

Last modified: 14.11.2018

## WG1 MEETING

Brussels (Belgium), 6 November 2018

### Draft Minutes

#### List of participants

Delegation	First Name	Surname
Austria	Helga	Posset
Albania	Linda	Pustina
BFUG Secretariat	Giovanni	Finocchietti
BFUG Secretariat	Susanna	Taormina
Czech Republic	Tomas	Fliegel
Co-Chair	David	Crocier
Co-Chair	Tone	Flood Strøm
Education International	Robert	Copeland
EQAR	Melinda	Szabo
ESU	Hélèn	Mariaud
EUA	Michael	Gaebel
EUA	Henriette	Stoeber
Eurostudent	Kristina	Hauschildt
Eurydice	Daniela	Kocanova
France	Hélèn	Lagier
Germany	Frank	Petrikowski
Italy	Vincenzo	Zara
Lithuania	Laura	Stracinskiene
Observatory Magna Charta Universitatum	Jan	Noorda Sijbolt
Poland	Bartlomiej	Banaszak

The meeting taking place at the European Commission DG EAC, the EURYDICE and the Norway delegates co-chaired the meeting.

#### 1. Welcome

Co-chairs (EURYDICE and Norway) welcomed all participants and introduced the agenda of the meeting as well as the work already done by the Working Group 1 on Monitoring and the work ahead until the Ministerial Conference in 2020.

## 2. Adoption of the draft Agenda

The agenda was adopted without modification.

## 3. Information on recent developments (BFUG, Vienna, BICG developments, other working/advisory groups)

After self-introduction of all participants and the adoption of the agenda, the co-chairs gave information on recent developments concerning the BFUG, the Vienna Meeting, the BICG and the other working/advisory groups.

Concerning CG2 on Learning and Teaching, the Magna Charta Observatory underlined the importance of the celebration and academic conference taking place in Bologna in June 2019 as a good opportunity for students-academics relationship. The Observatory specified that a draft-program has recently been finished, including the idea of calling for abstracts on 5 sub-themes (such as Academic Values, Student-centered Learning and Sustainable Development) which should be sent by January 2020. According to the Observatory, this might be a good opportunity for bottom-up contributions from academia itself rather than from political angles.

The delegate from Italy reminded the importance of Bologna fundamental values for a good operating of WG1.

## 4. Developing the 2020 report

### 4.1 Overall structure (thematic topics to be included)

### 4.2 Statistical indicators

### 4.3 Qualitative indicators

As far as the 2020 Report is concerned, all participants agreed that this should be more concise and focused on what has been achieved over these years and what has been not. The co-chairs discussed with all participants about which thematic topics should be included, what main issues are to be dedicated a specific chapter or integrated to a broader theme, and generally which are the main overarching themes that the report should focus on.

The co-chairs asked all participants to figure out a way to show the relationship between the 3 key commitments of Quality Assurance, Learning and Teaching and Recognition.

The delegate from Italy stressed out the usefulness of including a topic on the overall policy of the BFUG, with a special focus on the ultimate aim of the Bologna Process, that is the improvement of study programs as well as of the quality of teaching. Although there are many instruments for several purposes, according to the Italian delegate it is important to bear in mind that the final objective is quality improvement. Therefore, the Italian delegate suggested that the 2020 report should show how what has been done in 20 years has helped academic quality.

The EUA delegate pointed out that there are no real statistical indicators of quality, nor a clear definition of quality itself. As a matter of fact, the report describes what measures and instruments have been agreed upon *in order to* achieve such objective, therefore according to the EUA delegate it can only show whether implementation in country members has been successful or not.

The co-chairs then explained the purpose of the indicators documents sent out for this meeting. Compared to the 2018 Report, the co-chairs have emphasized that statistical indicators should be narrowed down, while only essential qualitative indicators should be included, due to the short amount of time available to collect data for the 2020 report. The co-chairs then asked all participants to select which indicators to maintain or not, according to their relevance.

During the discussion, some delegates stressed the importance of some indicators rather than others. The delegate from Germany, for instance, emphasized the importance of higher education comparability indicators, which is a factor that impacts international mobility. According to the delegate, 18 countries have not fulfilled the 3 key commitments yet, including international mobility, due to the presence of several obstacles to comparability.

The co-chairs reminded that the task is to reduce the list of indicators and proposed to focus on data from 3 different moments of the Bologna Process: the beginning, the middle, and most recent times, in order to see the main changes over 20 years.

While discussing on students, staff and funding indicators, the delegate from Germany underlined the importance of showing that student enrollment rates have witnessed a massive expansion, while on the contrary staff numbers are still too little. According to the delegate, this disproportion should be clearly shown through clear and transparent data over time in order to foster improvements.

Concerning part-time students indicators, the delegate from the Magna Charta Observatory emphasized that it is essential to distinguish among study levels: while having a job during undergraduate programs is less frequent and does not have a good connotation, part-time students having a job in graduate programs are more frequent and well-considered, since in this case having a job has a role in the funding of education.

After discussing all statistical and qualitative indicators, the co-chairs explained the document on guidelines for authors of thematic sections, asking all participants to choose what sections they were willing to write.

## 5. Guidelines for authors of thematic sections

Co-chairs presented the guidelines for authors on thematic sections and the group discussed about the different items and methodology.

## 6. "Advisory Group" to develop a proposal for future reports on values. Terms of Reference

The final part of the meeting dealt with the discussion on fundamental values and the proposal of a further Advisory Group for future reports on values. During the discussion, some participants expressed concern about clear violations of values, such as academic autonomy, within some countries. However, ministries cannot be expected to report such violations. For this reason, the challenge is to handle similar situations through an evidence-based monitoring. The delegate from the Magna Charta Observatory however pointed out that there is no shared definition of academic autonomy, which makes it difficult to monitor it. Although activists, such as Amnesty International, have a set of definitions, they use them for a different purpose, which is mainly political. On the contrary, monitoring and reporting is a professional task, so it should refrain from jumping to conclusions. According to the delegate, a body of experts should be in charge of such a work.

The co-chairs agreed that BFUG did not decide to create an advisory group on fundamental values. However, the BFUG did accept the WG1 proposal to develop a specific work on the topic of values through the collection and trial of indicators that can be used in the future to assess how far values such as academic freedom and institutional autonomy are respected and on what evidence this can be assessed. Organizations with particular expertise on this topic should take forward this work, perhaps led by the Magna Charta Observatory itself and in cooperation with a task force or consortium of countries and organizations. The final outcome would be a narrative text on the evolution of values.

## 7. AOB

The Co-chairs made no final remarks and thanked all participants for their active participation in this meeting. The next meeting was not scheduled, so further information would be sent via email.