

Overview of proposals for Bologna work programme 2007-2009 received by 28 August 2007

Action line (London Communiqué)	Action proposed	Organiser(s)	Participants	Timing / Place
<p><u>General comment by Portugal</u></p> <p>Following our meeting in London, we believe the progress achieved should allow us to pay greater attention to the <u>substance</u> of our objectives, viz. - changing the patterns of teaching and learning, promoting active (less passive) work by the students themselves and fostering student-centred education schemes are our ultimate goals; we have to work in order to allow students to determine their own <u>learning paths and trajectories</u>, namely along education cycles, but also across institutions in our different regions and countries.</p> <p>In order to achieve these objectives we -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ must foster evidence based project and experimental work, as well as focus our attention on the <u>transferable skills</u> students should acquire. ▪ need to <u>reduce drop-out (failure) rates</u> in higher education and involve higher education 1st and 2nd cycle students in research activities. ▪ need to increase the number of <u>adult students</u> in higher education by removing barriers to their entrance and success, with due attention to its social and economic roots. This certainly requires <u>increased diversified systems of tertiary education</u>, leading to greater differences in the learning and teaching systems in professionally-oriented and science-driven programs; ▪ need to foster institutions that take absolute care of emerging scientific and technological developments, but also pay attention to <u>societal changes</u> and the continuous alterations of the <u>labour market</u>. ▪ need also to look <u>beyond</u> our own institutions of higher education and monitor the <u>employability of students</u> along the various education cycles. <p>In summary, we need to go beyond the structure of higher education and gradually concentrate our efforts in measuring and taking stock of the diversity and evolution of concrete <u>student-centred parameters</u>.</p> <p>From another (complementary) point of view we need to harmonize quality assurance systems and we fully support the implementation of the <u>European Register</u> for Agencies of Accreditation and Evaluation across Europe.</p> <p>We celebrate this year the <u>20th anniversary of Erasmus</u> whose main social actors are the students themselves and, in that regard, we also would like to call your own attention for the need to measure and continuously analyse the <u>remaining obstacles to mobility in higher education</u>.</p> <p>In our Presidency of the Council of the European Union, the modernisation of higher education and their role in the fulfilment of <u>learning societies</u> are high on our agenda and the Bologna process ultimate objectives are reaffirmed, namely the urgent need to <u>increase the number of qualified human resources in Europe</u>.</p>				

Action line (London Communiqué)	Action proposed	Organiser(s)	Participants	Timing / Place
MOBILITY				
Incentivise mobility of staff and students (2.3)	<p>Campaign called "Let's Go" to promote mobility of staff and students in all Bologna countries. Envisaged activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Campaign materials</u> and national campaigns carried out jointly by teacher and student unions. ○ An interactive wiki-style-<u>website</u> where students and staff can exchange knowledge on mobility and share good and bad practices. ○ A <u>mobility barometer</u>, measuring the progress on mobility (via the use of questionnaires). ○ A <u>validation conference</u> in France finalising the campaign. 	Education International Pan European Structure and ESU	The aim is to encourage students and teachers to become mobile as well as to raise awareness among institutions and governments. More specifically, target groups are: key decision-makers, trade unionists in higher education, rectors and students across Europe.	November 2007 – October 2008
	<p>Seminar on "Staff mobility and pension arrangements – good practice in Europe"</p>	Germany		
	<p><u>Austria suggest</u> a mobility working group to address the issue of equitable balance and to monitor action taken at national level, also including national action plans on the social dimension</p>			
	<p><u>Comment by ESU</u> This WG should support national action where necessary and monitor national developments regarding information and support available (including financial support), the generalisation of student visas in Europe, and recognition of qualifications.</p>			
	<p><u>UK comment:</u> Focus should be on national implementation and reporting, no need for separate working group; possibly seminar to help identify and share good practice</p> <p><u>Comment by Finland:</u> The main work in this area over the next two years is at national level. No need for a separate working group.</p>			
			<p><u>Hungary</u> would like to participate in all activities related to mobility</p>	

Action line (London Communiqué)	Action proposed	Organiser(s)	Participants	Timing / Place
MOBILITY (continued)	<u>Malta</u> supports the organisation of a seminar on mobility			
	Seminar on Mobility	Armenia (option 4)	Interested parties and stakeholders	2008 or 2009
	Conference on equitable balance across the EHEA	Belgium (French Community)		
	<u>Portugal</u> is interested in contributing to the development of the inter-related issues of mobility / equitable balance / social dimension, namely co-operating with other partners in conference and other agreed follow-up actions.			
Identify and overcome obstacles to the portability of grants and loans (3.2)	Network of national experts	The Netherlands	<u>Expressed interest:</u> UK (England and Scotland), Austria, Georgia, Armenia, Sweden, Lithuania, possibly Switzerland; ESU; European Commission (depending on agenda of the meeting)	Start-up meeting in the second half of 2007
DEGREE STRUCTURE				
Proper implementation of ECTS based on learning outcomes and student workload (2.4)			<u>Poland and Spain expressed interest</u> in participating in the follow up of action line 2.4 (proper implementation of ECTS).	
	<u>UK comment:</u> There is a need for a clearer understanding of (a) ECTS, including the balance between learning outcomes and workload; (b) what learning outcomes mean in practice It will be important, given the focus on lifelong learning in the London communiqué, for BFUG to have an opportunity to consider how ECTS and ECVET can be developed to ensure that the two credit systems are more closely linked <u>UK proposal:</u> Seminar on learning outcomes hosted by EUA or jointly by EUA and EURASHE		<u>Expressed interest:</u> Hungary, ESU	
	<u>Comment by Austria:</u> No follow-up at European level needed, this is a national mandate. <u>Comment by Finland:</u> The main work in the area of degree structure over the next two years is at national level. The			

