



BFUG Board Meeting LXXXI

Hosted by Kazakhstan
5 October 2022

Minutes

List of Participants

Delegation/Organization	First Name	Last Name
Albania (Vice-Chair)	Linda	Pustina
Azerbaijan (BFUG Outgoing Co-Chair)	Vusala	Gurbanova
Bosnia & Hercegovina (BFUG Incoming Co-Chair)	Aida	Duric
Bosnia & Hercegovina (BFUG Incoming Co-Chair)	Goran	Janjic
Council of Europe	Katia	Dolgova Dreyer
Czech Republic (BFUG Co-Chair)	Michal	Karpišek
Czech Republic (BFUG Co-Chair)	Iveta Dudek	Ptačnicková
European Commission	Kinga	Szuly
European University Association (EUA)	Michael	Gaebel
European Students Union (ESU); WG on Social Dimension Co-Chair	Horia	Onita
France (BFUG Outgoing Co-Chair)	Mathieu	Musquin
Kazakhstan (BFUG Co-Chair)	Kuanysh	Yergaliyev
Kazakhstan (BFUG Co-Chair)	Indira	Abilmazhinova
Kazakhstan (BFUG Co-Chair)	Aitzhan	Kulumzhanova
Kazakhstan (BFUG Co-Chair)	Yuliya	Idiyatova
Sweden (BFUG Incoming Co-Chair)	Robin	Moberg
Sweden (BFUG Incoming Co-Chair)	Kristina	Haskas
Bologna Implementation Coordination Group Co-Chair	Ann Katherine	Isaacs
WG on Fundamental Values Co-Chair	Mihai Cezar	Haj
WG on Learning and Teaching Co-Chair	Ana	Tecilazic
CG on Global Policy Dialogue Co-Chair	Magalie	Soenen
WG on San Marino Roadmap Co-Chair	Jordi	Llombart
BFUG Secretariat (Head)	Oltion	Rrumbullaku

1. Welcome and Introduction

1.1. Welcome by the BFUG Co-Chairs (Czech Republic and Kazakhstan)

Mr. Kuanysh Yergaliyev (Co-Chair, Kazakhstan) welcomed everyone to the 81st BFUG Board meeting and thanked the BFUG Chairs, BFUG Secretariat and outgoing Co-Chairs for their support and contribution. Mr. Yergaliyev concluded by wishing for a successful discussion and fruitful meeting.

Ms. Iveta Dudek Ptačnicková (Co-Chair, Czech Republic) welcomed everyone and thanked the Kazakhstan Co-Chair for hosting the Board meeting. Ms. Ptačnicková commended the Kazakh Co-Chairs for sharing and promoting the Bologna Process values and good practices in the area of higher education in the Central Asia region. She emphasized the rigorous work performed by the outgoing BFUG Co-Chairs. Further, Ms. Ptačnicková reaffirmed Czech support for Ukraine and stressed the need to reinforce the key commitments and cooperation within the EHEA and on a global level. She thanked the BFUG Secretariat for their work and support, and highlighted

that the upcoming BFUG meeting would be held in Brno, Czech Republic on 7-8 November 2022, sharing additional details on the upcoming meeting.

1.2. Welcome by the BFUG Vice-Chair (Albania)

Prof. Ass. Linda Pustina (Vice-Chair) welcomed everyone to the BFUG Board meeting and thanked the Kazakhstan Co-Chairs for organizing the meeting, apologizing in advance for being unable to attend the meeting in person. Ms. Pustina highlighted the purpose of this meeting to review potential changes to the BFUG Rules of Procedure that will be presented at the next BFUG meeting, as well as to discuss the advancements that the BFUG working structures had made since the previous BFUG meeting. She congratulated the incoming and outgoing BFUG Co-Chairs, the working structures, and Secretariat for their efforts, cooperation and support.

