

**EUROPEAN SCHOOLS**

**4711-D-2001**

**Orig.: FR**

**Version: EN**

## **Annual Report of the Representative of the Board of Governors**

**Board of Governors of the European Schools -**

**29, 30 & 31.1.2002**

## 1. Introduction

According to the job description, the Representative is charged with

- representing the Board of Governors within the system and to outside bodies.
- managing the European Schools' system, paying particular attention to the planning, implementation and evaluation aspects.

In reporting on his activities during the previous year, the Representative is therefore required to make it possible for the Board of Governors to assess how the system has developed and to what extent it has achieved its objectives.

It is to facilitate such an examination that in addition to the traditional sets of statistics, taken from the schools' beginning-of-year reports, this report contains a different presentation of the key figures, in order to highlight the current state of the system by setting it in the context of its development in recent years.

In compiling the data, I found that they are inconsistent in places, from school to school or from year to year. There was not enough time to review the data and standardize their presentation. While it is possible that the results presented are therefore skewed, the margin of error is not such as to invalidate the conclusions.

## 2. School population

### 2.1. Total population

Each school appears in Table EL 1<sup>1</sup> with its pupil numbers and the percentage variation in these numbers year on year and, in the last column from 1997 to 2001, from 1999 to 2001 for Brussels III.

Tableau EL 1 : La population scolaire de 1997 à 2001								
La population globale								
Ecoles	1997	1999		2000		2001		Diff
	pop.	pop.	%	pop.	%	pop.	%	
Bergen	855	832	-2,7%	793	-4,7%	798	0,6%	-6,7%
Bruxelles I	3436	2645	-23,0%	2432	-8,1%	2411	-0,9%	-29,8%
Bruxelles II	2896	2773	-4,2%	2786	0,5%	2845	2,1%	-1,8%
Bruxelles III	0	1069	-	1500	40,3%	1751	16,7%	16,7%
Culham	955	933	-2,3%	903	-3,2%	913	1,1%	-4,4%
Karlsruhe	1145	1155	0,9%	1176	1,8%	1166	-0,9%	1,8%
Luxembourg	3565	3622	1,6%	3642	0,6%	3702	1,6%	3,8%
Mol	724	700	-3,3%	668	-4,6%	677	1,3%	-6,5%
Munich	1183	1318	11,4%	1335	1,3%	1376	3,1%	16,3%
Varese	1300	1347	3,6%	1341	-0,4%	1346	0,4%	3,5%
TOTAL	16059	16394	2,1%	16576	1,1%	16985	2,5%	5,8%

\* Pour Bruxelles III: 2001/1999 (en %)

The population of the schools as a whole rose by 5.8% between 1997 and 2001. This pattern of development was unequal across the schools: pupil numbers rose in the large schools (Brussels and Luxembourg) and the medium-sized ones (Karlsruhe, Munich and Varese), while they fell in the small schools (Bergen, Culham and Mol).

### 2.2. Population by category of pupils

Tables EL 2a, EL 2b and EL 2c show, for each year under review, the number of pupils in the

1. Translator's note: For technical reasons the tables are in the original French.

category in question and the percentage for which this accounts in relation to the total number of pupils on roll in the school. The last column gives the percentage variation in the pupil numbers in question from 1997 to 2001, from 1999 to 2001 for Brussels III.

### 2.2.1. Category 1 population

Tableau EL 2a : La population scolaire de 1997 à 2001									
La population de catégorie 1									
Ecoles	1997		1999		2000		2001		Diff
	pop 1	%	pop 1	%	pop 1	%	pop 1	%	
Bergen	139	16,3%	131	15,7%	127	16,0%	123	15,4%	-11,5%
Bruxelles I	2479	72,1%	1867	70,6%	1692	69,6%	1730	71,8%	-30,2%
Bruxelles II	2462	85,0%	2361	85,1%	2329	83,6%	2358	82,9%	-4,2%
Bruxelles III	0	0,0%	796	74,5%	1121	74,7%	1345	76,8%	69,0%
Culham	222	23,2%	153	16,4%	129	14,3%	104	11,4%	-53,2%
Karlsruhe	134	11,7%	103	8,9%	114	9,7%	119	10,2%	-11,2%
Luxembourg	2799	78,5%	2779	76,7%	2726	74,8%	2773	74,9%	-0,9%
Mol	134	18,5%	127	18,1%	134	20,1%	130	19,2%	-3,0%
Munich	687	58,1%	774	58,7%	795	59,6%	846	61,5%	23,1%
Varese	513	39,5%	507	37,6%	514	38,3%	542	40,3%	5,7%
TOTAL	9569	59,6%	9598	58,5%	9681	58,4%	10070	59,3%	5,2%
* Pour Bruxelles III, 2001/99									

The number of category 1 pupils is up. The proportion which they represent is around 59%. Overall, there is therefore a majority of category 1 pupils in the system. In that sense it meets the objective for which it was set up.

