Updates and draft recommendations
Bologna Implementation Coordination Group

Zagreb, 7 February 2020

BICG updated to the BFUG Board

- Activities of the TPGs are still ongoing until March.

- The last BICG meeting is taking place in March.

- A survey to the participants in all the groups will be launched – deadline end March.

- Analysis of the responses will feed into the Final BICG Report and the Communiqué.

- The final BICG Report will include reports from all the three TPGs and will be submitted to the BFUG for the Split BFUG meeting.

- Particular point on the BFUG Split agenda would be appreciated so to allow the TPGs to discuss the outcomes of their work.

- The TPGs were asked by the co-chairs to focus on recommendations to the Communiqué when preparing their update to the BFUG Board.

TPG A (QFs) - recommendations

- The **awareness** about NQF and the importance of their implementation has increased. However, availability of up-to-date **information** concerning especially self-certification on EHEA website is important.

- Co-operation with the EQF has been sought throughout the work. **Referencing/self-certification** as one process is being discussed. Many countries areready to self-certify their compliance with the QF EHEA.

- Challenges when it comes to self-certification in participating countries may be linked with:

    - uncertainty about timing (how much "implementation" is needed)

    - resources

    - political and administrative interest and prioritizing

- Further work needs to be done in the area of **ECTS** implementation in line with the ECTS Users' Guide.

TPG B (LRC) - recommendations

- The role of **DIGITALISATION** in supporting mobility, employability and automatic recognition with the application of new technologies (*blockchain*). Digitalisation is a key aspect also in linking recognition and quality assurance, with perspectives of simplifying the verification of accreditation – use of DEQAR database in the recognition process.

- The **Peer support model** has added value, and could be further developed with more transversal topic/actions among different TPGs. It is recommended to foster the implementation of the LRC in close cooperation with the ENIC-NARIC centres and the LRC Committee Bureau.

- Commitment of the EHEA countries in fostering **ethics, integrity and transparency** in education, enhancing **trust** and confidence in the quality and reliability of qualifications, adopting measures to eradicate all forms of fraudulent practices and encouraging the use of new technologies, networking and peer support activities among countries.

bologna process

EUROPEAN
Higher Education Area

TPG C (QA) - recommendations

- The TPG activities have not been all finalised yet.

- TPG C had its final meeting and discussed the **future of the Bologna Peer Support Group on QA**: the general message was a very positive towards the existence of the peer support structure, valuable for ministries and agencies. Although there are different QA arenas and structures, the specific structure of the TPG C on QA brings together **ministries** and QA **agencies** together. Proposal to take **stakeholders** up in the composition of the TPG C on QA, e.g. employers.

- Peer learning and the staff mobility are valuable. The **dissemination** of the outcomes in the national systems is important. Also the reporting of countries towards other members of the group can be considered relevant.

- The work of the TPG C on QA has been **concrete**. Hopefully the TPGs will continue, as the work started, should further be carried out. A new mapping of **topics** should be done if the peer group continues its existence.

BICG SURVEY (deadline: end March)

*In which peer support **group** are you participating? Which **organization** are you representing?*

*Has the work undertaken through the peer group **helped** your country to achieve implementation of the (3) key commitments in your country/institution/organization? If yes, please outline briefly the **concrete outcomes** that have been achieved so far. (Has it lead to new legislation? Has it inspired new measures? Have you been able to pick up good practice from other countries?) If no, please explain briefly why you consider the peer group approach has **not worked**.*

For the period 2020 – 2023, do you think the peer support approach should be:

- ***continued** for the **thematic area** in which you have participated?*

- *used in **different thematic areas**? If yes, which areas would you recommend. If no, please explain why not.*

*Do you have any suggestions to **improve** the Peer support/ Thematic Peer Group approach? If yes, please explain*

Draft 1xxx of the Ministerial Communiqué, Rome 2020 (version 6 Feb)

In the 2018 Paris Conference we decided to devote special efforts to the three "Key Commitments" essential for the functioning of the EHEA: the Qualifications Framework for the EHEA and ECTS, the Lisbon Recognition Convention and the Diploma Supplement, and Quality Assurance according to the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG).

We created the Bologna Implementation Coordination Group (BICG) to develop peer support mechanisms to accomplish this. The three Thematic Peer Groups have proved effective not only in assisting in implementing the agreed reforms, but also in developing a spirit of cooperation among the participating countries and identifying new aspects to be addressed.

Draft 1xxx of the Ministerial Communiqué, Rome 2020 (version 6 Feb)

We confirm our commitment to the full implementation of the key commitments. We ask the BFUG to continue to employ the peer support method, and commit to the continued participation of and contribution by our own countries. We recognize the efforts of the national authorities and their contribution to the Groups' success. [Here we might include some sentences about the thematic peer groups]

Open questions: advice and guidence from the Board appreciated

- Achievements and proposals of the three TPG, A, B, and C to be placed in the Annexes of the Communiqué – if agreed, would that be the BICG Report, the updated version of the one presented at the Helsinki BFUG meeting? Or another type of document?

- Do we need a coordination group (BICG)? Is there a need for better coordination in the development of commitments in the three interdependent policy areas or multiple structure is an administrative obstacle?