

**Minutes of the 3rd Working Group on Monitoring the  
Implementation of the Bologna Process meeting  
Hybrid, Vienna (Austria)  
15th-16th of October 2025**

**List of participants**

Nr.	Name	Country / Organisation
1	Entela Haloci	Albania (online)
2	Helga Posset	Austria (Co-chair)
3	Kyriacos Charalambous	Cyprus (online)
4	Cleo Savvidou	Cyprus (online)
5	Henriette Stoeber	EUA
6	David Crosier	Eurydice (Co-chair)
7	Roland Farkas	Eurydice
8	Kristina Hauschildt	Eurostudent
9	Franziska Sophia Knogler	ESU
10	Stefan Sant	Malta (Co-chair)
11	Marius Deaconu	Romania (online)
12	Aydın Aslan	Türkiye (online)
13	Oana Alexandra Țîntar	EHEA Secretariat

Kazakhstan and the Republic of Moldova were absent.

ETUCE, EQAR, France, Germany, Montenegro and Slovenia sent their apologies.

## Day 1

### 1. Introduction to the meeting by the Co-chairs

#### 1.1. Adoption of the agenda

#### 1.2. Update from the EHEA Secretariat

#### 1.3. Update on the work of the Working Group

#### Documents: [WG Monitoring 3 DK LI 1 Draft Agenda](#)

The Austrian Co-chair opened the meeting by welcoming the participants and inviting them to introduce themselves. As the participants did not raise any issues, the agenda was adopted as proposed by the Co-chairs.

The EHEA Secretariat member informed that 39 National Action Plans had been received from the EHEA member countries and had been published on the EHEA website. The NAPs were divided per key commitments. She explained that work was under way to compare the NAPs with the areas identified in the 2024 Bologna Process Implementation Report as implementation gaps. The resulting analysis would be made available first to the Bologna Implementation Coordination Group and subsequently to the BFUG, outlining the extent to which the NAPs address the implementation issues identified in the BPIR 2024. The representative further noted that the next BFUG meeting was expected to feature a substantial agenda, including the first drafts of the revised ECTS Users' Guide and the ESG. It was added that the Working Group on Internationalisation and Mobility would present a glossary note on terminology related to internationalisation and mobility, which could be of particular interest to the WG on Monitoring, as terminology alignment may have implications for future monitoring activities. Concerning the Working Group on Fundamental Values, she mentioned that several meetings and exchanges between the WG on FV and the WG on Monitoring had taken place regarding the proposed de jure indicators on Fundamental Values to be included in the data collection for BPIR 2027. Finally, the representative underlined that most BFUG working structures had sought liaison with the WG on Monitoring, highlighting its central role within the architecture of the 2024-2027 Work Programme, and expressed appreciation to the Co-chairs of the WG for their active engagement with the other working structures.

The Austrian Co-chair reported that, since the last meeting, the Maltese Co-chair had participated in the meeting of the Working Group on Fundamental Values held in Malta.

She added that a joint meeting had been organised with the Co-chairs of other BFUG working structures, to discuss the proposal for the 2027 Bologna Process Implementation Report. She further informed that 2 online meetings had taken place with the Co-chairs of the WG on Fundamental Values, underlying that progress was being made and expressed confidence that a coherent approach would be achieved.

## 2. Update on latest developments on BPIR 2027 indicators - discussion

### Documents:

### [WG Monitoring 3 DK LI 2 1 Revised Draft Proposal of Structure and Indicators BPIR 2027](#)

The Eurydice Co-chair presented the latest developments related to the indicators for the 2027 Bologna Process Implementation Report. He reported that, following the meeting with the Co-chairs of the other BFUG working structures, it had been agreed that the other working structures would draft narrative text for the BPIR 2027. These narrative sections would describe the activities undertaken to support implementation by the respective working structures and by the EU funded projects they are involved in. He noted that while further details on the format and length of the texts remained to be defined, the principle of including narrative contributions from all working structures had been confirmed.

He noted that further discussions with the WG on FV would be required to identify the most feasible path forward on the Fundamental Values chapter. It had been agreed that the WG on Monitoring would use the questions proposed by WG on FV in the data collection process, with the understanding that comments could be provided on wording and formulation, though the final decision would remain with WG FV.

He explained that three potential options were being considered for reporting on fundamental values in the BPIR 2027: i) all reporting covered by the WG on FV with an explanation in BPIR; ii) BPIR including a narrative section on the monitoring framework without indicators or iii) including a limited section based solely on governmental data for de jure indicators, which could however only offer a partial perspective and create inconsistencies with the indicators/methodological approach of the WG on FV.

