

## Advisory Group 3: Dealing with Non-Implementation

Strasbourg (France), 7 June 2017

### Minutes

#### 0. List of Participants

Delegation	First Name	Surname
COE	Villano	Qiriazzi
EQAR	Colin	Tück
ESU	Lea	Meister
EURASHE	Michal	Karpíšek
European Commission	Klara	Engels-Perenyi
France	Marie-Odile	Ott
Iceland	Una	Vidarsdóttir
Liechtenstein	Daniel	Miescher
The Netherlands	Ferdi	Geleijnse
BFUG Secretariat	Marina	Steinmann

#### 1. Welcome

Sjur Bergan welcomed the participants on behalf of the hosting organisation, Council of Europe, congratulated them on the valuable support their work had received at the BFUG meeting in Gozo, and reminded them of the challenging agenda for this meeting.

#### 2. Adoption of the draft agenda

The agenda was adopted.

#### 3. Minutes from the last meeting

The minutes were adopted.

#### **4. Update from the Gozo BFUG meeting**

The revised version of Working Paper III had been presented at the BFUG meeting in Gozo. Many delegations had actively supported the proposal on the cyclic model as put forward by AG3; four delegations had expressed concerns especially with the "implementation committee" but the model for the procedure (Working Paper III) was approved and AG3 had been asked to work further on the role and composition of the "implementation committee". Therefore the focus of the current meeting would be on that, as well as finding a more appropriate name for the facilitating organ, discussing the precise senders and recipients of the letters on implementation, as well as settling on which indicators to include in the report on the implementation of the key-commitments.

#### **5. Nature and role of the temporarily named "Implementation Committee"**

The members agreed that the nature of the "committee" is to be a facilitating body without any executive decision-making power (e.g. it is not signing/sending letters). Its role is to match partners for dialogue and peer support and to advise the BFUG on how the process is proceeding.

The group will be proposed as a "standing committee" to make clear that it has to be operational longer than one working period (i.e. the interval from one ministerial conference to the next) and needs to be more stable than the traditional AG/WGs with institutional memory. That means that some of the members may change through time but that the task is ongoing (like the monitoring implementation (WG1)).

##### *Composition*

The model specifies that members of the facilitating committee should be nominated during the Ministerial Conference, and therefore a procedure for inviting countries/organisations to volunteer for membership has to be launched in time. The committee should include representatives both from ministries and higher education experts. The nominated individuals should commit themselves to continuous participation i.e. within this committee there can be no sleeping members. In terms of composition, it was thought wise to limit the total number of members to 12-15 and for one to be a co-chair of a future WG1. The choice of countries/organisations should aim to best represent the existing diversity of the EHEA, i.e. by having a good mixture of organisations, countries, and levels of implementation. Some administrative support may be necessary (e.g. by the Secretariat).

##### *Tasks*

The committee will have the main purpose of matching up countries that offer support in implementation of key commitments with those in need of such support. Using its experiences and overview, it may bring to the BFUG's attention fields of particular interest. A regular (e.g. yearly) report from the committee to the BFUG was proposed.

The "committee" will report to the BFUG, and reports will be publicly available, and it is up to the BFUG, or – where appropriate – the Ministerial Conference, to make decisions on actions to be undertaken on the basis of information received from the committee.

The BFUG would have to make the decision on the indicators to be used for assessment, and on possible future changes regarding the key commitments. Letters could be drafted by the "committee" which would also ensure that they are sent. However it would be the responsibility of the BFUG Co-chairs to send the letters to BFUG representatives.

Monitoring of action plans will be the responsibility of the countries concerned, and progress be monitored through the regular monitoring procedures of the BFUG. In addition to that, the committee should be mandated to ask for progress reports as a source of the committee's report to the BFUG. Thus the "committee" should have an advisory role in pin-pointing further the challenges of the Bologna Process and its instruments.

##### *Committee name*

AG3 discussed several proposals for the name of the facilitating committee/group but agreed to propose the name "Key commitment implementation group" to the BFUG to underline that this group will be supporting the implementation of Bologna key commitments.

## 6. Monitoring the Key Commitments

WG1 had provided a list of scorecard indicators and tables/graphs for consideration for inclusion in the report on implementation of key commitments. As the cyclic procedure specifically addresses scoreboard indicators, it is necessary that the data on implementation of key commitments are compatible with that format. Thus the group could foresee that some of the material currently presented as graphs, or some of the new issues addressed in the revised monitoring questionnaire, need to be revisited and presented in the scorecard indicator format. The following list includes only the data that AG3 thought could or should be used in the monitoring of key commitments. The group felt that many of the other indicators that had been suggested by WG1 were indeed very important for the BFUG monitoring report, but do not specifically address the key commitments.

### 1.1 *Three cycle*

NEW Degree structures in parallel/not conforming to Bologna structures:

NB: needs to be developed into a scorecard indicator.

Figure 2.2 (Scorecard indicator no. 1)

2.1 is important, but already included in 2.2.

### 1.2 *ECTS*

2.21 (Scorecard indicator no. 4)

2.22, 2.23 and 2.24 to be used but need to be developed into scorecard indicators.

NEW: Student perspective to be included but needs scorecard indicator or combined with 2.22

NEW: monitoring of key aspects of ECTS to be included but needs to be developed as a scorecard indicator

### 1.3 *National Qualifications Frameworks*

2.19 (Scorecard indicator no. 3) There was discussion here on whether the indicator needed to be specified to avoid confusion between QFEHEA and EQF as some countries do have an NQF that only applies to parts of the education system that lies outside HE.

NEW: Use of national qualifications frameworks by national authorities – should be included in that scorecard indicator if possible. The information is very important

### 2.1 *Lisbon Recognition Convention*

Here there is a need for a scoreboard indicator on the subject (based on 2.30)

A new scoreboard indicator is needed (based on 2.30 and possibly 2.31).

It has to be confirmed with WG1 whether information from the recent report on implementation of LRC will be included as an additional source of data for the Bologna Implementation report and if score card indicators will be developed on that basis.

### 2.2. *Diploma Supplement*

Scorecard indicator no. 5 to be included

### 3 *Quality Assurance*

NEW Higher education institutions policies for quality assurance adapted to ESG 2015 needs to be included in a scorecard indicator

3.8 (Scorecard indicator no. 7) to be included but needs to be revised to reflect the key commitment

3.12 (Scorecard indicator no. 8) is needed.

3.13 (Scorecard indicator no. 9) to be included

3.9 – 3.11 are already included in Scorecard indicator 8 and 3.2, 3.3 and 3.8 already included in scorecard indicator 7.

## 7. Plans for the final report

Before the next meeting, a draft of the short report will be written by the chairs and the writing group and circulated to the rest of the group. The final version of the report will be published with the implementation report on the three key commitments produced by WG1, as one document.

## **8. Summary of decisions and the work ahead**

All details of the key commitment implementation group will be written up in the form of "Terms of Reference". These Terms of Reference will be drafted by the writing group; then sent out for comment by all AG3 members to be ready in time for submission to the Tartu BFUG meeting. Since they build the basis for the report from AG3, the indicators should be presented at the same meeting.

A proposal for further action should be brought forward to the first BFUG meeting in 2018 and finalised at/after the second BFUG meeting in 2018, so countries/organisations can come up with proposed members and these can be nominated at the Ministerial Conference.

The last meeting of the group will take place in December 2017, in preparation for the January 2018 BFUG meeting.