1.3. Information by the outgoing BFUG Co-Chairs (France and Azerbaijan)

Ms. Vusala Gurbanova (Azerbaijan) thanked the BFUG Secretariat and Chairs for the support and smooth handover procedures. She made notice of Russia and Belarus having their right of representation in the BFUG and the working groups suspended and underlined the necessity to promote cooperation amongst various BFUG groups in order to strengthen higher education.

Mr. Matthieu Musquin (France) expressed his gratitude to the BFUG Co-Chairs for the organization of the meeting. He underlined the first takeaway from France's co-chairing term, namely the suspension of Russia's and Belarus' representative rights in all EHEA working structures. Mr. Musquin continued by pointing out the necessity for the Bologna partners to support the Ukrainian educational system. He also mentioned the proposal to amend the existing rules of procedure, which would allow for the introduction of qualified majority voting, although with the possible effect of delaying potential adoption, and concluded by highlighting the topic of inclusive mobility.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda of the meeting was adopted without changes.

For more information, please see: [BFUG Board Meeting LXXXI Agenda](#)
[BFUG Board Meeting LXXXI Annotated Agenda](#)

3. Update from the BFUG Secretariat

Mr. Oltion Rrumbullaku (Head of BFUG Secretariat) thanked the BFUG Chairs and outgoing Co-Chairs for their great cooperation and support to the BFUG Secretariat during their tenure and for a smooth transfer process. Mr. Rrumbullaku gave an overview of the key processes and activities undertaken by the Secretariat since the last BFUG meeting, including the contribution of the BFUG Secretariat during the handover to the incoming Co-Chairs. He also shared information on an overview of data on the BFUG working structures, the state of the meetings held, participation in extra related events/activities of other WGs, membership and attendance rates, in addition to a synopsis of all the meetings held. Mr. Rrumbullaku concluded by wishing for a productive meeting and discussions.

4. Update from the Bologna Implementation Coordination Group (BICG)

Prof. Ann Katherine Isaacs (Co-Chair, BICG) provided an update of the state-of-play of the Bologna Implementation Coordination Group and its three Thematic Peer Groups (TPGs), as well as the respective challenges and disquiets. Ms. Isaacs highlighted the purpose of the BICG to coordinate the implementation of the three key commitments of the EHEA. She highlighted that four online meetings have been organized thus far, with the next meeting scheduled for October 25, 2022.

A summary of the work of the three TPGs was given, together with information on the composition and structure of each peer group, the organization of previous meetings, details on upcoming meetings, support from EU funded umbrella projects, and additional expressions of interest from countries to participate. Ms. Isaacs also discussed the primary specific thematic indications of all three TPGs, as well as their planned peer learning activities, public seminars, staff mobility programs, and specific working groups. Furthermore, it was informed that the majority of countries have submitted their TPG work plans, raising concerns about the remaining countries

Ms. Isaacs also enclosed the challenges, discussion points, and reflections identified by the BICG. She emphasized the need for all countries to participate more actively in TPG operations, particularly those that might offer guidance and information regarding the implementation of the Key Commitments. Increased cooperation was also anticipated, as there is in some cases a lack of coordination among the different representatives of each country in the three different TPGs. Overall, it was concluded that the TPGs should focus their efforts on ensuring that the Key Commitments are successfully completed and remain at the forefront of its operations as a result.

5. Updates from the BFUG Working Structures

5.1. Working Group on Monitoring the Implementation of the Bologna Process

The Co-Chairs of the working group delivered a written report on the group's progress thus far. Given the suspension of Russia and Belarus from the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), a question was raised about the data collection of these countries. The countries' involvement in the BFUG cannot be acknowledged due to the suspension of membership, despite the fact that they were identified as being nominal members of the EHEA. It was determined that the WG does not plan to collect data on Russia and Belarus for this working period.

For more information, please see: [Working Group on Monitoring Report](#)

5.2. Working Group on Fundamental Values

Mr. Mihai Cezar Haj (Co-Chair, WG on FV) gave an overview of the WG's meetings organized so far, and presented the work on the first draft statements with regards to the fundamental values¹ Further, he mentioned key discussion points in the last WG meeting in Malta on the possible indicators that should be used in the monitoring system, especially in the Bologna Process Implementation Report (BPIR) 2024.

