



**Bologna Stocktaking Working Group  
Minutes of the meeting of 8 November 2007**

Participants

Andrejs Rauhvargers (Latvia) – Chair  
Lela Maisuradze (Georgia)  
Andrea Herdegen (Germany)  
Sverre Rustad (Norway)  
Camelia Sturza (Romania)  
Aybar Ertepinar (Turkey)  
Ann McVie (UK-Scotland)  
Stéphanie Oberheidt (Eurydice)  
Marie-Anne Persoons (Bologna Secretariat)

Invited

Cynthia Dean (expert)

Apologies

Armenia, Italy, EUA

**1. Adoption of the agenda**

Agenda was adopted.

**2. Information by Chair and Secretariat**

The Chair stressed that the timeline for the work on stocktaking was extremely tight if the group was to meet the January 15, 2009 deadline for the draft report. Moreover the BFUG has explicitly asked for cooperation of the stocktaking group with other working/coordination groups in the framework of the 2007-2009 work programme. The Secretariat reported on its contacts with the European Commission. The European Commission will reserve monopoly grant for the Bologna stocktaking. It should be observed that the actual spending of the budget can only take place after the definitive approval of the project, so probably not before March 2008.

### **3. First general discussion on 2009 Stocktaking**

- General method

The Chair presented the relevant paragraphs in the London Communiqué related to stocktaking. It is clear that the demands and expectations are higher than at the previous exercises.

Taking into account the timing, it will not be possible to rely on the results of the data collection working group.

Apart from the usual work on indicators (where indicator 4 should certainly be rewritten), more attention should be given to the qualitative (comparative) analysis. The previous Focus on higher education report will still remain an important reference on the state of implementation end 2008, beginning 2009.

Also the new more limited surveys of Eurydice on the transparency tools (qualifications framework, ECTS and Diploma Supplement) for all 46 countries and on mobility and portability of social support to students (for 31 countries) will provide useful input.

The whole work should be carried out in an integrated way, which will be reflected in the clustering of the questions, e.g. on qualifications framework, credits (ECTS) and learning outcomes.

It could also be considered to look good practices for some aspects.

- Conclusion
  - The indicators will be adapted according to the experience of the 2005-2007 stocktaking and efforts will be made to keep previous indicators wherever possible.
  - The integrated approach will be mainly taken through the questions of the questionnaire.
  - The national reports will remain the main source of the stocktaking. As a national report is an instrument for policy making, it is highly desirable that public HE authorities draft it in cooperation with their national Rectors' conference and Students' association. Such arrangement can however, not be made compulsory to all countries.

### **4. First discussion on the use of indicators**

- Degree system

The following issues should be considered :

- National qualifications frameworks are also (and mainly) to be looked at relation to lifelong learning.
- Stage of implementation : percentages should be adjusted (red = 0-24 %, orange = 25-49 %) and it should be clear that all disciplines are to be counted

(including regulated professions, art and music education...) and “short cycle” to be included only if ISCED 5.

- 3<sup>rd</sup> cycle : information will be asked via questionnaire only. Communiqué does not provide sufficient basis to qualify structured programmes as better implementation and include it in a quantitative indicator.
- Access : relevance of this indicator is questionable. If kept, the question has to be redrafted (word “several” is unclear), also in order to discover whether in some cases first cycle degrees are delivered which do not give direct access to the second cycle.

- Quality assurance

- The whole group of indicators (4-6) should have a heading “Implementation of Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the EHEA (ESG)”. The 2005-2007 indicator 4 proved to be ineffective. Indicator 4 should therefore be redrafted and related to Part 1 of the ESG dealing with internal quality assurance within higher education institutions.
- Ann will provide a draft. For external QA, the top level 5 = peer review already taken place (or date scheduled ?)
- Student involvement. According to ESG they should participate at 5 levels (not 4). If involved at one level only = red. Rest of the colours attributed accordingly (dark green = 5 levels).
- International participation : dark green if in all cases.

- Recognition

- national reports will be checked against results of Eurydice survey on transparency tools. Therefore it is recommended to ask identical questions in questionnaire for national reports to avoid diverging answers. Eurydice will provide their questions to the working group in due course.
- Indicator 7-8 : attribution of colour to percentages should be amended. Higher percentages needed for higher scores.
- Indicator 9 (LRC) should be rewritten. Andrejs will provide a draft.

- Recognition of prior learning

- Indicator should build on the core elements in a sound procedure of recognition of prior learning. Previous work at EU level (e.g. Council resolution on the validation of non-formal and information learning) or OECD can be used as reference material. Marie-Anne will collect some material on this issue.

- Qualifications framework

- Completion of self-certification procedure needed for dark green.

- Joint degrees

- One of the subjects where there can be a large discrepancy between allowance by legislation and concrete obstacles in implementation.
- Indicator 12 will be dropped, only questions for questionnaire.
- Questions should be made more concrete to have a clearer picture on e.g. at which level joint degrees are more frequent than at other levels. Andrejs will provide a draft.

## **5. First discussion on template for national report**

Questionnaire will be focussed on new information. We should avoid to ask the same questions over and over again, if no substantial change in the situation is expected.

EHEA in global setting : questionnaire will concentrate on national implementation on implementation of UNESCO/OECD guidelines for quality provision in CBHE and on international recognition. Global dimension working group can be involved in formulating questions and provide a chapter, if necessary.

## **6. First discussion on inclusion on the social dimension**

Liaison needed with social dimension working group. Ann can function as liaison. If it appears impossible to set up a specific working group on social dimension, the stocktaking working group will have to draft the template of the national action plans for the social dimension by itself.

## **7. Timeline**

- to adjust in function of tight reporting scheme
- 4 meetings to come : Berlin, 7 February 2008, Paris, 13 October 2007, Brussels, 26-27 January 2009, Riga 13 March 2009
- Deadline for submitting national reports Mid-November 2008
- November 2008- January 2009 : preliminary analysis of results.

## **8. AOB**

Colleagues that promised formulation of questions or have other suggestions for drafting of the questionnaire will send their proposals to Andrejs.

Members of stocktaking working group that also participate in other working groups will function as liaison of our group to those groups.

The Bologna Secretariat will be present in all working/coordination groups anyhow.

***Next meeting : 7 February 2008, Berlin.***

*Start of the meeting according to arrival of flights (arrival times to be communicated to Marie-Anne).*

MAP

27.11.2007