



## BFUG BOARD MEETING LXIV

Skopje (“The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”<sup>1</sup>)

12 February 2019

### Minutes

#### List of participants

Delegation	First Name	Surname
BFUG Co-chair (Romania)	Cristina	Ghițulică
BFUG Co-chair (The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia)	Borcho	Aleksov
BFUG outgoing Co-chair (Austria)	Stephan	De Pasqualin
BFUG incoming Co-chair (Finland)	Maija	Innola
BFUG incoming Co-chair (Finland)	Birgitta	Vuorinen
BFUG incoming Co-chair (Turkey)	Tuncay	Döğeroğlu
BFUG incoming Co-chair (Turkey)	Elif	Huntürk
BFUG Vice-chair (Italy)	Ann Katherine	Isaacs
Council of Europe	Sjur	Bergan
ESU	Adam	Gajek
EUA	Michael	Gaebel
EURASHE	Michal	Karpíšek
European Commission	Klara	Engels-Perenyi
AG1 on Social Dimension Co-chair (ESU)	Robert	Napier
AG2 on Learning and Teaching Co-chair (France)	Philippe	Lalle
BICG Co-chair (Austria)	Helga	Posset
CG1 on Global Policy Dialogue Co-chair (Belgium Flemish Community)	Magalie	Soenen
BFUG Secretariat	Filippo	Benedetti
BFUG Secretariat	Giovanni	Finocchietti

<sup>1</sup> After the Board meeting was held, notice was given of the completion of the procedures foreseen by the Prepsa Agreement, and the name North Macedonia will be used for any meetings, events, reports, etc. after this date.

BFUG Secretariat	Rocío	Iglesias de Ussel Rubio
BFUG Secretariat	Clarissa	Ioimo
BFUG Secretariat	Edlira Adi	Kahani Subashi
BFUG Secretariat	Luca	Lantero
BFUG Secretariat	Vera	Lucke

Apologies from BFUG outgoing Co-chair (Switzerland) and WG1 on Monitoring Co-chair (Norway)

## 1. Welcome and introduction

The hosting Co-chair ("the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia") welcomed the participants convened in Skopje. He conveyed the apologies of the Swiss BFUG outgoing Co-chair and the Norwegian WG1 on Monitoring Co-chair for not attending the meeting.

### 1.1 Information by the outgoing BFUG Co-chairs: Austria / Switzerland

The Austrian outgoing BFUG Co-chair, also on behalf of the outgoing Swiss Co-chair, expressed gratitude and appreciation for the fulfilment of their tasks and thanked the BFUG Secretariat for their support and assistance which enabled them to carry out their work efficiently. The task of setting up the working, advisory and coordination groups and having their ToR approved has been quite a challenge, but with the joint efforts of all actors, this has been completed and the groups are operating.

*Attachment: Board\_AU\_CH\_62\_Minutes.pdf*

*Attachment: BFUG\_AU\_CH\_63\_Minutes.pdf*

### 1.2 Welcome by the current BFUG Co-chairs: Romania / "The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"

The Romanian Co-chair welcomed the participants and expressed her pleasure to be co-chairing the BFUG. The work plan has started to be implemented; the immediate target being to ensure the best organisation of the BFUG Meeting in Bucharest. 90 participants have already registered and there is optimism and encouragement for all countries to participate. The BFUG Vice-chair (Italy) is very much involved, and the BFUG Secretariat is very much on track with all the required assistance.

### 1.3 Information by the BFUG Vice-chair (Italy)

The BFUG Vice-chair (Italy) expressed her thanks to the host, the outgoing Co-chairs, with whom there was a very good cooperation and a lot of work was accomplished, and welcomed the new Co-chairs, with whom there is a strong shared feeling that joint efforts and cooperation will lead to a successful semester. A great deal of work has been carried out by everyone, and the outcomes are very positive. A special thanks to the BFUG Secretariat,

which is active and supportive in all the daily tasks. She emphasized that the meeting would be important and interesting as it is to address some very important topics, such as the future of the EHEA.