Next steps included the organization of the next WG meeting at the end of October 2022, with the main goal of discussing the key indicators that should be included in the BPIR 2024, as well as the proposals from the WG on FV, WG on Monitoring, and the EU funded umbrella project (NewFav). With the goal of having a final document on the topics of *public responsibility, student and staff participation*, and an advanced statement on *institutional autonomy* by December 2022, the group will continue the work on the abovementioned statements. In addition, another WG meeting will be held in February 2023, to examine the mechanism to be used to monitor the Fundamental Values across EHEA, which remains a very important challenge.

Mr. Haj concluded by highlighting the challenges ahead, namely proposing a clear set of indicators for the BPIR, and the drafting of the statement on *academic integrity*.

¹ Fundamental Values: Academic Freedom, Institutional Autonomy, Academic Integrity, Participation of students and staff in higher education governance, Public responsibility for and of higher education.

5.3. Working Group on Social Dimension

Mr. Horia Onita (Co-Chair, WG on SD) provided a summary of the WG on SD's progress so far, highlighting the need to create a framework for the Principles and Guidelines (PAGs) implementation through specific goals like planning peer support activities and creating a system for monitoring the PAGs' implementation. The close cooperation with the WGs on Learning and Teaching and Monitoring was highlighted, emphasizing four coordination meetings with each WG having been held.

Additionally, the main conclusions from the most recent WG meetings were presented. At the Malta meeting, it was decided that the indicators would take the form of statements. Moreover, as some indicators relate to QA activities, it was discussed in the Haguemeeting that cooperation with ENQA and EQAR was necessary. It was also decided to arrange additional internal consultations regarding the indicators. The list of indicators and sub- indicators was finalized at the most recent meeting in Brussels, but the definition of the term 'sub-indicators' and the nature remains to be determined. In the end, the indicators and monitoring system will be incorporated into a more thorough and complete edition of Principles and Guidelines. Finally, the representative of Belgium/Flemish Community extended an invitation to members to participate in the survey on the Principles and Guidelines and the PLAs as part of the umbrella project, supporting the WG on SD.

For more information, please see: *Working Group on Social Dimension Update*

5.4. Working Group on Learning and Teaching

Ms. Ana Telazic (Co-Chair, WG on L&T) provided an overview of the WG meetings, its three subgroups, and expounded on the three main specific issues and other topics from the ToRs, with the WG focusing on system-level initiatives and practices throughout the EHEA. Ms. Telazic discussed the next PLAs on staff development for October 2022, student-centred learning for June 2023, and innovative learning and teaching for the third PLA, which is still being discussed regarding its format and location.

The WG has created extensive lists of potential themes and indicators, which have been provided to the WG on Monitoring for consideration, with regards to their viability for data collection via BPIR. The WG has also developed connections with other BFUG working structures, including the WG on Social Dimension, the WG on Monitoring, and the Thematic Peer Group A on Qualifications Framework. The ERASMUS+ PROFFORMANCE+ Project, which has offered to host the WG's next meeting, and the ERASMUS+ START Project have undertaken concrete and practical steps toward cooperation.

A remark was made that the WG ought to focus more on system level policies than institutional ones, as has occasionally been the case for the latter.

For more information, please see: *Working Group on Learning and Teaching Update*

5.5. Coordination Group on Global Policy Dialogue

Ms. Magalie Soenen (Co-Chair, CG on GPD) provided an overview of the state-of-play of the CG on GPD and its respective subgroups, as well as information on the meetings organized. Ms. Soenen addressed in this overview the CG's contribution to the UNESCO World Higher Education Conference through a policy brief. It was announced that the first of three EHEA conversation webinars with Africa will take place around mid-December 2022. Within the Americas subgroup a colloquium with Mercosur and a session at the CHEA annual conference are prepared. Concerning the cooperation with Asia, there has been participation in several conferences already and further cooperation is being set up, also through the ASEM process. She also announced that a draft communication text has been composed to be utilized by the CG for communication with the regional organizations. Next steps include promoting synergies between the CG and the IN-GLOBAL project and the start-up of the subgroups on the Global Policy Forum and the Global Policy Forum Statement. In addition, it was announced that the next CG meeting would be held on the 24th of October. Overall, the Board members recommended that there be greater cooperation for tasks associated with the