Action line (London Communiqué)	Action proposed	Organiser(s)	Participants	Timing / Place
DEGREE STRUCTURE (continued) Proper implementation of ECTS based on learning outcomes and student workload (2.4)	follow-up is one of the tasks of the stocktaking group. No need for a separate working group.			
			Switzerland expressed interest in participating in a WG on the proper implementation of ECTS	
	<u>Comment by ESU:</u> Training seminars and assisting countries and higher education institutions in the move to a student-centred learning perspective could be useful for the successful implementation of Bologna Process reforms on the ground. Moreover, degree structures should not be addressed purely from the employability discussion perspective.			
	Experts Group Meeting on ECTS in relation to ECVET which could lead to an international seminar on ECTS/ECVET.	Malta		
	Network of ECTS Counsellors , part of National Teams of Bologna Experts, to be extended to all Bologna countries and beyond (Tempus countries).	European Commission	ECTS Counsellors	
	Discussion on new draft of ECTS Key Features. On that basis, the ECTS Users Guide will be updated in 2008.	European Commission	All BFUG members	2/3 October 2007 / Lisbon (BFUG meeting)
	<u>Comment by Czech Republic:</u> For ECTS (2.4) something at BFUG level is needed. We suggest asking the Commission to submit the draft of the new ECTS Guide for consultation with BFUG members and to have it in on the BFUG programme in the 1st half of 2008.			Autumn 2007 – Spring 2008
	<u>Lithuania</u> would like to participate in a working group on the proper implementation of ECTS			
	<u>Italy</u> considers proper implementation of ECTS based on learning outcomes and student workload a priority for the next two years and therefore supports close cooperation at the European level with active involvement of institutions in each country.			

Action line (London Communiqué)	Action proposed	Organiser(s)	Participants	Timing / Place
DEGREE STRUCTURE (continued) Proper implementation of ECTS based on learning outcomes and student workload (2.4)	<u>Italy proposes</u> to ask EUA – if consensus on the “ECTS Key features” is reached within the BFUG in October - to develop a work plan for the proper implementation of ECTS credits in institutions, to which all ECTS European experts should be invited to contribute. The work plan should include adequate consideration of the role of ECTS for lifelong learning and employability as well as of the link between ECTS and ECVET. Italy would be prepared to appoint an expert to cooperate on this project.			
	<u>Portugal</u> is willing to contribute to the improvement of student-centred learning and education schemes, through initiatives such as organising a seminar with other interested partners or the promotion of best practices through the launching of national and European competitions .			
	Seminar on the structure of medical studies in Europe	Germany		
EMPLOYABILITY				
Consider how to improve graduate employability in relation to all three cycles and in the context of LLL (2.4, 2.8, 3.5)	Working group to prepare a report on existing European studies analysing employability of graduates from different perspectives (graduates, employers, academics)	Spain	<u>Partners mentioned by Spain:</u> Valencia University of Technology, Maastricht University, Kassel University <u>Expressed interest:</u> Germany, Poland, Czech Republic, Austria, Hungary, Finland, Malta, French Community of Belgium, Georgia; EI, ESU	January 2008 – January 2009
	Conference to disseminate the results of the above-mentioned (draft) report	Spain	<u>Expressed interest:</u> Hungary, Malta, French Community of Belgium	October 2008 / Valencia
	Comment by EUA: address all three Bologna cycles, including the employability of young researchers – discussion at BFUG?			
	Conference on employability, focusing on implications of the internal market and on the employers' perspective; supported by surveys prepared as background documents	Luxembourg	<u>Expressed interest:</u> Hungary, Malta, French Community of Belgium	November 2008 / Luxembourg

Action line (London Communiqué)	Action proposed	Organiser(s)	Participants	Timing / Place
EMPLOYABILITY (continued) Consider how to improve graduate employability in relation to all three cycles and in the context of LLL (2.4, 2.8, 3.5)	Seminar	Georgia (option 5)	BFUG members and all interested parties	End of 2008 or early 2009 / Georgia
	Working group to consider how to identify and share good practice in areas such as involving employers in devising curricula; provision of careers services; awareness-raising amongst employers of the value of a bachelors qualification and associated learning outcomes; and the recognition of degrees in the labour market across Europe. ENIC/NARIC has been given a specific remit to improve recognition practices in general, including recognition of prior learning and flexible learning, but if there is to be a working group on employability, this topic could be a part of the work of that group. ENIC/NARIC's work could feed into such a working group	UK	<u>Expressed interest:</u> Germany, Poland, Czech Republic, Austria, Hungary, Finland, Malta, French Community of Belgium, Georgia; EI, EURASHE, ESU	
	Sub-working group "Employability of Bachelors" (under employability or data collection working group) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Prepare report on employability status of bachelors on a European or on sectoral levels, based on a survey. o Formulate recommendations on how to remove obstacles of employability, which are based on social, cultural, religious and gender issues. o Look into ways of integrating the LLL concept in the promotion of employability (alternative pathways to make 'employable bachelors'). 	EURASHE	<u>Proposed membership:</u> <u>Organisations</u> ESU, EI, Business Europe, UNESCO-CEPES	Preliminary survey on factors that determine a bachelor graduate's employability early 2008 Meanwhile collect data on the employability of bachelors in pilot countries (geographical spread, EU/non-EU). Preliminary results at EURASHE conference early May 2008. Final report to BFUG by the end of 2008.
	<u>ESU</u> sees the need for work in the field of bachelor employability and supports a seminar regarding this issue. Furthermore, ESU would like to coordinate an initiative promoting information for employers on the new degree structures and addressing HEIs on stakeholder involvement. This initiative, which should include a website , should also	ESU, together with Business Europe, EUA and EURASHE (tbc)		

