

Draft Minutes

4th meeting of the Task Force on the Future of Bologna

Date & time: 15th of January 2026, 11:00-11:50 CET, online, Zoom

No.	Member state/ Consultative member	Name
1.	Belgium – Flemish Community (Co-chair)	Liesbeth Hens
2.	EUA	Maria Kelo
3.	ESU	Lana Par
4.	Germany (Co-chair)	Michaela Böhme
5.	Greece	Nikoletta Chardalia
6.	Greece	Katerina Lenaki
7.	Holy See	Melanie Rosenbaum
8.	Lithuania	Neda Žutautaitė
9.	Poland	Bogdan Dziobkowski
10.	Romania	Romiță Iucu
11.	Slovakia	Vojtěch Przybyla
12.	Sweden	Robin Moberg
13.	Switzerland	Aurélia Robert-Tissot
14.	Türkiye	Serkan Gül
15.	Ukraine (Co-chair)	Maryna Murga
16.	Secretariat EHEA	Petrișor L. Țucă

Croatia and Ireland sent their apologies.

Albania, Azerbaijan, ETUCE, EURASHE, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Malta, Montenegro, Slovenia and United Kingdom – Scotland were absent.

The meeting started at 11:04 CET.

1. Welcome from the TF Future of Bologna Co-chairs

The Co-chair from Ukraine opened the meeting and welcomed all members of the Task Force.

2. Adoption of the agenda

The Co-chair from Ukraine presented the draft agenda. The agenda was adopted without amendments.

3. Adoption of the minutes of the 3rd TF Future of Bologna meeting
Document: [TF-Future-of-Bologna_3_DK_LIE_Minutes](#)

The EHEA Secretariat informed members that the minutes had been drafted in line with the Rules of Procedure, circulated for consultation to the TF Future of Bologna Co-chairs and members, and revised to reflect the comments received. No concerns were raised during the meeting, and the minutes were adopted.

4. Report from the [XCVII BFUG meeting](#)

The Belgium – Flemish Community Co-chair reported on the Copenhagen BFUG meeting. Due to time constraints, the planned two-breakout format was reduced to one breakout and a plenary, focusing on the interconnectedness between EHEA and the VET sector. The Flemish Co-Chair informed that this choice aligned with the Danish Presidency's priorities. The strand on the EHEA interconnectedness with ERA was therefore proposed for the Cyprus BFUG, and preliminary conclusions from the VET-focused discussion were briefly outlined.

The discussion at the BFUG meeting in Copenhagen highlighted VET as a strong pathway to higher education, particularly through short-cycle programmes, shared qualification frameworks, the use of ECTS, and ensuring permeability between systems. As such, interventions during the BFUG meeting emphasised that existing Bologna tools should be adapted rather than creating new ones. Barriers mentioned by BFUG delegates included institutional separation, fragmented governance, and concerns over identity, while social dimension and mobility were seen as key enablers.

The ESU representative referred to feedback from a recent meeting, noting that discussions on improving interconnectedness with other sectors showed increased openness, including links with VET. Based on colleagues' feedback, ESU suggested it could be useful to share the conclusions with other working structures to enable comparison and mutual learning.

The Belgium – Flemish community Co-chair clarified that the summary reflected their personal notes and should be cross-checked with the minutes. Members were invited to signal any misunderstandings or corrections to ensure an accurate reflection of the conclusions.

The Swedish representative confirmed that the summary accurately reflected the discussion. He highlighted the diversity of VET systems and noted that peer learning was particularly valuable. The Swedish delegate further stressed the need to consider how existing Bologna tools could be adapted to support stronger VET–higher education links, while noting the lack of a clear VET platform for structured dialogue.

The Holy See supported the conclusions and proposed moving towards concrete follow-up. She suggested organising a joint meeting between representatives dealing with VET and BFUG matters, building on the Tirana Communiqué and the Herning Declaration. The Holy See underlined that the main challenge rested in the limited mutual understanding between higher education and VET communities and argued that a single joint “table” for dialogue could already be organised. Rather than creating new tools or a new task force, she proposed that, if endorsed by BFUG, the Secretariat could be tasked with organising such a meeting, possibly with the support of the European Commission and relevant Directorates-General, as a practical step to enhance policy coherence and collaboration.

The Secretariat recalled that, at the previous meeting, it had presented its intention to organise a Conference on enhancing knowledge sharing in autumn 2026, alongside an in-person meeting of the TF Future of Bologna in Bucharest. In this context, the Secretariat noted that it would consider how a joint or complementary meeting could be organised within that framework.

5. Preparation of the BFUG meeting in Cyprus

Document: [TF-Future-of-Bologna_4_CY_NO_5_Interconnectedness](#)

The Belgium–Flemish Co-chair introduced the preparatory document for the Cyprus BFUG meeting, focusing on interconnectedness between the EHEA and the European Research Area

(ERA). The text was presented as an improvement of the paper circulated before the BFUG meeting in Copenhagen, with a revised layout and an emphasis on ERA linkages. The paper proposed guiding questions on existing examples of interconnectedness, desired levels of synergy by 2027 and 2030, obstacles following the 2021 Task Force work, and ways to establish stable cooperation.

Greece welcomed the approach and suggested adding an introductory question mapping national governance arrangement for research and higher education (e.g. single vs. separate ministries), to capture cross-country differences and contextualise EHEA-ERA interconnectedness.

ESU welcomed the practice of sharing a consolidated overview of draft notes, topics, and conclusions with the TF Future of Bologna before they are presented to the BFUG. This approach was seen as helpful for ensuring common understanding, continuity, and transparency, particularly when members cannot attend entire meetings.

6. AOB

No additional points were raised.

The meeting ended at 11:47 CET.