He further informed that it had been agreed that the WG on Monitoring would clean and validate the collected data before sharing it with the WG on Fundamental Values and the NewFAV 2 project. Any incomplete or incorrect information identified during quality checks would be sent back to the countries for correction. The Eurydice Co-chair concluded that progress had been made in agreeing on the principles and process for collaboration with WG FV, although the final outcomes remained to be defined. The Eurostudent representative inquired whether the data collection on Fundamental Values would be conducted within the framework of the regular questionnaire for BPIR, using the same procedure for checking indicators and references. She also raised a concern regarding the timeline for completing the process, noting that in the previous cycle, several iterations with countries had been required, which might make the timeframe particularly tight depending on the final approach adopted. In response, the Eurydice Co-chair acknowledged that the proposed timeline was feasible in principle, noting that the data collection for Fundamental Values monitoring framework and the regular BPIR questionnaire were officially aligned and expected to take place in parallel. He underlined, however, that it remained to be seen how this would work in practice. He expressed confidence that the simplified set of indicators and the reduced volume of data to be collected from countries would help ensure a smoother process compared to the previous cycle. If delays or challenges were to occur, it was mentioned that prioritising the Fundamental Values indicators could be considered to facilitate timely completion. He concluded that both groups had jointly developed and agreed upon a coordinated approach to ensure coherence between

the monitoring processes and that the BFUG would be informed of this coordinated work, demonstrating that the agreements reached were deliberate and systematic rather than ad hoc.

## Degree structures - chapter 1

### Figure 2.3

The Eurydice Co-chair explained that, in the previous meeting, it had been proposed to drop this indicator, as there were no formal Bologna Process commitments related to the combination of ECTS credits across the two cycles. However, a comment received from the TPG A had underlined that it remained relevant for contextual reasons, as in many countries the total workload of the first and second cycles is considered when granting access to the third cycle, and such information also provides context for flexible learning pathways. The EUA representative asked whether there had been any developments regarding this indicator in recent years, questioning whether there was sufficient rationale to maintain it and, in any case, that it should be retained at most in the annex. In response, the Eurydice Co-chair explained that, although changes over time were generally limited, some countries might adjust the balance between 180 and 240 ECTS first-cycle programmes, which could result in shifts in the total workload across the first and second cycles. He expressed openness in retaining the indicator, noting that the collection of data for this indicator would not pose a significant burden and that no sources other than BPIR offer data on this indicator.

The Turkish representative considered that the indicator could be dropped entirely. He suggested that, if necessary, a short explanatory narrative text could be added to clarify how the two cycles were combined. In response, the Eurydice Co-chair highlighted that a principle should be established regarding the consistency between narrative text and data presentation. He underlined that narrative text should directly correspond to data displayed in the report, and that having data only in the annex but descriptive text in the main body would be confusing for readers. He concluded that if data were to be placed in the annex, no related explanatory text should appear in the report, to maintain clarity and coherence of presentation.

It was agreed that the indicator would be kept in an annex.

### Figure 2.5

The Eurydice Co-chair noted that a comment had been received from the TPG B, suggesting that students enrolled in medicine should be excluded from the dataset. The argument was that, while medicine is typically offered as a long, integrated programme, there have been European-level efforts to increase enrolment in medicine, which could appear contradictory compared with maintaining a maximum share of students in long programmes in order to conform with the implementation of the three-cycle system. He acknowledged that the reasoning was valid in principle, but underlined that excluding medicine students would not be technically feasible, as most countries would not be able to provide disaggregated data for this purpose.

The Austrian Co-chair mentioned that not all countries offer medicine exclusively as a long integrated programme, noting that bachelor and master structures already exist in some systems, demonstrating that the three-cycle structure was feasible in this field. She added that the share of medicine students alone would not lead countries to reach the 10-20% threshold observed for long integrated programmes and thus supported retaining the information in the

annex and keeping medicine included, noting that excluding it would require making distinctions between dentistry, human medicine and other related fields, which would not be practical for data collection. The Romanian representative added that medicine was not the only field offered as a long, integrated programme, noting that architecture and several other study fields were in a similar situation.

It was agreed that the indicator would be kept in an annex in its initial form.

### **Figure 2.8**

The Eurydice Co-chair reported that a comment had been received from the German Co-chair of the Working Group on Internationalisation and Mobility. The comment noted that, in the German system, it was not considered necessary to include microcredentials in the National Qualifications Framework for their successful delivery, and therefore questioned the objectives of the indicator. The German proposal had been to replace the figure with an indicator showing the percentage of institutions offering microcredentials. The Eurydice Co-chair noted that the alternative indicator was likely to be less accurate than the current one, while, by contrast, the current indicator could be easily verified, making it a more robust and technically feasible option.