Action line (London Communiqué)	Action proposed	Organiser(s)	Participants	Timing / Place
EMPLOYABILITY (continued) Consider how to improve graduate employability in relation to all three cycles and in the context of LLL (2.4, 2.8, 3.5)	carry a survey towards employers regarding the way they perceive both the new degrees and their engagement with curricula change in their national and local contexts.			
	<u>Malta proposes</u> a working group to look into the relevance of HE programmes to industry.			
	<u>Comment by Sweden:</u> The question of employability is hard and needs some exploration. Probably a working group is the best way to find out what employability means and how to measure. Sweden is interested in following the work of the group but can unfortunately not take an active role.			
RECOGNITION				
Implement fully agreed recognition tools and procedures (2.3)	<u>Comment by Austria:</u> National implementation <u>plus ENIC/NARIC and European level</u>			
Analyse national action plans and spread good practice (2.6)	Working group and study to assist Bologna countries with implementing the national action plans and to identify possible weak points The <u>European Commission</u> will support a NARIC project 2007-2008 for this purpose, covering 31 countries and working closely together with the ENIC Network	ENIC and NARIC Networks	ENIC and NARIC Networks, Council of Europe, European Commission, UNESCO-CEPES; through the networks national recognition centres of all Bologna countries	November 2007-December 2008
	Seminar	Georgia (option 6)	BFUG members and all interested parties	End of 2008 or early 2009 / Georgia
	Seminar	Armenia (option 5)		
Develop proposals for improving the recognition of prior learning (2.11)	Working group The <u>European Commission</u> will support a NARIC project 2007-2008 for this purpose, covering 31 countries and working closely together with the ENIC Network	ENIC and NARIC Networks	ENIC and NARIC Networks, Council of Europe, European Commission, UNESCO-CEPES; through the networks national recognition centres of all Bologna countries; representation of BFUG in the working group could be considered	November 2007-December 2008
	<u>Comment by Finland:</u> The ENIC/NARIC networks are working on this area on a regular basis. Therefore there is			

Action line (London Communiqué)	Action proposed	Organiser(s)	Participants	Timing / Place
RECOGNITION (continued) (2.3, 2.6, 2.11)	no need for a separate working group.			
	<u>Comment by ESU</u> : The spread of good practice should lead to guidelines for the recognition of prior learning at European level.			
			<u>Slovak Republic</u> and <u>ESU</u> are interested in participating in follow-up of recognition action line	
			<u>Portugal</u> is willing to actively support and closely co-operate with ENIC and NARIC networks and with interested partners in the effort for improving recognition practices and strengthening the causal relation between recognition and employability	
Recognition, QA and mobility (2.3, 2.6, 2.12)	Conference to stimulate mutual recognition of qualifications, based on accreditation and quality assurance decisions, and to enhance the international cooperation between agencies, ENIC/NARICs, and other stakeholders. This conference is a follow up to the ECA conference on the benefits of mutual recognition, taking place in Barcelona on 10 and 11 December 2007.	The Netherlands In cooperation with ECA and ENIC/NARICs (to be confirmed)	Representatives of recognition authorities (ENIC/NARICs), accreditation and quality assurance agencies, governments, institutions, students, and employers Proposal supported by Sweden	End of 2008
	<u>Portugal</u> will actively support initiatives in the field of mutual recognition of qualifications based on quality assurance decisions. Also, the recognition issue can be tackled through promoting initiatives of joint first and second cycle degree programmes and through activity of joint accreditation. This type of initiatives will also help to clarify issues such as ECTS implementation. <u>Portugal</u> is willing to discuss this issue and set actions with other partners.			
	<u>Germany</u> considers organising an <u>additional seminar</u> on quality assurance and recognition, dealing with the collaboration of bogus institutions with HEIs in other countries, in order to circumvent national accreditation. Germany seeks an international solution to this practice which is detrimental both to the host country of the bogus institutions and the country in which the degree is given.			