Global Policy Forums (GPF). In the framework of its work discussions to strengthen global links, references were made to the Council of Europe (CoE) in regard to the Lisbon Recognition Convention (LRC), the ENIC-NARIC annual meeting and Global Recognition Convention related to UNESCO.

5.5.1. Developing Central Asian Higher Education Area on the basis of Bologna process principles

Mr. Kunaysh Yergaliyev (Co-Chair, Kazakhstan) provided an overview of the development of the Central Asian Higher Education Area based on the Bologna Process principles. The establishment of the Central Asian Higher Education Area is essential due to the region's growing mutual migration of students in Central Asia, and an increase in requests for the recognition of academic credentials and other qualifications. The Bologna Process experience of Kazakhstan can be used to share best practices with the surrounding nations.

The Turkestan Declaration in June 2021, which established the Central Asian Higher Education Area (CAHEA), has been signed by three countries. The creation of comparable NQFs, streamlining the processes for recognizing academic credentials and qualifications, promoting regional student and staff mobility, cooperating in the creation of collaborative study programs, etc. are a few of the primary objectives of the Turkestan Declaration.

More than 150 representatives and rectors of Central Asian institutions gathered in Kazakhstan for a significant forum. In order to increase the quality, inclusivity, and competitiveness of higher education in Central Asia, this forum formed the Alliance of Central Asian Universities, that aims to multiply cooperation in this area.

To conclude, through the establishment of a permanent CAHEA bureau, Mr. Yergaliyev described a further step that is intended to establish and unify the Central Asian Higher Education Area. Each country will serve as the bureau's chair for a single year, and the bureau will have six permanent members. The creation of work plans, the organization of the Conference of Ministers of Central Asia, and other coordinating tasks will be the key responsibilities of the CAHEA bureau.

5.6. Working Group on on Roadmap for San Marino's accession to the EHEA

Mr. Jordi Llombart (Co-Chair, WG on San Marino Roadmap) underlined the purpose of the WG to assist the San Marino authorities in the process of implementing the key principles at national level. He emphasized the fourth WG meeting, which took place in San Marino, highlighting the roadmap's progress, as well as the members' positive cooperation and information exchange.

Mr. Llombart elaborated on the main points of the roadmap, stating that the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) is currently subject of second consultations with important stakeholders, and that two experts have been selected to assist with the completion of the NQF and the self-certification process. In terms of governance, the majority of the coalition has been presented with the university Bill of Law, which allows universities more autonomy and transparency, and the formal legislative procedure in the parliament will begin the following month. With regards to quality assurance (QA), three articles have been adopted to embed internal and external QA. It was also noted that San Marino will work with an external QA agency, but it remains to be identified. All of the degrees granted by the university are joint degrees with Italian partner universities, with a framework for the recognition of qualifications in place.

Finally, the HE system has steadily incorporated lifelong learning initiatives to aid students in honing their abilities, utilizing technology, and fostering social cohesion. The Territorial Pact

was highlighted, which is regulated by the HE Law, as an advisory body with representatives like rectors, university staff, students, local administrations, trade unions etc.

On a technical note, Mr. Lombart voiced concern regarding the Secretariat's inability to attend the in-person meetings that this WG has organized. He urged that the Secretariat resolve this issue, as it interferes with the WG's activities and effective functioning. It was also highlighted that the Secretariat ought to fully carry out its mandate, which required participating actively in WG meetings and providing support and assistance. Similar concern was raised by Cezar Mihaj Haj (RO) on behalf of WG Fundamental Values, referencing to late delivery, low clarity of minutes, complications and lost emails caused by hacking secretariat servers according to the Secretariat.

