conclusion, it was decided that Italy will collect the feedback on the action plan. It was stated that, it would be to have new countries and organizations join and be assigned to activities as they see fit. New proposals should be sent via e-mail to the Co-Chairs by January 15th, 2023.

The version of the Action Plan incorporating comments received and the discussions will be sent via email. All feedback will be collected and work will resume on a new version of the draft action plan to be discussed in an online meeting to be organized as soon as possible. On this note, the meeting was concluded.