The Maltese Co-chair noted that, for a microcredential to be related to the NQF, it must be accredited, whereas institutions may offer short learning programmes that they themselves regard as microcredentials without these being subject to the same accreditation standards as traditional programmes. This could lead to a dilution of the concept, resulting in data that are inconsistent or not comparable. The EUA representative expressed support for retaining the current figure, noting that it provided useful information. She added that EUA had also encountered difficulties with such definitions for the Trends survey, therefore using a broader category encompassing microcredentials, badges, learning certificates and other non-degree offerings. She informed the group that EUA would collect data on microcredentials again in 2027, and proposed that there could be an opportunity to discuss adjustments to the definition used in Trends so that it aligns more closely with the concept in the BPIR.

It was agreed that the indicator would be kept in its initial form.

### **Figure 2.11**

The Eurydice Co-chair noted that a comment had been received from the TPG A, suggesting that the criteria used for this Scorecard indicator should be reviewed since several countries report full implementation even though they have not renewed their self-certification for several years. As such, the proposal was to not only reflect whether self-certification had been carried out, but also whether it had been completed within a reasonable timeframe. He expressed agreement with this suggestion and observed that a ten-year period would be a “very safe” criterion, unlikely to be challenged by the BFUG. Following the group discussion, it was concluded that the issue would be further examined.

## Recognition - chapter 2

### Figure 2.14

The Eurydice Co-chair explained that the initial proposal had been to drop this indicator, as it does not reflect a Bologna Process commitment, but rather provides supplementary information related to the implementation of Article VII of LRC. He reported that TPG B had argued in favour of keeping the figure for two main reasons. First, the European Qualifications Passport for Refugees (EQPR) is explicitly mentioned in both the Rome and Tirana Communiqués, and secondly, although some countries do not have a legal provision on Article VII embedded in national legislation, they nonetheless implement the article in practice through the use of tools such as the EQPR or the ENIC/NARIC toolkit. From this perspective, retaining the figure would provide useful information on how countries support the recognition of refugees' qualifications, even in the absence of formal legal commitments.

EUA questioned whether it was necessary to retain the figure in the report, noting that the Council of Europe had conducted several surveys on the implementation of Article VII, including both dedicated reports and broader monitoring exercises. Supported by Malta and Cyprus, EUA therefore suggested placing it in the annex, should the group decide to keep it.

The Maltese Co-chair further noted that EQPR happened to be aligned with meeting a particular obligation under Article VII, but that alone should not justify expanding the scope of the report beyond what is necessary and in contrast with many other tools developed and which are not referenced.

The Eurostudent representative noted that, in the Tirana Communiqué, reference was made not only to the EQPR but also to other tools and instruments supporting the recognition of refugees' qualifications, which would justify not including only one of them. The EUA representative added that the figure could be cross-referenced with existing data collected by the Council of Europe and UNESCO.

The Co-chairs concluded that data would not be collected on this matter and the information could be addressed in the narrative section through cross-references from UNESCO or the Council of Europe without a dedicated figure.

### Figure 4.3

The Eurydice Co-chair noted that the proposal had been to move the indicator on recognition of prior learning from the Social Dimension chapter to the Recognition chapter, which would strengthen this thematic area and provide a broader understanding of recognition. He noted that the Italian Co-chair of TPG B initially expressed that the indicator might fit better under Social Dimension, which however had been expressed before the broader discussion on the Social Dimension chapter had taken place.

The Austrian Co-chair stated that recognition of prior learning should belong within the broader recognition framework, rather than being treated as an additional or marginal element under Social Dimension, and noted that the Social Dimension chapter already encompassed a wide range of topics.

## Quality assurance - chapter 3

### Figure 2.19

The Eurydice Co-chair reported that a comment had been received from the EUA Co-chair of the BICG, noting that international participation in external quality assurance is not referenced in a normative way in the ESG, nor is it expected to be added in future revisions. He noted that the Head of the EHEA Secretariat had responded by recalling that the commitment to international participation in quality assurance predates the ESG, originating in the 2003 Bologna Process discussions. He emphasised that no proposal had been made to remove the indicator, and, as there were no objections from the group, it was agreed that the indicator would be kept.