During the meeting the deputy Minister of Education of “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” greeted the participants, giving them an overview of the latest developments in the country, starting with the new law on higher education, which is not fully compliant with Bologna yet, since there are some commitments still to be achieved, e.g. full membership in ENQA. Then he gave an overview of HE in the country, focusing on the issue of quality assurance. There is a need to comply with accreditation processes, to increase the number of graduates, and to increase investment in scientific research, considering that in recent years it is around 0.2% of the GDP. Considerable funds are spent for students going abroad or for translating international scientific literature. “The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” is learning from others’ experiences, i.e. for VET and the Torino Process and the good practices from Albania, while in the HE sector examples of good practices should be taken from different countries.

## **2. Adoption of the agenda**

The agenda was adopted with minor modifications

*Attachment: Board\_RO\_MK\_64\_2a\_Draft Agenda.pdf*

*Attachment: Board\_RO\_MK\_64\_2b\_Draft\_Annnotated\_Agenda.pdf*

## **3. Information from the BFUG Secretariat**

The BFUG Secretariat illustrated the work done so far. The new EHEA website is finally operational, including a calendar of events. The participants were asked to inform the BFUG Secretariat in case they face any difficulties when using the new website. All participants and countries have been asked to review and update, if needed, their national information, in order to finalise all contents.

The BFUG groups and their composition were presented:

- Advisory Group 1 on Social Dimension (AG1)
- Advisory Group 2 on Learning and Teaching (AG2)
- Coordination Group 1 on Global Policy Dialogue (CG1)
- Working Group 1 on Monitoring (WG1).

All BFUG national delegations were contacted in order to update their contact details and respective participants. All BFUG groups are in place and fully functional. All the contact persons will be contacted in the next weeks with reference to the GDPR regulations. With regard to Advisory Group 1 (AG1), the Secretariat proposed to hold an electronic consultation to accept the two new members Luxembourg and Sweden. In regard to Working Group 1 (WG1), the Secretariat has updated the e-mail contact list, but there are still three countries that have not answered the request to give their representative’s contact details. They will be directly contacted by the BFUG Secretariat during the BFUG meeting in Bucharest. The BFUG Secretariat informed the Board that from 2012 Board and BFUG meetings are being considered on the same level, and the numbering continues according to the order in which the meetings are held. They will continue to use this method. In regard

to the BFUG Co-chairing in the second semester of 2020, and therefore with regard to the incoming Co-chairs of the first semester of 2020, due to the uncertain outcomes of the "Brexit" process, different options for the BFUG Co-chairing were presented. The floor was opened for comments. The Board members congratulated the BFUG Secretariat on the new website, which proves to be very user-friendly (e.g. uploaded documents can be easily downloaded, and every group has its own page). The consensus was that the issue of Co-chairing after the 1<sup>st</sup> 2020 semester should be discussed after 29 March 2019, the expected date of the "Brexit".

*Attachment: Board\_RO\_MK\_64\_3\_Info\_BFUG\_Secretariat.pdf*

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

The Austrian Co-chair of the Bologna Implementation Coordination Group (BICG) informed the participants about the BICG and the three Thematic Peer Groups (TPGs). The 1<sup>st</sup> formal meeting of the BICG was in June, and the second at the end of August 2018. A questionnaire was sent to all BFUG countries and Consultative members asking them to declare their interest to participate in the TPGs. All BFUG countries except two have committed themselves to at least one TPG. The BICG met in September in Vienna with the TPG Co-chairs and discussed the feasibility of the work ahead. The designated TPGs, including all Co-chairs, met again in Brussels, discussed their respective action plans, and agreed to send one representative per TPG to the BICG meetings. All TPGs had their 1<sup>st</sup> meetings in December 2018 or January 2019. The European Commission (EC) launched a call for financing activities in the TPGs, and there is a strong belief that once financed, the countries that could not attend the first meetings will become more active and the work of the TPGs will be more fruitful. The already active participation in the 1<sup>st</sup> TPGs meetings shows the interest of countries that a good formula for the groups has been found. The BFUG Secretariat has done a good job so far regarding the updating of the web site with the information on the BICG and TPGs work. The BICG will have an interim report ready for June 2019.

The feedback to the questionnaire, sent in summer 2018, showed the commitment of all participating countries in regard to taking practical steps on the implementation of Bologna Process (BP) key commitments.

