

Autumn 2026 BFUG Survey

1. Purpose

The survey serves three purposes:

1. **Longitudinal comparison on the priorities of the Bologna Process** based on the questions and topics asked to the BFUG in the October 2018 survey.
2. **Evidence for the 2027 Communiqué.** The results will inform the drafting of the Iași-Chișinău Communiqué and thus support the Drafting Committee in its work.
3. **Completion of the study** on the implementation of the Bologna Process and future trends

2. Questionnaire

Section A — Respondent information

Q1. In what capacity are you responding? (*single choice*)

- BFUG member
- Consultative member

Q2. Country / organisation: (*open text*)

Q3 for BFUG members. Was this response informed by a consultation at national level? (*single choice*)

- Yes, a consultation external stakeholders (higher education institutions, student unions, quality assurance agencies etc)
- Yes, a limited internal consultation (within the ministry)
- No

Q3 for BFUG consultative members. Was this response informed by a consultation at organisational level? (*single choice*)

- Yes, based on a (current or former) consultation with the membership
- Yes, a limited internal consultation
- No — response of the delegate only

Section B — Priorities after 2030

Q4. For each of the following thematic areas, please indicate whether you retain it as a priority for intergovernmental cooperation within the EHEA in the period 2030 to 2040. (*matrix: High priority / Medium priority / Low priority / Should not be addressed at EHEA level / No opinion*)

1. Full implementation of the existing key commitments
2. Artificial intelligence and the digital transformation of learning, teaching and assessment
3. Lifelong learning, including recognition of prior learning, flexible learning paths and micro-credentials
4. Social dimension
5. Innovative, flexible and student-centred learning and teaching, including support for teaching staff
6. Internationalisation and mobility
7. Fundamental values of the EHEA
8. Interconnection of the EHEA with the European Research Area (research–education nexus)
9. Permeability between higher education and vocational education and training
10. The societal role of higher education, including the green transition and the Sustainable Development Goals
11. Promoting active and responsible citizenship and the democratic mission of higher education
12. Financial sustainability of higher education systems
13. Global engagement of the EHEA
14. Other topics:

Q5. From the list in Q4, please select and rank the **five** areas that should structure the next BFUG Work Programme (2027-2030) (1 = highest priority). (*ranking*)

Q6. Please indicate your agreement with the following statements. (*matrix: Strongly agree / Agree / Neither / Disagree / Strongly disagree*)

1. The accumulated stock of ministerial commitments should be reviewed and consolidated, identifying commitments that are completed, superseded or inactive and should be explicitly retired.
2. The distinction between key commitments (subject to structured peer support) and other commitments should be maintained.
3. Additional commitments should be designated as key commitments and made subject to structured peer support.
4. For all commitments to be maintained, there should be identified an explicit implementation instrument (working method, monitoring arrangement, or support structure).
5. New commitments should only be adopted together with an explicit implementation instrument (working method, monitoring arrangement, or support structure).

Q7. How should artificial intelligence be addressed in the 2027 Communiqué? (*single choice*)

- Within a named/specific commitment with a dedicated instrument (e.g. guidelines, working/thematic group, revision of EHEA tools)
- As a named political priority without a dedicated instrument at this stage
- Through monitoring and exchange of practice only (e.g. via the BPIR)
- Other (*please specify*)
- No opinion

Section C — Commitments, quantitative targets and monitoring

Q8. Should the 2027 Communiqué set quantitative targets for the period to 2040 (such as the 20% by 2020 mobility target)? (*single choice*)

- Yes, in a small number of selected areas
- Yes, aligned with existing EU or international indicators
- No, qualitative commitments with strengthened monitoring are preferable
- No
- No opinion

Q9. (*If yes*) In which areas would quantitative targets be feasible and meaningful? (*select all that apply*)

- Learning mobility
- Participation and completion of students from underrepresented and non-traditional backgrounds
- Support and professional development of teaching staff
- Recognition of prior learning
- Quality assurance, including Transnational Education (TNE) provision
- Lifelong learning participation of adult learners in higher education
- Other (*please specify*)

Q10. Should members commit to adopting **national targets** for the social dimension, monitored at EHEA level? (*single choice*)

- Yes
- No
- No opinion

Q11. Which of the following would most improve the follow-up of ministerial commitments?