Action line (London Communiqué)	Action proposed	Organiser(s)	Participants	Timing / Place
QUALIFICATIONS FRAMEWORKS				
Sharing experience in the elaboration of National Qualifications Frameworks (2.8)	European conference (Forum on Qualifications Frameworks)	Council of Europe	Those responsible for developing NQFs in all Bologna countries; European Commission and consultative members; possibly also a limited number from non-EHEA countries	11-12 October 2007 / Strasbourg
	Follow-up conference at European level	Council of Europe		2008 / 2009
	Regional conferences to exchange experience	Council of Europe together with host countries <u>Expressed interest:</u> Czech Republic Georgia (option 1) Armenia (option 1)	<u>Expressed interest:</u> Turkey BFUG members and all interested parties Interested parties and stakeholders	2007 / 2008 End of 2008 or early 2009 / Georgia 2008 or 2009 / Armenia
	Overview of experts able to offer advice in the development of NQFs	Council of Europe		
	Coordination / advisory group for qualifications frameworks (for details see terms of reference prepared by the Council of Europe)	Council of Europe (Chair and Secretariat)	Not more than 10-15 1x European Commission 1 x Bologna working group on qualifications frameworks 2003 – 2007 (<u>expressed interest:</u> "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia") 1 x country that has completed the self certification process (Ireland or Scotland) 3 - 4 Bologna member states at various stages of the development of their qualifications frameworks (other than those having completed the self certification), with some regard also to geographical representation (<u>expressed interest:</u> Czech Republic, Turkey, Malta) 2 - 3 consultative members 1 x ENIC and NARIC Networks or LRC Committee 1 x Bologna Secretariat	Late 2007 until first BFUG after 2009 ministerial conference, meeting at least twice a year

Action line (London Communiqué)	Action proposed	Organiser(s)	Participants	Timing / Place
QUALIFICATIONS FRAMEWORKS (continued) Sharing experience in the elaboration of National Qualifications Frameworks (2.8)	<u>The European Commission supports</u> the establishment of National and Sectoral Qualifications Frameworks for Lifelong Learning and their networking. Close cooperation is sought with the Council of Europe.			
	<u>Comment by Finland:</u> The main work in this area over the next two years is at national level. No need for a separate working group.			
	<u>Comment by ESU:</u> The preliminary stage of discussion and implementation of NQFs suggests a need for further work in this field and the development of training events and sharing of good practices. Assistance regarding NQFs should focus on implementation in a comprehensive manner, with a lifelong learning perspective, alongside with the establishment of procedures for recogn. of prior learning			
	Working group to assist member states in sharing experiences in the drawing up of NQFs	Malta		
	<u>"the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"</u> would like to continue sharing experience in the development of National Qualifications Frameworks		Bologna participating countries, Council of Europe and other international organisations involved in the Bologna Process, Bologna Secretariat	Autumn 2007 – Spring 2009
LIFELONG LEARNING				
Increase the sharing of good practice (2.11)	EUA conference on social dimension in relation to LLL, access and diversity	EUA, supported by NL		October 2008 / Rotterdam
	Seminar	Georgia (option 4)	BFUG members and all interested parties	End of 2008 or early 2009 / Georgia
Work towards a common understanding of the role of Higher education in LLL (2.11)	Working group to consider from a lifelong learning perspective the following topics: 3 cycle degree structure (including access); recognition (also of prior learning); qualification frameworks; mobility; ECTS; employability; learning outcomes; the social dimension EUA autumn 2008 conference (see above)	Proposed by EUA	<u>Proposed membership</u> EUA, ENIC and NARIC networks, Council of Europe, and interested partners <u>Expressed interest:</u> "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"	

Action line (London Communiqué)	Action proposed	Organiser(s)	Participants	Timing / Place
Develop proposals for improving RPL (2.11)	See section on recognition		EI offered its support to the proposed action on LLL, primarily by means of an internal survey among its affiliated unions	
LIFELONG LEARNING (continued) (2.11)	Seminar on lifelong learning to consider (a) the interdependency of qualifications frameworks, recognition of prior learning and flexible learning paths; (b) the relationship between the social dimension and lifelong learning; and (c) the role of higher education institutions in lifelong learning.	UK (Scotland)		
	International seminar to work towards a common understanding of the role of higher education in lifelong learning, with special focus on assessment and recognition of prior applied learning	The Netherlands, in cooperation with EURASHE, Dutch ENIC/NARIC and other interested parties (tbc)		Late 2008 or early 2009/ the Netherlands
	<u>Comment by Finland:</u> A series of seminars could be a good starting point for future work.			
	<u>"the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"</u> expressed interest in sharing experience on developing a LLL strategy and introducing recognition of prior learning		Countries and organisations involved in the Bologna Process, Bologna Secretariat	Autumn 2007 – Spring 2009
QUALITY ASSURANCE				
Share good practice (2.13)	European Quality Forum	E4 group		15-17 November 2007 / Rome
	Seminar	Georgia (option 3)	BFUG members and all interested parties	End of 2008 or early 2009 / Georgia
Register of European Higher Education Quality Agencies (2.14)	Regularly report progress to BFUG and in 2009 to the ministerial conference	E4 group		October 2007- April 2009
External evaluation of the register (2.14)	<u>Comment by Finland:</u> To carry out the evaluation properly the decision about the external evaluation should be made by the end of the year 2008.			