The BICG should report on the added value and developments in the countries. Gathering the country inputs used as basis for TPGs action plans was an important first step. The responses were very detailed, giving an overview of activities. The countries now must match up with other countries to address matters of common interest. The BFUG members themselves should be involved more closely with their representatives in the TPGs in order to facilitate normative change and engagement of stakeholders. In the discussions two important questions were raised. First, that the work should be focused on what the TPGs were set up to work on, i.e. the three key commitments, rather than broader aspects of the related topics. The TPGs should not develop into general policy making fora. Second, that, i.e. the final reports should be analytical rather than merely descriptive, so as to clearly identify the issues on which further work will be required. This would give ministers a clear understanding on how this method works, with highlighted examples where peer support led to improvement in the national legislation and national context.

The overall approach of the TPGs is very positive, as the practical steps seem to be most relevant when it comes to actual implementation and constructive solutions. On the basis of the needs and issues identified by each country, the key issues within the TPGs need to be targeted through a good collaboration between members, as suggestions for change must come first from the professionals, then from the national authorities, if change is to be accomplished on the country level.

## 5. Updates from the AGs, CG and WG

### 5.1 Advisory Group 1 on Social Dimension (AG1)

The Board was informed by the Co-chair of AG1, representative of ESU, that Luxembourg and Sweden requested to participate in AG1. The BFUG will be asked for approval via electronic consultation. The creation of a restricted area on the BFUG website was requested, in order to enable members to share materials online rather than via e-mail. The AG1 Co-chair also raised also the issue of locations and dates of the future meetings, due to a possible visa problem for some participants.

Two meetings are foreseen (ideally April and June 2019) before releasing a first draft of the report, which should be ready by mid-September 2019, to enable circulation and discussion among members. In the discussion, it was underlined that the report should be analytical, in order to enable the BFUG to develop a concrete discussion. Finally, the request of the Austrian Student Ombudsman, who is representing the European Network of Ombuds in Higher Education (ENOHE), to join the coming meeting in Zagreb was welcomed.

AG1 will dedicate its first meeting on 19 February in Zagreb to discussing the ToR of AG1, the current state of play on the social dimension, and on previous commitments, as over the years several social dimension commitments were made, but not all of them were implemented. There is therefore the intention to analyse the reasons. AG1 will have a workshop to analyse how best to present the guidelines that it should deliver by 2020. For example other guidelines discussed and approved previously, but not many countries have acted on them. AG1 will review them again, asking all the BFUG countries for their approval. More information on AG1 will be available after the 1st meeting.

### 5.2 Advisory Group 2 on Learning and Teaching (AG2)

The French Co-chair informed that, with reference to the Paris Communiqué, AG2 is focusing its work on the impact and potential of digital technologies in supporting innovation, inclusivity, and the research/education linkage. The specific tasks of AG2 include supporting innovative approaches in learning and teaching and collecting best practice examples across EHEA countries. A survey has been carried out among members via an online questionnaire. Three sets of questions were raised:

- Supporting and training teachers for future higher education (four questions)
- Policies and practices for teaching, learning and curriculum development in higher education in a digital age (six questions)
- How can higher education be prepared for future skills and future challenges? (four questions).

The group has not yet met, but there has been electronic consultation and the Co-chairs met in Paris on 16 January 2019 to discuss the results of the survey.

12 countries answered the questionnaire, which was only sent to the group, therefore the outcomes of the survey concern those countries. Although all issues raised in the survey appear to be relevant, six topics should be considered most relevant for the work of the group: Teaching in career path, teacher training, diversity, lifelong learning, digitalisation in teaching and quality assurance.

Then the floor was opened to the Board members for discussion. The main issue raised was that most of what has been discussed was focused on the teaching side, while the approach should mainly focus on a student-centred approach, hence on learning, as one of the pillars of the Bologna Process. The learners' needs should be placed at the heart of the discussions, and all issues should include the learners' perspective. Furthermore, assessment should be considered, as well as learning and teaching, and there should be focus on ensuring alignment of these three elements.