### Figure 2.22

The Eurydice Co-chair reported that the first comment received concerned the accuracy of the title of the figure. The EUA Co-chair of the BICG had pointed out that the figure does not reflect countries using the European Approach, but rather shows whether higher education institutions within those countries have used the European Approach for the external quality assurance of joint programmes. He noted that this could be easily resolved by adjusting the title to: “Countries where higher education institutions have used the European Approach” or similar wording. He further reported that an additional comment had been submitted by TPG C, proposing the inclusion of a new indicator on transnational education and whether same quality assurance standards apply as for domestic provision, which was also supported by ENQA. Furthermore, ENQA informed in writing through the Secretariat that they would survey ministries and QA agencies specifically on TNE in the upcoming 6 months under ROQA-TNE project, which could be used for collecting the data for this figure and thus decreasing the burden for the WG on Monitoring. Potential indicators could monitor the framework for the QA of TNE, e.g. covered under the same process as domestic HE, covered in a separate specific framework, not explicitly covered/mentioned in national framework etc.

The Eurydice Co-chair clarified that the proposed indicator could easily be included in the report, with ENQA cited as the data source. He noted that EQAR was already used as a data source for other indicators within the same chapter. Furthermore, the EHEA Secretariat presented the points transmitted by the EQAR representative via email regarding this figure, namely supporting adjusting the title and confirming that DEQAR could be used for the number/percentage of HEIs that have undergone an EA review. They also outlined how DEQAR could support an indicator on TNE (number of HEIs operating outside home country, HEIs evaluated by CBQA or CBQA reviews per QA agency), yet highlighted the importance of terminological accuracy and the difficulty of qualitatively monitoring the QA of TNE.

The Eurydice Co-chair responded that the WG could include a new indicator on the QA of TNE based on the data collected by ENQA and available from EQAR, without having the WG involved in additional methodological complexities.

The EUA representative asked a general question concerning the definition of TNE. She noted that, according to the glossary developed by the sub-group of the Working Group on Internationalisation and Mobility, TNE was considered a commonly understood term, and therefore the sub-group had concluded that it did not need to be included in their glossary. She

added that the WG IM glossary had been developed partly on the basis of the terminology used in previous BPIRs. She therefore sought clarification on the workflow and coordination between the two structures. The Eurydice Co-chair underlined the need for coordination and discussion with the WG on IM and added that Eurydice had also begun internal discussions, as a new iteration of the Mobility Scoreboard was being prepared, and it was similarly important not to introduce definitions inconsistent with those of the WG on IM. He noted that the Co-chairs would request a discussion on the draft glossary with the WG on IM.

The EHEA Secretariat member noted that the WG on IM would be presenting their draft glossary to the upcoming BFUG meeting and offered to liaise with the WG on IM.

## **Fundamental Values - chapter 4**

The Eurydice Co-chair recalled the agreements reached between the WG on Monitoring and the WG on Fundamental Values, including on the terminology, the wording of questions, and the conceptual framing of the indicators. He explained that the WG on Monitoring would include questions on the de jure indicators in the questionnaire to be launched in 2026, and that the final wording of these questions would be agreed with the WG FV. He further clarified that the WG on Monitoring would transfer the collected data to the WG FV only after it had been cleaned and validated. Once the dataset would be complete and quality-checked, the WG FV and the project team would use it for their own analysis. The decision on whether and how to include fundamental values indicators in the BPIR 2027 would be taken at a later stage, once the FV project had progressed sufficiently. Regarding the indicators, he noted that there was little need to discuss them in detail at that stage, since the exact wording of questions may still change following joint discussions with the WG FV. He highlighted that the only significant difference compared to the 2024 report concerned the area of public responsibility for and of higher education. He recalled that, for the 2024 edition, the WG on Monitoring had concluded that it was extremely difficult to develop meaningful indicators in that area and thus had decided not to develop a synthetic scorecard indicator on public responsibility in 2024. He noted, however, that the WG on FV intended to collect data on topics linked to public responsibility.

The EUA representative noted that they had already raised significant concerns regarding certain parts of the draft list of indicators, particularly where it appeared impossible to formulate questions that would accurately reflect national situations, given the breadth and complexity of the topics. She added that EUA was worried that including such questions in the questionnaire could implicitly endorse regulation or legislation in areas where EUA would not support legislative intervention, even if the exercise remained informational in intent. She noted that the response often heard in the group was that, because certain elements had been included in the Statements on Fundamental Values adopted by ministers, the data now needed to be collected. She stressed that it would be important for the WG on Monitoring to have a further opportunity to comment once the WG on Fundamental Values had progressed in its work. Finally, she indicated that EUA could support the process by cross-referencing data from the Trends survey. She invited the Working Group, as well as the WG on Fundamental Values, to suggest specific areas where EUA Trends data collection could generate useful inputs for their respective reports.