The Co-Chairs proposed later, after mutual consultation, that the Secretariat and Vice-chair will be invited to update the BFUG on possible challenges and obstacles in order to seek for the suitable solution which would enable the Secretariat to participate and offer full support to the BFUG structures work and meetings. This proposal was adopted by the BFUG Board.

For more information, please see: *Working Group on San Marino Roadmap Update*

5.7. Update from the EHEA Network of QF National Correspondents

Ms. Katia Dolgova-Dreyer (CoE) delivered an update on the EHEA Network of NQF Correspondents' and its thematic focus points, with emphasis on the impact of Covid-19 on higher education credentials and the HE's role in promoting democracy. Three case studies from Finland, Andorra and the United Kingdom were presented and are related to the implementation of the Reference Framework for competences for Democratic Culture and its relationship with qualifications. Ms. Dolgova-Dreyer added that the theme of democracy is an essential one for the CoE. Additionally, a discussion regarding micro credentials with an emphasis on the EU Recommendation on a European Approach to Micro credentials for Life Learning and Employability took place, and Ms. Dolgova-Dreyer confirmed that more information about its results will be provided at the BFUG meeting.

6. A thematic block on Learning and Teaching

The discussion of the thematic block on Learning and Teaching began with a mention of the LOTUS project and the previous informal consultations with the WG on Learning and Teaching. It was clarified that all that is presented are working proposals to be accepted by the BFUG and Board as a direction for final preparations for the BFUG. Conclusions and discussions from the last BFUG meeting in Strasbourg, such as on the topic of Mobility, represent some of the inherited tasks to be addressed in the present meeting and in the future. It was proposed that this thematic block be focused on an umbrella view of Learning and Teaching, Academic Career Development and Mobility.

It was suggested that this block begin with a reflection on Learning and Teaching-related topics and concrete ways in which governments can support. Career development, particularly in governmental policies and regulations, and Mobility were cited as the other two main discussion topics. It was confirmed that no further presentations are needed, only short introductions of topics by those facilitating the groups as the focus should be on communicating the main actions and proposals from members. It was suggested that overlap among the different groups' discussions should be minimized as much as possible.

The BFUG meeting was noted as a rare occasion bringing together a large group of representatives from ministries, in contrast to most PLAs and group discussions where there are more representatives from academia. This was cited as possibly a great help to the WG on Learning and Teaching colleagues in terms of yielding a fruitful policy-level discussion. Further on, the WG on Learning and Teaching was reminded to reflect on the possible agenda and the

issues they would like to address for the Ministerial Communiqué. Bullet points that reflect the focus of the discussion were requested. The agenda proposed included specific time slot for presentations to allow more time for facilitated group discussion.

One of the suggestions was to keep the focus on a limited number of questions that can serve to direct the discussion and keep it centered, as losing focus represents one of the main struggles during discussions. Student-centered learning and student mobility were proposed as additional priority topics to be carefully treated during Learning and Teaching discussions. The group was reminded that the discussion should be kept at the policy-level. The point was heavily emphasized that all members should take care to not repeat any past discussions, to be specific, and to choose issues that can contribute to policy-making. As policy-making discussions are especially challenging, the members were urged to seek concrete approaches to be discussed.

There was a reminder that, in Strasbourg, the working group leaders of Learning and Teaching, Social Dimension and Monitoring, were to all address the issue of Mobility but there were no concluding remarks on this issue. It was iterated that Board agreement was necessary at this point in time to ensure that the discussion is headed in the right direction. The case of the Netherlands, where Learning and Teaching is divided into the three pillars of national-level strategy, funding and bodies/agencies was proposed. Transformative education was recommended as an essential point in the agenda for policy in education.

The meeting concluded with the following proposition: Theme and focus were approved including three different strands within group discussions. Secretariat will contact all working groups relevant to the issue of mobility, remind them of Strasbourg BFUG discussion and co-chairs will invite them to discuss jointly mobility issues in order to clarify the focus of further discussion, while keeping the focus on possible methods of government support and being open to any important subjects that may come up.