Participants also raised the question of how examples of good practice should be collected, and what should be the criteria for this exercise. Examples of good practice should include as many countries as possible. A further issue regarded the possible synergies but at the same time the potential overlapping of the AG2 agenda with those of other groups, e. g. AG1 on Social Dimension, and the BICG Thematic Peer Group (TPG) on Quality Assurance. A further issue was the role of public authorities in improving learning, teaching and assessment.

*Attachment: Board\_RO\_MK\_64\_5\_2\_AG2.pdf*

### 5.3 Coordination Group 1 on Global Policy Dialogue (CG1)

The Belgium - Flemish Community CG1 Co-chair recalled the general scope of CG1, which is aimed at enhancing useful and beneficial dialogue with other regions of the world. There is a need to define and discuss themes of mutual interest and benefit, dealing with the most active actors of the different regions, with a global approach rather than aiming efforts towards a few specific regions.

She reported then on the outcomes of the meeting held on 8 February 2019 in Brussels. The discussions focused first on the ToR and aimed at making clear the goals of the CG1. For the preparation of the 2020 Policy Forum, it was decided to follow up on the Paris Policy Forum in 2018 by sending letters to the ministers who attended, as well as to those not attending the event in Paris. A third letter should be sent to countries not invited to the Paris BPF. A subgroup from the CG1 will work on reaching out to regional organisations to be involved, according to existing contact lists which will also be expanded.

Since the ToR mentions linking to existing events, as well as organising the CG's own events, the Board was informed about the following: There will be an *ad hoc* event in Rome in October 2019, which will be organised in close cooperation with the EU Representation in Italy, aiming to inform all the diplomatic representations in Rome about the Bologna Process and the Rome 2020 Ministerial Conference and Policy Forum; the CG wishes also to interact with the CoE event "Global Forum on Academic Freedom, Institutional Autonomy, and the Future of Democracy" on 20-21 June 2019 and the 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Bologna Declaration event (24-25 June 2019).

As the Drafting Committee for the Rome 2020 Communiqué will be the same committee working on the Global Policy Forum (GPF) Statement, the CG1 members suggested to be involved in the drafting of the Statement.

Possible forms of membership such as affiliate or associate for non-European countries wanting to join the Bologna Process was another topic discussed during the CG1 meeting. The issue of countries outside Europe wanting to be associated with the EHEA should be carefully considered. ESU suggested inviting students' representatives from non-EHEA countries to the GPF, considering that it would be an advantage to include relevant and strong student organisations. This should be underlined in the invitation letters for the ministers.

With regard to the Rome 2020 Ministerial Conference and Policy Forum, the CG1 proposes holding parallel sessions focusing relevant issues, also taking the UN SDGs as a possible focus. The SDGs are mentioned in the Paris Communiqué, but the question was raised as to whether it might be better to keep the SDG theme for after 2020. The key commitments, internationalisation and mobility were also mentioned as possible topics.

In the last Ministerial Conference, the integration of the EHEA Conference and the BPF which included some breakout appeared to work well. The CG suggests considering such a scheme also for the Rome 2020 Ministerial Conference. However, the agreement was that the geographical scope of the GPF should be discussed further. There were arguments for a more restricted scope (e.g. South-East Asia, Africa), but also for a global approach. Once the geographical scope is decided, invitations to countries should be discussed carefully.

Finally, the CG1 discussed the need for a Bologna Process newsletter, not only for Global Policy Dialogue, but also in order to inform EHEA stakeholders about what is happening in the EHEA. The task of developing ideas on this topic was delegated to the BFUG Secretariat. Since it would take resources, both human and financial, it is necessary to reflect further on the feasibility of the proposal, as well as on its benefits.

#### 5.4 Working Group 1 on Monitoring (WG1)

The Board received the apologies of the Norwegian representative of WG1, absent due to health reasons. The CoE representative informed about the composition of the Task Force created under WG1 to investigate the issue of fundamental values in the EHEA and referred to the discussion of this point in the September BFUG meeting in Vienna. He also emphasized that in order to seek a broader view, the Task Force intends to organize two hearings, with opinions from a broad spectrum of actors, on how to implement the fundamental values and on how to assess the state of play. The Task Force which will meet for the first time on 25 March will report to the WG1 their results for final approval or for their considerations.