## **Social Dimension - chapter 5**

The Eurydice Co-chair noted that the TPG D on Social Dimension would meet in November and discuss the indicators. He noted that the Working Group had to reduce the content of the Social Dimension chapter by approximately half, which meant that a maximum of five scorecard indicators could be retained. In addition to these indicators, the chapter would also include narrative text reflecting the work being carried out. He explained that the Working Group had proposed an initial selection of indicators based on the principle of maintaining a balanced representation of areas where progress remained limited and areas where implementation was comparatively more advanced. Furthermore, he informed the group that a comment had been received from ESU, expressing a preference for retaining the indicator on guidance and counselling, which had been proposed for removal. He noted, however, that ESU had not indicated which other indicator should be dropped instead, and that such a substitution would be required if their proposal were to be accommodated. The Eurydice Co-chair also recalled that the indicator on recognition of prior learning would be moved to the Recognition chapter, while indicators related to international mobility would be moved to the Internationalisation and Mobility chapter. He concluded by noting that, despite the reductions required in the Social Dimension chapter, the Working Group would in fact be retaining a substantial amount of Social Dimension content.

The Austrian Co-chair noted that since all countries provide guidance and counselling services, the more relevant issue would be their quality, evaluation and effectiveness.

The Eurydice Co-chair reflected on the indicator concerning guidance and counselling, noting that the underlying challenge illustrated a broader issue encountered in the development of Social Dimension indicators. He recalled that the Working Group developed indicators that aligned as closely as possible with the Principles and Guidelines adopted by ministers. This approach ensured a strong political basis, however it did not always lead to high-quality or meaningful indicators, particularly when limited to top-level information. In the case of guidance and counselling, the indicator could only capture whether there was a legal requirement to provide such services free of charge, without assessing effectiveness. Conversely, the fact that for many indicators countries still performed poorly overall highlighted the scale of the challenges in the social dimension area. He concluded by noting that these methodological limitations provided an interesting parallel with the work currently being undertaken by the WG on Fundamental Values.

## **Internationalisation and mobility - chapter 6**

The Eurydice Co-chair reported that several comments had been received from the Dutch Co-chair of the WG on Internationalisation and Mobility. He clarified BPIR would not include a standalone chapter of statistical data, and that the use of statistics would be limited to mobility data available through the European Higher Education Sector Observatory (EHESO). He explained that EHESO currently included Eurostat mobility data, and that there was an intention that its geographical coverage may be expanded to include all EHEA countries. He stressed that the European Commission supported the idea of extending the country-level data collection used by Eurostat to non-Eurostat EHEA countries. However, he noted that, while the extension might be completed in time for the 2027 report, this remained unlikely. He explained

that the concern expressed by the Dutch Co-chair of the WG on IM was that the absence of a statistical chapter would prevent the monitoring of trends over time. He clarified that this was not the case, as EHESO includes annual time series, ensuring that progress - and lack of progress - can still be tracked.

The next point raised by the Dutch WG on IM Co-chair concerned methodological inconsistencies in mobility data. He had noted that countries - and even individual institutions - sometimes apply different definitions when reporting mobility figures. The Eurydice Co-chair emphasised this longstanding challenge lies outside the remit of the WG and that Eurostat already provided a standard definition.

He then referred to the Netherlands' comment mentioning that the BPIR tends to focus more on outgoing mobility than on incoming mobility, and that the report should address push and pull factors, the share of foreign-language instruction, and other related issues. The Eurydice Co-chair explained that such topics cannot be included at present, as they are not linked to existing Bologna policy commitments. Moreover, the Eurydice Co-chair noted that the Dutch Co-chair had also raised the issue of giving more attention to staff mobility and to examining joint, double and multiple degrees in greater depth. He explained, however, that the Working Group faced a clear methodological limitation in this area. At present, there is no established methodology for collecting comparable data on joint, double or multiple degrees across EHEA systems. He emphasised that the WG on Monitoring cannot collect such data, and that, to date, no other body had developed a viable approach for doing so. As a result, it would not be feasible to include such information in the next report.