For more information, please see: [Thematic Block on Learning and Teaching](#)

7. Finalization of the pending changes of the Rules of Procedure for 2022-2024

The present topic, it was clarified from the very beginning, was deliberately separated from the next topic (The creation of a Task Force for the Rules of Procedures) on the present meeting's agenda. It was noted that there was an agreement among members on the necessity of a provisional method which allows for a conclusion on the issues where consensus cannot be reached. It was iterated that there has never been any voting procedure, with the exception of choosing Ministerial Conferences hosts, and that this process has been reserved solely for situations of crises. Because, however, there have been past situations that have brought up similar discussions, it is safer for the BFUG to include a written set of rules, guidelines, and procedures on how to manage similar situations.

The group was reminded that the issue was introduced in Strasbourg and most arguments centred on the voting mechanism and the decision-making powers. The question was raised whether a bridging solution should be proposed to the BFUG until the revised Rules of Procedures are in place. If agreement is reached, a proposal with an agreed-upon formulation should be drafted and be presented in Brno.

It was confirmed that the overarching principle is that BFUG members attempt to reach a decision by consensus and, when this proves unsuccessful, the BFUG chairs opt for a decision to vote. It was further clarified that the BFUG representative responsible to cast the vote is the head or member of the delegation and that each member has two votes. Finally, there was a reminder that the voting procedures and arrangements are coordinated by the BFUG secretariat.

The discussion was centered around the term "absolute majority" as stated in the Rules of Procedures document. There were issues with the ambiguity of the footnote attached to the term "absolute majority" in that it does not specify the exact meaning of the term. It was suggested that either "absolute majority" be better specified or that the alternative of a 2/3 majority be proposed in its place. It was recommended that the document not be sent out offering alternatives.

Another suggestion was to be precise about the numbers. As the document is drafted, attention should be devoted to the precise number of members, on the counting or lack thereof of the two suspended countries and on how the two alternatives discussed are affected by the numbers. In response to this, it was stated that in the case of an absolute majority, the counting takes place irrespective of the number of people present as voting in absentia is an option. To this, there was a response regarding the figures of active participation of members in meetings. The usual participation consists of 40-42 members with one single case of 35 members. Considering this number, an absolute majority, which is reached with 25-26 votes, can be attempted. Furthermore, it was clarified that suspended members are not counted for any type of quorum or majorities, as they do not have the right to vote.

In terms of voting procedures, it was discussed that the rule is open ballot but there should not be more than one member asking for a secret vote. It was suggested that this be used as a threshold. There were suggestions that casting a single vote per country, with Belgium as a possible exception, may be more appropriate than having countries represented by two members or votes. It was explained that the BFUG tradition is the granting of two ballots to each country, which does not present a problem as every country has two ballots. There was a reminder here that in BFUG, the correct term to use is "delegations" rather than countries.

There was concern regarding the legality of drafting these guidelines and the possibility of seeking legal counsel before adoption as most members are education experts with no legal expertise. The example of the Rules of Procedure of the Lisbon Recognition Convention was cited wherein the specifics of who is allowed to vote are very clearly and explicitly stated.² On the legal concerns, it was confirmed that due to the fact that the BFUG is not a legal personality, it can only discuss these issues as internal rules and cannot discuss Rules of Procedure from a legal standpoint.

On the topic of introducing a 2/3 majority, it was deemed necessary to create a better basis for having such a discussion, and it was recommended that the pros and cons of the proposed method are first discussed among members.

Discussion on the specifics of who should be allowed to vote were extensive. There were proposals that the vote of all BFUG members who have the right to vote should be counted and not only those present in the meeting where the voting takes place. The issue was raised that counting votes from all members might be problematic. It was suggested that it may be better to have votes from members who participate rather than the ones who do not. Furthermore, there may be issues with not reaching a quorum as some may forego participation. It was recommended that the procedure selected take into consideration such potential issues and somehow ensure that voting takes place.