*Attachment: Board\_RO\_MK\_64\_5\_4\_progress\_report\_task\_force.pdf*

*Attachment: Board\_RO\_MK\_64\_5\_4\_guidelines\_task\_force.pdf*

## **6. Future of the EHEA: Governance and thematic priorities after 2020**

### 6.1 The Survey: Presentation and analysis

The BFUG Secretariat forwarded the apologies from the outgoing Swiss BFUG Co-chair for not attending the meeting and presented the results of the survey on her behalf. Answers were received from 32 BFUG members and eight Consultative members. The presentation gave an overview of the answers received on the topics of governance level on the BP, suggestions for the priorities for the next decade, quantitative goals for 2030, work of the BFUG, BFUG Secretariat, topics for future goals, chairing arrangements (with the approval of the Troika formula) and the period between the Ministerial Conferences.

The reason for the survey is to prepare discussions in the BFUG that can lead to the proposals to the ministers on how EHEA might look between 2020-2030. Discussions brought out some interesting topics, such as a great need for continuity, the composition of the secretariat, and how to establish a structure which could serve also on national level. There is the need for the BFUG delegations to have close relations at the political level in their respective countries. The topic should be raised during the BFUG meeting in Bucharest.

It was proposed that the BFUG Secretariat should redraft the report on the survey. The report is the first step in the trajectory which will lead to formulating new goals at the Rome 2020 Ministerial Conference. To elaborate on the vision for higher education for 2030, at the Bucharest BFUG meeting, there should be a key note speech by a speaker with sound experience in higher education policy and the Bologna Process. This should be followed by discussions in groups. A concept paper should also be developed as base for discussions. Topics for the next decade should include an analysis of what is the added value of the EHEA in dealing with those topics in this setting. The EHEA should focus on the basic values of higher education, like academic freedom, institutional autonomy, student and staff representation, and also on new areas of cooperation. It was proposed to work on a longer timescale than just from one Ministerial Conference to another. This would enable the EHEA to have a broader vision, and the single Ministerial Conferences could be used to specify better or to modify some of the goals.

*Attachment: Board\_RO\_MK\_64\_6a\_Governance\_Priorities.pdf*

### 6.2 Twentieth Anniversary of the Bologna Declaration

The BFUG Secretariat informed the Board about the celebrations of the 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Bologna Declaration through a conference in Bologna on 24-25 June 2019. The deadline for proposals of contributions to the scientific conference is March 15, and the scientific committee will make a selection. There are some BFUG consultative members involved in the scientific committee. The discussions, at this stage, focus more on the technical aspect of the preparations. The BFUG members have invited national representatives to participate in the event. The BFUG should have some ownership in this event, and it should be seen as a good opportunity for receiving feedback also with respect to the discussions on the future of the EHEA.

The scientific conference could be a good opportunity to focus on the future, creating further input for the BFUG discussions. The Board asked the BFUG Secretariat to discuss the issue of BFUG involvement with the host of the event, University of Bologna.

### 6.3 Other events for wide-scale consultation

Items 6.3 and 6.4 on the agenda were discussed together, considering they are connected to each other as topics.

### 6.4 Discussion, roadmap, workplan

The EC submitted a draft document with suggestions how preparations for the next decade of the EHEA could be structured. It was proposed to give the task of preparing the roadmap for further broad consultations to the BFUG Secretariat; the roadmap would be presented to the Board for discussion and to the BFUG for approval. Suggested activities foreseen in the roadmap start with a thematic discussion in the BFUG meeting in Bucharest, followed by consultations on the national level, include preparation of the 1<sup>st</sup> draft of the Rome 2020 Communiqué around the end of 2019, and the endorsement of the proposals to the BFUG meeting in April/May 2020, which should finalise the text of the Rome Communiqué. The Co-chairs will present a roadmap to the BFUG for approval in its meeting in Bucharest.

The Board considered that topics for the next decade should focus on the implementation of structural reforms, peer support, mobility, innovation in learning and teaching, social dimension, while limiting the number of new topics. Only topics should be considered for the Bologna Process for which this type of cooperation demonstrates a clear added value. Monitoring of all agreed commitments should be continued. These topics, including a roadmap, should be discussed in the BFUG in a structured way.

