



Working Group on Monitoring the Implementation of the Bologna Process

Eighth Meeting, Online

14 February 2024

Minutes of meeting

List of participants

Country/Organization	First Name	Last Name
Albania	Entela	Haloçi
Austria	Helga	Posset
EACEA	Olga	Davydovskaia
EACEA	Anna	Horvath
EACEA	Daniela	Kocanova
EQAR	Magalie	Soenen
EQAR	Blazhe	Todorovski
ESU	Guibert	Tanguy
EUA	Henriette	Stoeber
European Commission/ Eurydice (Co-Chair)	David	Crosier
EUROSTUDENT	Kristina	Hauschildt
France	Mathieu	Musquin
Kazakhstan	Aitzhan	Kulumzhanova
Kazakhstan	Rauza	Mendaliyeva
Kazakhstan	Alibek	Madibekov
Norway (Co-Chair)	Tone Flood	Strøm
Romania	Camelia	Mircea-Sturza
The Netherlands	Robert	Wagenaar
UK	Sarah	Allen
BFUG Secretariat	Blerina	Caslli

Azerbaijan, Cyprus, Czech Republic, EI-ETUCE, Germany, Italy, Malta and Moldova did not attend the meeting.

1. Welcome remarks and approval of the agenda

The Co-Chairs welcomed all participants to the 8th meeting of the Working Group for the Monitoring of the Implementation of the Bologna Process for the 2021-2024 work period. Tone Flood Strøm (Co-Chair) outlined the meeting agenda and participants were invited to suggest topics for discussion. The agenda was adopted without any changes.

For more information, please see: [Agenda of the meeting](#)



2. Updates on BFUG meetings

David Crosier (Co-Chair) provided a detailed update on the last BFUG meeting, explaining that half of the report (three chapters) was sent out before the meeting, while the remaining chapters were posted online during the meeting. Key discussion points included indicators in the key commitments chapter and the approach to the social dimension chapter. He emphasized the challenges faced by both countries and analysts and stressed the need for careful consideration of future monitoring methods.

Tone Flood Strøm (Co-Chair) then discussed the recent meeting of the WG on Fundamental Values in Brussels, covering the final statements on fundamental values and a proposed technical framework for monitoring them. This framework, based on a scorecard system, will be presented at the next BFUG meeting and is currently being tested in four countries. The project's methodology is being evaluated, and its integration into the next reporting period was highlighted as crucial due to resource constraints.

Additionally, a meeting on the social dimension chapter of the monitoring draft focused on descriptors, indicators, and results. The BFUG discussed presenting countries' general measures, and a separate meeting with the WG on Social Dimension suggested adopting indicators as standalone documents.

No information from the WG on Learning and Teaching was provided at the Board meeting.

Helga Posset (BICG Co-Chair) summarized the 8th BICG meeting, highlighting progress and achievements from the Bologna Process Implementation Report (BPIR). The group initially agreed on wording for their Communiqué input but received feedback to revert to the original version. The new draft of the Tirana Communiqué will be discussed at the next BFUG meeting, and the draft final report has been delivered.

Robert Wagenaar (The Netherlands) reported on the Task Force on Enhancing Knowledge Sharing's progress, which proposed a more structured approach including expert groups and national reports. He stressed the need for continued progress on key commitments and expressed concerns about the Bologna Process's disconnect from higher education institutions, advocating for better strategies to reinvigorate the process. The Task Force will present their recommendations at the next BFUG meeting.

3. State of Play of the 2024 Bologna Process Implementation Report

David Crosier updated on the 2024 BPIR report's progress, detailing ongoing dialogue and feedback from various countries and stakeholders. The report was distributed in two batches, with the final version expected by March 11th, followed by a two-week period for final feedback. Printed copies will be available for the Tirana Ministerial Conference. Key issues included adjusting the percentage for students in integrated long programs and retaining the "light green" category for quality assurance, which were addressed through necessary adjustments.

In the social dimension chapter, objections about the misrepresentation of countries with mainstreamed social inclusion strategies led to the removal of two scorecard indicators. These were replaced with more comprehensive mappings and explanatory texts to address concerns while preserving the report's integrity and usefulness.

Tone Flood Strøm opened the floor for comments on the BFUG feedback changes. Participants discussed adjusting the scorecard indicator for integrated and long programs from 10% to 20%, acknowledging that while the 20% threshold might better reflect the current educational landscape, no consensus existed for this threshold. A broader discussion on degree structures, especially in professional fields like medicine and architecture, was suggested as a future priority. David Crosier emphasized that the 20% threshold was a temporary solution and agreed on the need for further discussions on degree structures.

Finally, David Crosier reviewed the executive summary and invited feedback from participants. The summary was praised, and a request for additional time to submit comments was made, with a Friday deadline.

suggested. David Crosier agreed that comments could be submitted after Friday, stressing the importance of a clear and comprehensive presentation for the BFUG meeting.

4. Future options for monitoring

David Crosier (Co-Chair) presented the challenges in collecting evidence-based information for the monitoring report, highlighting issues such as the extensive data requirements, limited personnel resources in many countries, and difficulties in meeting data submission deadlines. He emphasized the increasing scope of monitoring tasks and the need for a sustainable, long-term solution. He proposed three options for future monitoring:

- **Thematic Monitoring:** Focus on one main thematic topic per reporting period for in-depth exploration. This approach allows for thorough comparative analysis of national implementation and a deeper understanding of specific topics and policy commitments. However, it would mean that topics not chosen for the thematic report would be excluded until a future period. This method requires significant expertise and commitment from a dedicated group for effective implementation.
- **Restricted Comprehensive Monitoring:** Limit the number of issues and key indicators examined to manage data collection and processing more effectively. The BFUG would select key indicators based on WG proposals, streamlining the questionnaire design, data collection, and cleaning processes. While this approach ensures continuity and reduces the BFUG members' workload, it would not allow for detailed exploration of new topics.
- **Alternating Approach:** Alternate between in-depth thematic monitoring and comprehensive but restricted data collection over a five-year cycle. For example, a thematic report in 2027 followed by a comprehensive report in 2030. This approach balances thematic and comprehensive monitoring but may not fully resolve current challenges.

David Crosier posed four questions for the BFUG on future monitoring: Which of the three options (thematic, restricted comprehensive, or alternating) is most viable? For the 2027 report, should the focus be on thematic (e.g., fundamental values) or comprehensive monitoring? Should a single model or an alternating approach be used long-term? Are there other viable monitoring options? He concluded by stressing the need for a sustainable solution for effective monitoring.

Participants discussed the proposals, agreeing to continue the conversation after the first BFUG meeting. Some members favored Option 2 for its balance of indicators and coverage, while others, along with David Crosier, explored combining thematic and comprehensive approaches to establish a vision for EHEA by 2030. Suggestions included asking countries to create action plans post-Communiqué to track progress, outsourcing data collection to working group projects, creating a European higher education sector Observatory, and expanding Eurydice's thematic reports to EHEA countries.

5. Reporting to the BFUG

David Crosier explained that the executive summary and the proposal on future monitoring would be distributed to the BFUG alongside with explanations on the state of play of the BPIR and proposal for future options for the BFUG to provide comments and suggestions. The goal is to ensure everyone is satisfied with the proposed approach and to address any issues raised during the discussion, for proceeding later with the development of a survey.

6. AOB

The Co-Chairs suggested that a future meeting could be arranged if needed. With no further issues raised, they concluded the meeting by thanking all participants for their valuable contributions.