## Technical details

The Eurydice Co-chair informed the Working Group that work on the BPIR 2027 questionnaire would begin in the coming weeks. The Eurydice team would be fully in place in November, allowing preparation of the questionnaire to start shortly thereafter. He raised the issue of communication channels with countries during the data collection phase. In previous reporting cycles, Eurydice had contacted countries directly, using its own communication channels. However, given the current practice and the well-established communication flow between the EHEA Secretariat and BFUG members, he proposed that the forthcoming data collection should be channelled through the Secretariat. Under this approach, Eurydice would transmit the questionnaire to the Secretariat, who would then distribute it to countries and return the completed questionnaires to Eurydice. This would ensure consistency, facilitate smoother communication, and build on a process with which countries were already familiar. He added that Eurydice intended to pre-fill the questionnaire as extensively as possible, using verified responses from the 2024 data collection whenever the same questions were retained. This would help countries identify changes more easily and reduce their workload. Nevertheless, Eurydice would still need to carry out the usual quality checks, including verification of references and follow-up requests to countries where clarification or additional documentation was required.

In terms of timeline, the Eurydice Co-chair indicated that the questionnaire was expected to be ready by February, taking into account possible adjustments requested by the BFUG. Drawing on the experience from the 2024 cycle, he noted that although the questionnaire had been launched in February, the final responses had not been received until September, which had

created significant pressure during the quality-checking phase and the drafting of the report. For the 2027 cycle, the aim would be to ensure that questionnaires are returned and fully quality-checked by the summer, allowing sufficient time for analysis and drafting. He noted that this target should be more achievable in the upcoming cycle, as a significant portion of the questionnaire would be pre-filled, including elements that could not be pre-filled during the previous round (such as the social dimension questions). Once the draft questionnaire is ready, it will be shared with the Working Group for comments, particularly to identify any questions that may present difficulties for countries. He clarified that the questionnaire itself will not require BFUG approval, but that the Working Group would brief the BFUG on the methodology used and the process agreed with the Working Group on Fundamental Values regarding their data collection.

The EHEA Secretariat member confirmed the Secretariat's full availability to support the proposed approach.

## End of day 1

### Day 2

The Maltese Co-chair opened the second day of the meeting and informed members that a slight adjustment to the agenda was being proposed. The revised agenda for Day 2 agreed by members was therefore structured as follows:

3. Discussion on the WG on Fundamental Values proposal of indicators for BPIR 2027
4. Discussion on the WG on IM draft note on terminology
5. Division of tasks and planning of narrative inputs from Working Groups
6. Wrap-up, next steps and AOB

## 3. Discussion on the WG on Fundamental Values proposal of indicators for BPIR 2027

### Documents: [WG Monitoring 3 DK LI 3 FV proposal of indicators BPIR 2027](#)

For question **Q1.1**, The Eurydice Co-chair pointed out that the expression “customary practice” was too broad and could lead to divergent interpretations. He suggested that such terms should be accompanied by a definition in the glossary to ensure consistency and avoid ambiguity during data collection. The Maltese Co-chair suggested that it might be worth noting that “customary practice” does not constitute legislation, so its inclusion under this category could be misleading unless explicitly clarified.

For question **Q1.5**, the Eurydice Co-chair noted that, methodologically, some countries might indicate that certain dimensions of academic freedom are covered by law, even though no specific legal text explicitly refers to them. This could create ambiguity when verifying information or conducting data analysis. Furthermore, he pointed out that, for consistency with the wording of the first and third questions, it might be preferable to use the term “legislation” here as well, rather than “legal document”.

For question **Q4.3**, EUA noted that the eighth response option appeared overly lengthy and unclear, making it difficult to determine whether it referred to a single indicator or several combined elements. The Maltese Co-chair suggested that the Working Group might wish to express some reservations regarding the formulation of the question, particularly in terms of whether it would allow for consistent and meaningful responses across countries. The Eurydice Co-chair expressed concern that the question combined elements that could be verified with others for which verification would not be possible. He cautioned that this risked undermining the reliability of the verifiable components. He further noted that, within the broader methodology of the WG on Fundamental Values - where responses to these questions are later combined with information from other sources - the complexity and lack of verifiability would be amplified.

For question **Q4.7**, the Austrian Co-chair pointed out that in higher education systems with several sectors operating under different legal frameworks and levels of institutional autonomy, relevant provisions may be spread across multiple documents. This would make it difficult to clearly distinguish between system-level and institutional-level regulations when responding to the question.

For question **Q3.9**, EUA noted that multiple concepts were being merged into a single response option ("Right to initiate debates and table proposals in all governing bodies and participate in discussion of and decision on them"), limiting the ability of countries to provide accurate and nuanced answers. The Eurydice Co-chair suggested separating the mentioned elements into distinct response options.