Action line (London Communiqué)	Action proposed	Organiser(s)	Participants	Timing / Place
QUALITY ASSURANCE (continued)			Turkey expressed general interest in participating in the follow-up on QA Armenia would like to participate in a WG on QA	
	<u>The Commission supports</u> quality assurance initiatives from E4 members and others. Special support is given to the establishment of the European Register			
DOCTORAL CANDIDATES				
Closer alignment of the EHEA with the ERA (2.15)	<u>Proposed by Czech Republic</u> as separate action line to look at the issue more generally and not only reduced to the question of doctoral candidates			
Support the sharing of experience among higher education institutions (2.17)	EUA Council of Doctoral Education	EUA	<u>Expressed interest:</u> EI (wish to be associated); ESU	
	<u>UK comment:</u> The EUA has been given a specific remit to support the sharing of experience on the way that doctoral provision is being enhanced. The Nice seminar in December 2006 identified a clear need for more information on professional doctorates to address the lack of understanding of these programmes. The UK is therefore prepared to assist the EUA in this work in any way it can.			
Exchange of information on funding and other issues (2.17)	Seminar on doctoral candidates (funding, developing career prospects)	Finland	<u>Expressed interest:</u> Hungary, Turkey, French Community of Belgium, possibly Switzerland	October 2008 / Finland
	Seminar on doctoral candidates	Georgia (option 2)	BFUG members and all interested parties	End of 2008 or early 2009 / Georgia
	Seminar on doctoral candidates	Armenia (option 3)	interested parties and stakeholders	2008 or 2009 / Armenia
			<u>Turkey</u> expressed general interest in participating in the follow-up concerning doctoral studies. The <u>French Community of Belgium</u> and <u>Estonia</u> wish to participate in a WG on doctoral candidates.	
	<u>The Netherlands</u> expressed interest in furthering QA: influx			

Action line (London Communiqué)	Action proposed	Organiser(s)	Participants	Timing / Place
DOCTORAL CANDIDATES (continued)	via graduate schools and employability/career paths. (Also related to activities furthered by the OECD.)			
	<u>Commission comment</u> : Projects for Doctoral Candidates and their mobility are supported through EU Lifelong Learning Programme and the Framework Programme for Research.			
SOCIAL DIMENSION				
Report on national strategies and policies for the social dimension, including action plans and measures to evaluate their effectiveness (3.3)	Sharing experience on the development of national action plans		<u>Expressed interest</u> : EUA	
	<u>Comment by Austria</u> : Monitoring should be carried out by mobility working group			
	<u>UK comment</u> : Focus should be on national implementation and reporting, no need for separate working group; possibly seminar to help identify and share good practice <u>Comment by Finland</u> : The main work in this area over the next two years is at national level. No need for a separate working group.			
	<u>ESU proposes</u> social dimension working group as one of the priorities for the work programme. The WG should follow national developments, assist countries regarding their national action plans and promote the sharing of good practices. The working group should also organise a seminar on National Action for Underrepresented Groups, covering all levels of higher education and addressing affordability, student support, access to higher education and between cycles and gender equality.			<u>Expressed interest</u> : French Community of Belgium
	<u>Lithuania</u> expressed interest in joining a working group on social dimension evaluating the effectiveness of action plans			
	<u>Portugal</u> is interested in contributing to the development of the inter-related issues of mobility / equitable balance / social dimension, namely co-operating with other partners in conference and other agreed follow-up actions.			

Action line (London Communiqué)	Action proposed	Organiser(s)	Participants	Timing / Place
GLOBAL DIMENSION				
<p>Take forward work in the core policy areas: improving information on, and promoting the attractiveness and competitiveness of the EHEA; strengthening cooperation based on partnership; intensifying policy dialogue; and improving recognition.</p> <p>This work ought to be seen in relation to the OECD/UNESCO <i>Guidelines for Quality Provision in Cross-border Higher Education</i> (2.20)</p> <p>Report back on overall developments at European, national and institutional levels. All stakeholders have a role here within their spheres of responsibility. In particular give consideration to two priorities. First, to improve the information available about the EHEA, by developing the Bologna Secretariat website and building on EUA's Bologna Handbook; and second, to improve recognition (3.6)</p>	<p>Working group "European Higher Education in a Global Setting"</p> <p>(a) to take forward work in the five core policy areas of the strategy with a special focus on the two priorities "improving information on, and promoting the attractiveness and competitiveness of the EHEA" and "improving recognition";</p> <p>(b) to prepare a draft report on the overall development at the European, national and institutional levels to be submitted to the BFUG in preparation of the Ministerial Meeting in 2009.</p> <p><u>Comment by Council of Europe:</u> We recommend that a new working group be appointed to coordinate the implementation of this strategy and to further the measures that do not depend solely on respective national authorities or where responsibility lies with specific actors.</p> <p><u>Comment by EUA:</u> It will be important to look at all elements in the strategy note and to ensure that progress is made in relation to all these elements until 2009.</p>	Austria	<p><u>Proposed membership:</u></p> <p>Norway as chair of the former working group on external dimension</p> <p>Equal balance of regions, sizes and systems (from North and South, East and West, EU/non-EU etc.)</p> <p>ACA, Council of Europe, EC, EI, ESU, EUA, EURASHE, UNESCO-CEPES</p> <p><u>Also expressed interest:</u> Germany, UK, Holy See, Slovak Republic</p> <p>At the first meeting a detailed work programme and timetable will be agreed upon and work will be divided among the participating countries and institutions so that for each portion of the work programme a country or organization will take the lead so that the work load is equally shared.</p> <p>The working group will be led by a steering committee (also to be agreed upon at the first working group meeting), which will then also act as editing committee for the report</p>	<p>First meeting in 2007</p> <p>Draft report in preparation of the ministerial meeting submitted to BFUG by the end of 2008</p>
	<p><u>UK comment:</u> also consider the role of the ENIC/NARIC networks in wider dissemination</p>			
	<p><u>Czech Republic proposes</u> to further develop the idea of "privileged partnership" or "interested partners", inviting them to seminars dealing with ECTS, learning outcomes etc.</p>		Board to prepare a discussion at BFUG?	
	<p><u>Comment by Austria:</u> All action lines should be dealt with by one working group on "European HE in a Global Setting"</p>			
	<p><u>Comment by Finland:</u> The Bologna Secretariat could take responsibility for developing the website and EUA naturally for developing the Handbook. No need for separate WG.</p>			
	<p><u>Comment by ESU:</u> The website should include</p>			