The issue that there cannot be a 2/3 majority with a quorum was reiterated. However, it was also clarified that regardless of the option selected, whether 2/3 or absolute majority, it should be clearly specified whether that majority is of all members or of all members who are physically present. This brought on more discussion on the electronic voting option which, according to some members, needs further clarification. There may be two methods of offering remote and in-presence electronic voting and these should be specified. It was suggested that

² "Simple majority of the Members present and voting," was the phrasing cited.

members can vote electronically or grant in-presence delegation members a mandate to vote by proxy. The pros and cons of secret voting were also considered.

The recommendation of having a hybrid version was underlined, of having 2/3 of participants but no less than the absolute majority of the BFUG membership vote which would make the number not fall below 25. While it can also be problematic, some members agreed that this may be a good compromise. Another proposition asked whether the final required figure can be 2/3 of those present if they represent no less than half of the total number of members of the BFUG. In the end, it was reminded that half of the members make a quorum and, from that, the 2/3 majority is the decision-making power. It was ultimately suggested that the voting options be kept to either in-presence or online or both, without the option of hybrid or votes in absentia.

The conclusion was to propose one solution to the BFUG, relatively simple with the prospect of having revised Rules of Procedure within next two years. The final formulation emphasised the voting used mainly for procedural, not content or policy issues, the role of co-chairs in calling for the vote, a quorum of at least half of members present and at least two-thirds of those present voting in favour of the proposal to adopt it.

8. Discussion on the creation of an Ad Hoc group for the Rules of Procedures

In the BFUG Meeting LXXX, it was proposed that the current Rules of Procedures 2021–2024 document be reviewed in its entirety. As a result, a Terms of Reference document for a Task Force (TF) has been developed in order to carry out the revision of the Rules of Procedures document. It was indicated that the ToRs should be officially adopted at the forthcoming BFUG Meeting LXXXII, in order for the TF's work to ideally start in the beginning of 2023 and produce a thorough overview of the Rules of Procedure document in one to one and a half years. It was advised that the TF composition be somewhat small and ideally made up of individuals with historical knowledge of and experience with the Bologna Process and its procedures, principles, and ideals over the years, as well as drawing on the experience of the BFUG Co-Chairs and the Secretariat.

It was suggested that this TF might make recommendations on the necessary structural changes for the position and mode of operation of BFUG structures, with a focus on examining the position and role of the Secretariat and mode of operation in order to facilitate a smooth process. It was emphasized that these suggestions have to be regularly discussed in the upcoming BFUG meetings, and it is envisaged that they will be proposed as basic framework and principles before the Ministerial Conference, to be reflected as necessary within the Communique and mandate the BFUG to prepare implementation during the following working period.

It was advised that the specific tasks be outlined in detail and that organizational processes be taken into consideration rather than just specific cases (i.e., voting procedures). Thus, it was emphasized that the Rules and Procedures document should address all eventualities that the Bologna Process's rules and regulations may require for.

A point was raised with reference to Specific Task f)³, regarding the engagement of consultative members in the consultation of the Rules and Procedure document. On that basis, it was proposed to either omit this task or reword it and transfer it to the section under "Values and principles."

It was also noted that if the document would be slightly revised to address certain procedural situations that have been highlighted, then the current planned composition would suffice, but

³ Cooperation with the Consultative Members that have similar way of organization.

if a full extended review that included substantial changes were to be conducted, it was noted that the composition might not be adequate to perform such a thorough review. Nonetheless, it was argued that since there will be conversations between the TF members and the BFUG members and consultative members, the small composition number might not be an issue.

To conclude, it was decided that specific task f) would be omitted and incorporated in the section on 'Values and principles'. It was also determined that written comments on the ToR paper would be sent within a week, in order to establish the framework of this TF in the future BFUG meeting so that the TF may commence work at the beginning of the following year.