## **7. Discussion on EHEA - ERA coordination process**

The European Commission informed the Board on the ongoing contacts with their colleagues of DG Research: there was agreement about the opportunity to find concrete issues around which to start discussions. A Conference might be organised, maybe in November. The Finnish incoming BFUG Co-chair informed that the Finnish EU Presidency intends to establish a connection between Research and Education by organising a joint seminar for European Research Area and Innovation Committee (ERAC) and Directors General for Higher Education (DG HE). Discussions are still at an early stage, and no information on the practicalities is available yet. More information will be given during the BFUG Meeting in Bucharest.

## **8. BFUG Delegate in the EUROSTUDENT VII Steering Board – Result of the Call for Candidates and designation of the delegate**

The Romanian BFUG Co-chair gave information on the EUROSTUDENT Project and summarised the role and composition of the EUROSTUDENT VII Steering Board. Following the proposal of the EUROSTUDENT Coordination Group, a Call for Candidates was launched to designate a BFUG delegate in the EUROSTUDENT VII Steering Board. The BFUG Secretariat informed that – as in previous years – the Call for Candidates was open to BFUG members only. Ms. Linda Pustina (Albania) and Prof. Vincenzo Zara (Italy) submitted their expression of interest. Ms Pustina notified that, in case of other candidatures, she would step down.

The designation of Prof Vincenzo Zara was approved as the BFUG delegate in the EUROSTUDENT VII Steering Board. The BFUG delegate and the EUROSTUDENT Coordination Group would be notified accordingly.

## **9. 2018 Annual Report on the developments and progress in the implementation of the Belarus Strategic Plan**

The Co-Chairs informed the Board that the Belarusian authorities sent a report on the implementation of the 2018 National strategic plan. The Board agreed that the report was received too close to the Board Meeting, making it very difficult to read it thoroughly, to understand the status of the process, to make comments, and to raise questions. A lot of information is included in the report, but it lacks analyses and does not make any synthesis. ESU shared with the Board the comments received from the Belarusian Students' Association and the Belarusian Independent Bologna Committee. They reported that a number of issues are missing in the report, while further issues do not appear to be properly addressed; among others, the student representation, the mandatory work placement, the plans to involve foreign experts, and a work plan for expected peer support actions. It was decided to ask Belarus that the report should be resubmitted and forwarded with all annexes to the Board. The Board members were given two weeks' time to read the report thoroughly and reflect on the contents. Comments and questions should be sent to the BFUG Secretariat, will be collected and forwarded to the Belarusian authorities by the BFUG Vice-chair, who will be keeping contacts and receiving feedback. It was suggested that discussions on Belarus should be envisaged in future Board meetings.

*Attachment: Board\_RO\_MK\_64\_9\_Belarus.pdf*

## **10. Composition and work plan for the Drafting Committee for the 2020 Ministerial Communiqué and a Bologna Policy Forum Statement**

Board members discussed the composition of the Drafting Committee: it was suggested that it would be opportune to include a consultative member in the Committee. The Co-chairs concluded that the composition of the Drafting Committee would be forwarded to the BFUG for decision with the proposal to include ESU as representative of Consultative Members according to the modality that will be decided by the BFUG in Bucharest. It was suggested that the CG1 would produce a first draft of the BPF Statement, which would then be developed further by the Drafting Committee to ensure coherence with the draft Communiqué.

## **11. Update on EHEA Network of National Qualifications Frameworks Correspondents**

The CoE briefed the Board on the topic, recalling the discussions held in the BFUG meeting in Vienna. Two topics are particularly pertinent: the self-certification process and short cycle qualifications. The CoE is represented in the EQF Advisory Group with particular reference to higher education. A meeting of the Network is planned for early autumn. A document will be submitted to the BFUG meeting in April.