Action line (London Communiqué)	Action proposed	Organiser(s)	Participants	Timing / Place
GLOBAL DIMENSION (continued) (2.20, 3.6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ trustworthy information supporting international students in a comprehensive manner; ○ an online feedback form for incoming and outgoing students related to the website and to their experiences in the EHEA, e.g. in the field of recognition practices. ○ Information on other regions of the world. 			
	<p><u>The European Commission supports a network of Bologna Promoters</u>, operating in National Teams under the National Authorities (Ministry of Education/ BFUG Delegate). National Teams will be established in all Bologna countries and beyond (Tempus countries). They will be linked to a Virtual Community and will get European Training by experts from their midst.</p>	European Commission	National teams of Bologna Promoters and national authorities in all Bologna countries (and beyond)	
	<p>Seminar on "Transnational education (TNE) and the OECD-UNESCO-Guidelines for quality provision in cross-border higher education" to discuss the guidelines with representatives of other regions, with a view to achieving a consensus of purpose and method, thereby helping to create mutual confidence among quality assurance and accreditation agencies and other key stakeholder groups</p>	ENQA	Representatives from regional quality assurance networks (Asia-Pacific, South America, Africa, etc.) would be encouraged to contribute to the seminar through an invitation to the group of INQAAHE (International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education) regional representatives. Representatives from the Council of Europe, ENIC-NARIC and UNESCO-CEPES would also be invited to contribute to the event.	Autumn 2008
			<p><u>ENQA expressed interest</u> in participating in any work related to the UNESCO/ OECD guidelines and their convergence with the BFUG global strategy</p>	
	<p><u>The Netherlands expressed interest</u> in furthering promotion of European HE and research, for instance through cross border benchmarking and typology of institutions. It is important that next to international comparable information on research, international comparable information on higher education is available. The Netherlands is <u>prepared to organise an event in cooperation with others.</u></p>			

Action line (London Communiqué)	Action proposed	Organiser(s)	Participants	Timing / Place
GLOBAL DIMENSION (continued) (2.20, 3.6)	<u>Comment by the Czech Republic</u> : BFUG should be informed about the developments of the CHEPS project on a typology of institutions (to be completed in May 2008)			
	<u>Germany</u> considers organising an <u>additional seminar</u> with a regional focus (e.g. North America, East Asia, South America)			
DATA COLLECTION				
Develop comparable and reliable indicators and data to measure progress concerning social dimension, employability, and student and staff mobility in all Bologna countries (3.4)	<u>Comment by Germany</u> : There should be one working group responsible for data collection rather than three subgroups			
	Working group to develop indicators for the collection of data	Luxembourg	Data collection experts from Eurostat, Eurostudent and BFUG (<u>Expressed interest</u> : UK; Italy, possibly Hungary and Switzerland; EURASHE; Commission)	
	<u>UK comment</u> : This task has been given to Eurostat and Eurostudent. Until this work has been undertaken, there will be little scope to develop possible indicators for stocktaking. In the interim BFUG should consider what mechanism may be necessary to oversee the work of Eurostat and Eurostudent and monitor progress. This may be best dealt with by a <u>small group of BFUG representatives</u> with expertise in the relevant issues. Whilst a separate WG is probably not necessary, there will be a need for some mechanism to monitor progress and to report back to BFUG as a whole as and when appropriate.			
	<u>EI proposes</u> to have two separate working groups concerning social dimension and mobility and volunteers to take part in the group on mobility.			
	<u>Comment by Austria</u> : No additional working group but should be covered by one stocktaking / data collection working group <u>Comment by Finland</u> : Data collection should be connected to the work of the stocktaking group. No need for a separate working group.			