For more information, please see: [ToRs Task Force Review of Rules and Procedures](#)

9. Roadmap towards the Ministerial Conference and Global Policy Forum 2024

The purpose of this document was highlighted to develop a comprehensive, in-depth process flow so that all parties involved in the various structures would be aware of how to bring the various activity strands together. It was underlined that this process flow should be incorporated into the suggested final documents that will be discussed in the Ministerial Conference in Tirana.

Moreover, it was proposed that incoming BFUG Co-Chairs provide a review or regular updates on this document, to be presented at the respective BFUG meetings, in order to maintain the concept of this roadmap relevant.

It was highlighted that there will be two BFUG Board meetings and two BFUG meetings in the semester prior to the Ministerial Conference; therefore, it was requested that the document reflect the additional meetings. It was suggested that the first BFUG meeting take place in February 2024, and the second be held around the end of April or the start of May 2024. Consequently, the BFUG Board meetings would be scheduled five to six weeks prior to the BFUG meetings. Representatives of Belgium and Holy See will be asked to clarify the planned meetings.

An additional remark was made with regards to the terminology used in the text, that there ought to be a distinction between the terms 'Communique' and 'statement'. It was also noted that the Drafting Committee would be established and determine the structure and timelines to be followed. Additionally, it was highlighted that one consultative member be nominated, thus discussions should commence on this matter in order to agree on consultative members' representative at the next BFUG.

It was decided to propose at the upcoming BFUG meeting that the following Ministerial Conference take place in the spring of 2027, with the host country to be decided by the start of 2023. Since the financial plans must be finalized by the European Commission by October 2023 and are necessary for the launch of the Erasmus+ calls, it was noted that this decision needed to be made soon. To conclude, comments on this document would be sent within a week to the Secretariat and Co-Chairs before 13 October and incorporated accordingly, with the revised document, with correct terminology, to be presented at the BFUG meeting in November 2022.

For more information, please see: [Roadmap Towards the Ministerial Conference and GPF 2024](#)

10. Discussion of the Draft Agenda for the Upcoming BFUG Meeting LXXXII

The proposed draft agenda for the upcoming BFUG Meeting LXXXII meeting was presented. The proposal of including a section on the situation in Ukraine in the agenda received support and was given priority as a subject. The subject would be added at the start of the second day to allow more time as requested by ESU and EUA, and in addition to an update on the situation in Ukraine, a summary of the current coordination and member responses at the European

level would also be offered. In order to allow more discussion on policy and content issues addressed by the working groups, it was suggested that the updates from the BFUG working structures be given additional time, totaling to 2 hours.

For more information, please see: [BFUG Draft Agenda LXXXII](#)

11. Information by the Incoming Co-Chairs (Sweden and Bosnia & Hercegovina)

11.1. BFUG Board Meeting LXXXIII (Bosnia & Hercegovina)

Ms. Aida Duric (Incoming Co-Chair, Bosnia & Hercegovina) thanked the Kazakh Co-Chairs for hosting the meeting and made a brief announcement about the co-chairmanship of Bosnia and Hercegovina coinciding with the country's 20th anniversary of joining the Bologna process. She mentioned that a pre-meeting had already taken place and that there were plans to hold the Board meeting in Sarajevo at the beginning of April (possibly on 4 April 2023).

11.2. BFUG Meeting LXXXIV (Sweden)

Mr. Robin Moberg (Incoming Co-Chair, Sweden) expressed gratitude to the Kazakh Co-Chairs for hosting the meeting and provided a brief update on the 2023 BFUG meeting, which will be held in Stockholm, Sweden from May 10 to 12. More comprehensive details about this meeting would be made available at a later stage.

Following these updates, it was agreed to include in the Roadmap the suggested dates for the upcoming BFUG Board meeting and BFUG meeting as most likely, yet these might be still revised in the light of the BFUG roadmap discussion.

12. AOB

A summary of the meeting discussions and outcomes was delivered and approved as a whole list of conclusions, and the meeting was concluded with thanks to the BFUG Chairs, BFUG Secretariat and the members for their contribution and support.