For question **Q5.1**, EUA pointed out that it may be difficult for countries to identify specific legislation addressing certain purposes (e.g. personal development). Moreover, the Eurydice Co-chair mentioned that as some purposes (such as preparation for the labour market) are likely to receive a uniform "yes" response, the question may have limited value in distinguishing between national approaches. Thus it might be useful to reconsider how this information could be captured more meaningfully.

For question **Q6.1**, the Eurydice Co-chair highlighted that it might be helpful to include a short definition of the term "higher education communities" to enhance clarity and shared interpretation. Eurostudent stressed that the response option "Equip graduates with general, specialized and ethical knowledge, understanding, support them in developing the ability to act and to decide what action to take and what action to refrain from taking" combined several distinct elements which may not all be equally regulated or addressed.

Finally, as for **General remarks**, the WG considered that questions that include long lists of items or dimensions may lead to automatic or less reflective responses, as respondents tend to select similar answers across items once a pattern is established. It might therefore be useful to consider simplifying or shortening such lists to encourage more deliberate and differentiated answers. Furthermore, the WG found that some response options appear to combine multiple sub-elements or dimensions within a single statement. This may create ambiguity for respondents, as some parts may apply while others may not. It might be advisable to separate such components into distinct, single-focus items to improve clarity and data reliability. On the same note, some of the more detailed items might be better suited to a narrative or descriptive approach, which could allow for more nuanced and meaningful input from respondents

#### 4. Discussion on the WG on IM draft note on terminology

The Eurydice Co-chair pointed out that the BPIR would include a glossary, as in previous editions, and underlined the importance of ensuring full alignment with the definitions developed by the WG on Internationalisation and Mobility. As long as the definitions were not problematic, they would be adopted in the glossary of the BPIR, in order to avoid inconsistencies across EHEA documents.

The EHEA Secretariat member clarified that the glossary would be presented at the upcoming BFUG meeting, yet minor adjustments might still occur afterwards, as the WG on IM continued work on the action plan. The Eurydice Co-chair emphasised, however, the need for a point at which definitions became stable, noting that once they were integrated into the BPIR questionnaire, further changes would not be feasible. He confirmed his intention to raise this issue directly with the WG on IM Co-chairs. The EHEA Secretariat member informed the group that the next WG on IM meeting would take place in two weeks. She proposed that a coordination meeting between the Co-chairs of the two working groups be scheduled in advance, and confirmed that she would support the process by preparing a Doodle poll once possible dates were provided.

The Eurydice Co-chair also underlined that the WG on Monitoring should be able to comment on definitions where necessary, highlighting, as an example, concerns regarding the definition of balanced mobility. He added that certain terms which the WG on IM considered “commonly understood” (e.g. transnational education, joint programme, joint/double/multiple degree) should nonetheless be defined explicitly in the glossary.

The Romanian representative asked whether it was customary for definitions to draw on multiple sources. In response, the EUA representative explained that the WG on IM intended to produce a single consolidated definition for each term. Where existing definitions were used as references, they would be cited, but the final glossary would contain only one authoritative definition per concept.

#### 5. Division of tasks and planning of narrative inputs from Working Groups

##### Documents:

##### [WG Monitoring 3 DK LI 5 Draft Guidelines Narrative Texts BPIR 2027](#)

The Eurydice Co-chair recalled that, following the BFUG meeting in Warsaw, it had been agreed that each chapter of the BPIR 2027 would contain a narrative text outlining the work undertaken at European level through the various working structures, alongside the indicator-based analysis. The working structures had been informed of this approach.

He briefly presented the elements that could help ensure coherence and consistency across the narrative texts. He invited members to reflect on additional elements that might be useful, noting that suggestions could also be submitted after the meeting. He highlighted several procedural points requiring clarification:

- Harmonisation of style and structure: To avoid receiving texts of uneven length, format or detail, it would be important to define common expectations. He suggested

appointing an editor to review all contributions and ensure coherence before integration into the report.

- Selection of authors: While the responsibility for designating an author should lie with each Working structure, it would be important that authors are able to deliver their contributions within the defined timeline. A first draft of the BPIR would need to be available for the autumn 2026 BFUG meeting, meaning that narrative texts must be delivered sufficiently in advance.
- Approval of the final narrative texts: He proposed that the WG on Monitoring should have responsibility for approving the final versions included in the BPIR. He indicated that he would seek confirmation from the BFUG on this point, to avoid uncertainty between Working structures.

He noted that including narrative contributions from Working Groups represented an innovation in the methodology of the BPIR. While a broadly comparable approach had been used in the 2020 report - when experts were asked to prepare thematic historical analyses - this would be the first time that Working structures themselves would provide structured narrative inputs directly for inclusion in the BPIR.