Action line (London Communiqué)	Action proposed	Organiser(s)	Participants	Timing / Place
Develop comparable and reliable indicators and data to measure progress concerning social dimension [...] in all Bologna countries (3.4)	International Workshop on "Collection and interpretation of data on the social dimension in higher education"	Eurostudent and UNESCO-CEPES in collaboration with the Ministry of Education of Education and Youth of Romania		5-6 November 2007 / Bucharest
	Expert meeting to examine the data needs in higher education policy making in general and Bologna in particular	European Commission	Eurostat, Eurydice, Eurostudent and Bologna experts	November 2007 / Brussels
STOCKTAKING				
Continue the stocktaking process based on national reports (3.7)	Working group Also supported by QF Coordination group Cooperating closely with Beyond 2010 WG	Latvia	<u>Expressed interest:</u> Turkey, Georgia, UK (Scotland), Armenia, Italy; EUA (Trends VI only in 2010); Commission (Eurydice)	October 2007 – April 2009
	<u>Comment by Finland:</u> The Stocktaking group is one of the core elements of the process. We would like to see the Stocktaking group taking a major role in developing stocktaking indicators (qualitative and quantitative) and data collection together with different actors (Eurostat, Eurostudent). According to the need the Stocktaking group could have sub-groups. Analysing national reports and information from other sources is a demanding task especially when there is a lack of valid data. We think that the development of data collection and monitoring indicators (mobility, employability, social dimension) should be closely linked to the work of the Stocktaking group.			
	The European Commission will support the stocktaking through grant support , through the Eurydice network and through participation in the WG (in function of the agenda)			
	<u>Comment by Sweden:</u> The transversal activities like stocktaking and data collection are important and it would be useful to establish a network or coordination group of BFUG representatives with expertise in the field. Unfortunately Sweden is not able to chair or to participate in it.			

Action line (London Communiqué)	Action proposed	Organiser(s)	Participants	Timing / Place
BEYOND 2010				
<p>Consider how the EHEA might develop after 2010 and report back to the next ministerial meeting in 2009. This should include proposals for appropriate support structures. (4.3)</p> <p>Consider for 2010 the preparation of a report including an independent assessment, in partnership with the consultative members, evaluating the overall progress of the Bologna Process across the EHEA since 1999. (4.4)</p>	<p>The <u>Council of Europe</u> would like to contribute to any work on this topic in preparation of the 2009 Ministerial meeting. While structural reform will remain an important feature of the European Higher Education Area, it will be essential to the further development of the EHEA that the roles and functions of higher education in modern societies be put on the EHEA agenda in broader terms. In particular, it would seem essential to include the role of higher education in developing and maintaining democratic culture and in further intercultural dialogue as important elements of the EHEA beyond 2010. The reflections on the EHEA beyond 2010 should also include a consideration of how to approach countries that may fall significantly short of implementing key "Bologna goals". Possible measures may include offers of assistance in devising national policies in specific areas and offers of sharing of experience from countries that have experienced - and overcome – similar problems.</p>			
	<p><u>The Czech Republic proposes</u> an evaluation of the Bologna Process 1999-2009</p>		<p>External experts, collaborating closely with Beyond 2010 working group <u>ESU</u> expressed interest in contributing to this report</p>	<p>2007 – Dec. 2008</p>
	<p><u>The Czech Republic suggests</u> consultative members develop possible scenarios for the future of (European) HE and research</p>		<p>Consultative members (<u>Expressed interest</u>: Council of Europe)</p>	
	<p>Working group to prepare a report on "Bologna beyond 2010" based on the evaluation of the Bologna Process 1999-2009 (see above) and the latest stocktaking results, also introducing the different scenarios for the future of higher education and research (see above)</p>	<p>Czech Republic</p>	<p>+/- 10 members: 1 x stocktaking WG 1 x evaluation WG (if set up) 3 participating countries (<u>expressed interest</u>: Germany, Norway, Georgia, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Estonia, Flemish Community of Belgium) Consultative members (<u>expressed interest</u>: Council of Europe, EUA, EI, ESU)</p>	<p>October 2007– April 2009 draft strategy document to be discussed at BFUG mid-February 2009</p>

Action line (London Communiqué)	Action proposed	Organiser(s)	Participants	Timing / Place
<p>BEYOND 2010 (continued)</p> <p>Consider how the EHEA might develop after 2010 and report back to the next ministerial meeting in 2009. This should include proposals for appropriate support structures. (4.3)</p> <p>Consider for 2010 the preparation of a report including an independent assessment, in partnership with the consultative members, evaluating the overall progress of the Bologna Process across the EHEA since 1999. (4.4)</p>			European Commission 1-3 independent experts 1 x Bologna Secretariat	
			<u>Norway</u> would be willing to set aside resources to support the work on the Beyond 2010 Report	
	A new edition of the Bologna With Student Eyes	ESU		
	Survey prepared by scientific committee to identify current and future challenges for the EHEA	Belgium (Flemish Community)	International experts in higher education (<u>Expressed interest</u> : Council of Europe)	October 2007 – March 2008
	Seminar followed by electronic consultation to discuss and validate conclusions of the survey	Belgium (Flemish Community)	All Bologna partners (<u>Expressed interest</u> : Council of Europe)	Late March 2008 / Belgium
	<u>Comment by Germany</u> : While the communiqué demands that BFUG as a whole considers how the EHEA might develop after 2010, the discussion in BFUG and suggestions need to be prepared in a smaller group. The tasks of this group should also include the preparation of a report on the overall progress of the Bologna Process as well as the preparations for an independent assessment. Decisions on the latter issue will of course have to be taken by BFUG as a whole. Especially with regard to the report networking with the Stocktaking group is advisable.			
	<u>Comment by EUA</u> : Discussion on the future shape of the European higher education landscape is of crucial importance to universities. Therefore EUA is planning to engage in a thorough dialogue with its members, in order to contribute actively to this debate [Beyond 2010] in the BFUG			
	Publication to identify the major challenges and possibly propose new action lines.	Luxembourg	renowned politicians, scholars and business representatives	
<u>UK comment</u> : It will be important that all countries are fully involved in this issue and that there is an early discussion on this at BFUG. A working group on this would be inappropriate; it would be better if this was instead a regular				