## **12. Draft agenda for the BFUG meeting in Bucharest**

The Board members discussed the draft agenda. The idea of putting the issues of vision and thematic priorities for the future of the EHEA in the agenda of the first day of the meeting was seen as effective: experience has shown that discussions on complex topics should be initiated on day one of the BFUG meeting, allowing enough time for discussions and conclusions. Issues more for information – i.e. discussions on the ERA-EHEA coordination process – should be dealt with later on in the meeting and at shorter length than foreseen in the draft agenda. The final draft of the agenda should be circulated among the Board members, and at least two weeks before the meeting it should be forwarded to the BFUG. All items in the Agenda should have a brief written background document/report

*Attachment: BFUG\_RO\_MK\_65\_2a\_Draft\_agenda.pdf*

*Attachment: BFUG\_RO\_MK\_65\_2b\_Draft\_annotated\_agenda.pdf*

## **13. Information by the incoming Co-chairs**

### BFUG Board Meeting LXVI in Turkey (23-24 September 2019)

The Turkish incoming Co-chair proposed to hold the Board meeting in Istanbul on 23-24 September 2019. The venue is to be decided. The draft agenda will be discussed with the Finnish Co-chair, to be sent to the Board members. The incoming Turkish Co-chair gave a presentation on Higher Education in Turkey, with an overview focused on the national authorities, the trends of enrolment of foreign students (an impressive increase through international support programmes such as Mevlana Exchange Programme, Project-Based International Exchange Programme, Erasmus+ Programme; scholarships; joint education and training programmes in the number of international students studying in Turkey is reported since 2014), the internationalisation policies and trends, the NQF, and other topics related to the HE sector and the present and future challenges for the country.

*Attachment: Board\_RO\_MK\_64\_13a\_Turkey.pdf*

### BFUG Meeting LXVII in Helsinki, Finland (12-13 November 2019)

The Finnish incoming Co-chair gave practical information on the BFUG meeting to be held in Helsinki on 12-13 November 2019. The incoming Finnish Presidency of the EU was also introduced, giving information on the preliminary priorities in regard to Higher Education, and reporting on plans of action. Preliminary information was given on the joint conference of ERAC and Directors General for Higher Education, organised back-to-back with the ERAC and DG HE meetings, the ESU convention, and a launch event of the “European Universities”.

*Attachment: Board\_RO\_MK\_64\_13b\_Finland.pdf*

## **14. Follow-up on BFUG membership**

### 14.1 EURODOC

ESU informed the Board members about a recent meeting with EURODOC, where the latter expressed the intention to apply for consultative membership in time for the Rome Ministerial

Conference 2020. The issue of possible double representation was also discussed between the two organisations. In case consultative membership for EURODOC is accorded, ESU will represent and discuss issues considering students between level 4 to 8 of the EQF, while EURODOC will represent PhD students from the professional side, as well as young researchers and teaching Phd students. If not granted consultative membership, EURODOC would join the ESU delegation. An answer to this Board letter asking for more details is expected.

*Attachment: BFUG\_AU\_CH\_63\_14\_Letter\_Eurodoc.pdf*

#### 14.2 Association Européenne des Conservatoires, Académies de Musique et Musikhochschulen (AEC)

The application letter from the AEC asking for partner status was distributed to the Board members. EUA reported about a recent meeting, in which the Association indicated its interest in the Bologna Process, and the issues it addresses in particular learning and teaching. The Board recommended the BFUG to accept the AEC's application.

*Attachment: Board\_RO\_MK\_64\_14b\_Letter\_AEC.pdf*

### **15. AOB**

#### 15.1 CHAIN5 letter on short cycle

EURASHE gave information on the CHAIN5 community, as some of their representatives are members in the Association. Within the agreed scope of cooperation CHAIN5 is a community of practitioners while EURASHE should address policy issues. The proposal from the CHAIN5 regards programmes of the level 5 of EQF and aims at having a distinctive naming for some of the qualifications. The attempt might be too early, there should be more systemic overview of the sector and its features which should as well result into a potential review of terminology. The BFUG members stated that the name used in the Paris Communiqué ("short cycle") should be the only one used in order to avoid any confusion and asked the Co-chairs to respond accordingly.

*Attachment: Board\_RO\_MK\_64\_15\_Letter\_CHAIN5.pdf*

No other business was proposed.

The Meeting ended with warm thanks to the Co-chairs and to the local organizers.