The Eurostudent representative agreed with the proposed common elements and suggested providing a slightly more detailed and structured outline for the narrative texts, recalling that a similar approach had been useful in the 2020 report. She noted that broad, shared headings - such as a short background section followed by reflections on progress and challenges - would support consistency across chapters and facilitate the editorial process. She further proposed indicating an approximate expected length for each narrative section, to ensure comparability between contributions.

The Eurostudent representative proposed that Working structures might be encouraged to start from the indicators that had been removed, ensuring that any relevant developments or contextual information previously captured statistically could be addressed narratively, while also highlighting new or emerging trends within their thematic areas.

The discussion then turned to the expected length of the narrative contributions, including the number of pages to be allocated to each Working Group.

The EUA representative asked what the Working Group expected the narrative sections to achieve. She noted that, according to the guidance, narratives could cross-reference developments in specific countries or data trends, including areas where indicators had been removed. She sought clarification on whether the narrative should primarily introduce and contextualise the statistical section, or whether it was intended to be a broader mixture of contextual explanation, qualitative developments and reflections on progress. The Eurydice Co-chair clarified that the purpose of the narrative sections was to highlight key developments at European level that help explain or contextualise progress shown in the indicators. Narratives should reflect the objectives and activities of the relevant Working structures and how these contribute to advancing the implementation of Bologna commitments. Indicators would then illustrate the current state of play.

The EUA representative underlined the need to articulate clearly what is expected from authors, noting the risk that working structures might otherwise produce texts resembling working

structures reports. She also asked how contributions would be organised, given that several working structures cut across multiple chapters. She stressed the importance of clearly communicating the timeline, including dates relevant for external initiatives such as EUA's Trends survey. The Eurydice Co-chair confirmed that each chapter would draw on contributions from the relevant working structure, including TPGs, and that the WG on Monitoring would ensure coherence across all contributions. He agreed that a clear timeline would be provided.

The Eurostudent representative suggested that the narrative sections should not only describe measures undertaken but also offer broader contextual insights, especially in areas where statistical indicators had been reduced or removed. She noted that in the social dimension chapter, for instance, studies such as Eurostudent or Eurograduate provide valuable information on vulnerable groups and systemic challenges, which could complement the limited indicator set. The Eurydice Co-chair agreed that this broader perspective was compatible with the objectives of the narrative sections. He noted that references to studies, surveys or analyses could be included where they help illustrate developments and challenges relevant to implementation.

The Eurydice Co-chair agreed that authors should be encouraged - though not required - to draw on wider evidence where it contributes meaningfully to understanding implementation challenges or progress. He emphasised that the purpose of the narrative sections was to highlight how European-level actions, projects and working structures activities support the implementation of Bologna commitments. While acknowledging that narrative texts could cover areas no longer reflected in indicators, he cautioned against framing their role explicitly as "replacing" dropped indicators; rather, the intention was to ensure that each chapter presents a comprehensive and coherent thematic picture.

Turning to the question of editing, he confirmed that there was agreement on the need for a single overall editor to ensure consistency across chapters. The Eurydice Co-chair indicated that Eurydice had already considered the option of externalising the task, including the possibility of issuing an expert contract for this purpose. The group briefly exchanged initial views on potential profiles for such an editor.

## **6. Wrap-up, next steps and AOB**

The Austrian Co-chair recalled that the next BFUG Board meeting would take place on 4 November. By that date, the WG would need to provide the updated version of the proposal for the structure and indicators of the BPIR 2027.

The Eurydice Co-chair clarified that, regarding the Fundamental Values chapter in the proposal for the structure and indicators of the BPIR 2027, the section would be revised to include an explanation of the approach (i.e. integrating the agreed questions into the questionnaire), but without reproducing the full list of questions.

The EHEA Secretariat member confirmed that she would synthesise the feedback provided during the meeting on the WG on FV' proposed indicators. A consolidated version of the comments would be circulated within the WG on Monitoring for confirmation, and subsequently transmitted to the WG on FV Co-chairs.

The Austrian Co-chair also noted that the Eurydice Co-chair would participate in the upcoming TPG D meeting and that the Social Dimension chapter in the proposal for the structure and indicators of the BPIR 2027 would be updated afterwards, in line with the feedback received from TPG D.

It was agreed that the EHEA Secretariat would launch a poll to schedule the next WG on Monitoring meeting, to be held on 12 or 13 February 2026.

There was no other business. The meeting ended at 11:57 CET.