Action line (London Communiqué)	Action proposed	Organiser(s)	Participants	Timing / Place
<p>BEYOND 2010 (continued)</p> <p>Consider how the EHEA might develop after 2010 and report back to the next ministerial meeting in 2009. This should include proposals for appropriate support structures. (4.3)</p> <p>Consider for 2010 the preparation of a report including an independent assessment, in partnership with the consultative members, evaluating the overall progress of the Bologna Process across the EHEA since 1999. (4.4)</p>	item on the BFUG agenda for discussion by the full group on the basis of papers circulated in advance.			
	<u>Hungary also proposes</u> to have "Beyond 2010" as regular topic on the BFUG agenda			
	<u>Austria proposes</u> to have the 2009 report prepared by the stocktaking working group (with inclusion of Secretariat and Board/ BFUG) and the ToR for the 2010 independent assessment prepared by the Secretariat with inclusion of Board and BFUG			
	<u>Comment by Finland:</u> It is important that all members of the BFUG are fully involved in these discussions. There is no need for a separate working group.			
	<u>The Netherlands</u> is interested in development of proposals for the period beyond 2010. In co-operation with others it is prepared to invest in the preparation of the terms of reference for an evaluation; and in a group that prepares proposals for follow-up.			
	<u>Sweden proposes</u> to have "Beyond 2010" as a standing point on the agenda of BFUG meetings, at least until 2009			
	<u>European Commission:</u> The preparation of an independent assessment could be an eligible activity under the next Call for the Lifelong Learning Programme (early 2008, for work starting in summer 2008)			
	<p><u>Comment by Slovenia:</u> Paragraph 4.3 asks for a proposal on the development of the EHEA post 2010 (for ministerial meeting in 2009), while the paragraph 4.4 asks for an evaluation report 1999 - 2009 that will also include an independent assessment (for 2010, not necessarily for 2009 ministerial meeting).</p> <p>Slovenia suggests the following three action lines (underlined) with possible follow-up instruments:</p>			

Action line (London Communiqué)	Action proposed	Organiser(s)	Participants	Timing / Place
<p>BEYOND 2010 (continued)</p> <p>Consider how the EHEA might develop after 2010 and report back to the next ministerial meeting in 2009. This should include proposals for appropriate support structures. (4.3)</p> <p>Consider for 2010 the preparation of a report including an independent assessment, in partnership with the consultative members, evaluating the overall progress of the Bologna Process across the EHEA since 1999. (4.4)</p>	<p><u>a) Preparation of a proposal for devel. of EHEA post 2010:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Public consultation on EHEA post 2010, organised by EUA, ESU, EURASHE, ENQA, EI, UNICE in 2008 2. Results reported to and discussed by BFUG in early 2009 3. Final proposal prepared by the Secretariat <p><u>b) Preparation of an evaluation report on implementation of Bologna in signatory countries in period 1999-2009</u></p> <p>Editing group composed of representatives of EUA, ESU and BFUG; the evaluation report will take into account General, stocktaking, Trends and Bologna With Student Eyes reports in 1999-2009 period and include an independent assessment.</p> <p><u>c) Preparation of independent assessment</u></p> <p>Public tender for a project, published and financed by the Commission; the assessment should take into account and provide an overview of the results of numerous studies, projects, PhD theses etc. evaluating the implementation of Bologna process and published in 1999-2009 period; to the extent feasible, the project should provide also an original evaluation study</p>			
	<p>Discussion on public responsibility for higher education</p>		<p>Council of Europe</p>	
<p>2009 COMMUNIQUÉ</p>	<p><u>UK proposal: Small drafting group</u></p> <p><u>Comment by Czech Republic:</u> Also take into account conclusions from seminars</p> <p><u>The Netherlands</u> anticipates that a communiqué drafting group will start mid 2008. That drafting group should be small, and should facilitate proper discussion in the BFUG.</p> <p><u>EUA</u> would like to highlight the important policy development work that has been done in the previous term by the different working groups, reports and seminars. When working towards the next ministerial meeting it would be opportune to define the role of these different elements in the drafting process of the Communiqué leading up to the Leuven Ministerial meeting</p>	<p>Czech Republic?</p>	<p><u>Proposal by Czech Republic:</u> use the "troika" arrangement; including WG chairs, where appropriate; consultative members. To be supported by Bologna Secretariat</p>	<p>Late 2008 until the 2009 conference</p>

Action line (London Communiqué)	Action proposed	Organiser(s)	Participants	Timing / Place
EUROPEAN DIMENSION/ IDENTITY/ VALUES	The Holy See proposes to link the CoE project on these questions (to be launched in Nov. 2007) with the work of BFUG and offers to make a substantial contribution to this work. The best form of this contribution and who else would be interested to join would still need to be discussed.			

General comments made by several delegations:

- The most important issue is to make progress on the implementation of commitments that have already been agreed, and this includes all action lines from all communiqués.
- Most of the activity needs to take place at national level.
- The number of working groups and seminars should be limited – most delegations proposed to have no more than 3 to 5 working groups.
- There should be sufficient time to discuss seminar conclusions and working group outcomes at BFUG meetings to make sure they are fully approved and result in a strong commitment of the entire group.