# Draft - guidelines for narrative texts for the Bologna Process Implementation Report 2027

## Introduction

At its meeting in Warsaw, the BFUG accepted in principle the proposal made by the Working Group on Monitoring the Implementation of the Bologna Process for the 2027 edition of the Bologna Process Implementation Report. This proposal includes the following key elements:

1) Significant reduction in the number of indicators from the 2024 report

2) Focus on indicators related to policy commitments, and elimination of statistical indicators except those that relate to a policy commitment (e.g. mobility)

3) Addition of a narrative section in chapters to describe European-level projects and actions supporting implementation of policy commitments since 2024.

For the third element, the proposal was that Bologna working groups should be primarily responsible for providing narrative texts. This idea was supported and confirmed by the Co-chairs of the working groups in a meeting with the Co-chairs of the Monitoring Working Group.

## Purpose

The purpose of this document is to propose guidelines to ensure that there is a common approach to how these texts are written.

## Common elements for texts

Texts should aim to describe the main activities and projects that have been put in place to support implementation across the EHEA since 2024.

The texts should follow the political commitments in the thematic area as set out in the Bologna Process Ministerial Communiqués.

Texts should focus on the EHEA rather than individual countries. However, changes in specific countries may be used as examples to highlight positive practice and achievements.

Texts should highlight both advances in implementing political commitments, and also - where it is the case – difficulties that have come to light through activities, projects and working group discussion.

Where progress has clearly been made in at least some countries, the factors that facilitated progress should be outlined (if they are known). Where there has been a lack of progress, possible reasons should be discussed.

Texts should be based on clearly referenced evidence and presented objectively.

Texts should be concise. No more than 6000 words should be submitted.

**Issues to discuss**

1) Are there any elements missing in this first draft of the guidelines?
2) Would it be a good idea to have an overall editor for the narrative texts? (to ensure coherence in style)
3) Who should have responsibility for selecting an author for the texts?
4) Who should have responsibility for approving the text to be published in the report (before going to the BFUG)? Monitoring WG, or the thematic working group?