- Strengthened peer support (continuation and reinforcement of the thematic peer group model)
- More prominent role for the national action plans
- Tailored peer support (1:1, 1:2, or targeted support)
- A structured follow-up procedure for BPIR findings, discussed at BFUG level
- Country-level review or peer review of implementation on a voluntary basis

- Public visibility of implementation status (e.g. scoreboard published on ehea.info)
- No change to current arrangements
- Coordination meetings with other policy arenas (EU, CoE, UNESCO, OECD)
- Other (*please specify*)

Q11a. If you would like to explain your answer, please do so here: (*open text*)

Section D — Governance, implementation and ownership

Q12. Which measures should be prioritised to strengthen the role and impact of national action plans?

- Close the feedback loop by reporting on their implementation
- Relate the actions in the national action plans to the achievements or pitfalls of the last plan
- Increase the engagement of stakeholders in the elaboration and implementation of the plan
- Take into account the content of the plans in the work of the BFUG working structures
- The action plans are not needed anymore
- I don't know
- Other (*please specify*)

Q12a. If you would like to explain your answer, please do so here: (*open text*)

Q13. Which changes to the BFUG's working methods would you support? (*select all that apply*)

- Focusing BFUG meetings on a small number of strategic and policy questions, with fewer procedural or technical discussions
- Discussions in small groups or parallel thematic sessions, including sessions open to practitioners, especially for technical questions
- Regular expert and practitioner consultations built into the working methods
- Greater/regular use of online meetings and electronic consultation between meetings
- Stronger information sharing and synergies among working groups on the occasion of meetings or at regular intervals between BFUG meetings
- Discussions on issues raised by a member/ a group of members as part of the regular BFUG agenda (if linked to EHEA priorities)
- No substantial changes are needed
- Other (*please specify*)

Q13a. If you would like to explain your answer, please do so here: (*open text*)

Q14. Which measures would most strengthen ministerial-level engagement with the Process? (*select up to two*)

- A shorter, more decision-focused ministerial agenda (fewer, clearer, strategic commitments)
- Coupling the conference with a high-visibility political theme
- More systematic involvement of ministers between conferences (e.g. written procedures, ministerial-level messages)
- Stronger alignment of communiqué commitments with national reform agendas
- Other (*please specify*)

Q14a. If you would like to explain your answer, please do so here: *(open text)*

Q15. Which measures should be prioritised to strengthen the connection between the BFUG and higher education practitioners? *(select up to three)*

- Re-invigorating national Bologna expert teams
- Identifying further thematic practitioner networks and their possible useful involvement in working structures
- Organise and communicate Bologna events between Ministerial conferences open to or targeted at practitioners
- Appointment of national practitioners alongside ministry representatives/BFUG delegates in delegations and groups
- An EHEA communication strategy and digital platform for practitioners
- Other *(please specify)*

Q15a. If you would like to explain your answer, please do so here: *(open text)*

Section E — Global dimension

Q16. What should be the primary objectives of the EHEA's global policy dialogue after 2027? *(select up to three):*

- Peer exchange with other regional higher education spaces (mutual learning, not export of the Bologna model)
- Practitioner- and expert-level cooperation (recognition, quality assurance, qualifications frameworks)
- Cooperation on shared emerging challenges, in particular AI in higher education
- Support for capacity development, including engagement with the Global South
- Joint positions in global fora (UNESCO, Global Convention on Recognition)
- Render the EHEA a more attractive space for international students and staff
- Other *(please specify)*

Q17. How should the Global Policy Forum develop? *(select all that apply)*

- Retain the Forum, co-located with the Ministerial Conference
- Precede each Forum with macro-regional preparatory events involving ministries, stakeholders and experts
- Involve macro-regional organisations and transnational bodies, not only individual countries
- Adopt a Global Policy Action Plan with follow-up after each Forum, with resources identified
- Replace the Forum with continuous dialogue formats with UNESCO, OECD etc
- The Forum should be discontinued
- Other *(please specify)*
- No opinion

Section F — Final question

Q18. Any additional ideas for thematic or procedural innovations after 2027, or comments on the future of the Bologna Process, that are not captured above: (*open text, max 300 words*)