Individually, substantial differences emerge. The Brussels, Luxembourg and Munich schools are above average in this respect, while the others are far from the average. Attention should be drawn particularly to Karlsruhe (10.2%), Culham (11.4%), Bergen (15.4%) and Mol (19.1%).

### 2.2.2. Category 2 population

Tableau EL 2b : La population scolaire de 1997 à 2001									
La population de catégorie 2									
Ecoles	1997		1999		2000		2001		Diff
	pop 2	%	pop 2	%	pop 2	%	pop 2	%	
Bergen	17	2,0%	8	1,0%	6	0,8%	5	0,6%	-71%
Bruxelles I	90	2,6%	46	1,7%	41	1,7%	29	1,2%	-68%
Bruxelles II	180	6,2%	128	4,6%	133	4,8%	142	5,0%	-21%
Bruxelles III	0	0,0%	15	0,0%	21	0,0%	27	0,0%	80%
Culham	12	1,3%	41	4,4%	44	4,9%	48	5,2%	300%
Karlsruhe	13	1,1%	22	1,9%	25	2,1%	65	5,6%	400%
Luxembourg	99	2,8%	155	4,3%	205	5,6%	225	6,1%	127%
Mol	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	0%
Munich	55	4,6%	93	7,1%	116	8,7%	127	9,2%	131%
Varese	60	4,6%	74	5,5%	104	7,8%	117	8,7%	95%
TOTAL	526	3,3%	582	3,6%	695	4,2%	785	4,6%	49%
* Pour Bruxelles III : 2001/1999 (en %)									

Karlsruhe, Culham, Munich, Luxembourg and Varese are in a favourable position to attract agreements with local companies. The opposite is true of the Bergen and Mol schools, which not only attract few category 1 pupils, but are also not very attractive to category 2 pupils. At Mol, this state of affairs appears to be due, amongst other things, to the absence of an English

section.

### 2.2.3. Category 3 population

Tableau EL 2c : La population scolaire de 1997 à 2001									
La population de catégorie 3									
Ecoles	1997		1999		2000		2001		Diff
	pop 3	%	pop 3	%	pop 3	%	pop 3	%	
Bergen	699	81,8%	701	84,3%	660	83,2%	670	84,0%	-4,1%
Bruxelles I	867	25,2%	734	27,8%	698	28,7%	652	27,0%	-24,8%
Bruxelles II	284	9,8%	294	10,6%	324	11,6%	345	12,0%	21,5%
Bruxelles III	0	-	265	24,8%	357	23,8%	379	21,4%	6,2%
Culham	721	75,5%	746	80,0%	730	80,8%	761	83,1%	5,5%
Karlsruhe	998	87,2%	1031	89,3%	1037	88,2%	982	84,5%	-1,6%
Luxembourg	667	18,7%	697	19,2%	711	19,5%	704	19,0%	5,5%
Mol	590	81,5%	573	81,9%	536	80,2%	547	80,3%	-7,3%
Munich	441	37,3%	451	34,2%	424	31,8%	403	29,2%	-8,6%
Varese	727	55,9%	766	56,9%	723	53,9%	687	50,9%	-5,5%
TOTAL	5994	37,3%	6258	38,2%	6200	37,4%	6130	36,0%	2,3%
* Pour Bruxelles III : 2001/1999 (en %)									

In absolute terms, the number of category 3 pupils has risen by 2.3%. But owing to the faster increase in the number of categories 1 and 2 pupils, the proportion of category 3 pupils has fallen to 36.0%.

The situation of the Karlsruhe, Bergen, Culham and Mol schools remains extraordinary because of the fact that they each have more than 80% category 3 pupils on roll. The Mol and Karlsruhe schools have succeeded in containing the proportion of category 3 pupils, while at Bergen and Culham it is still increasing.

The Varese school is close to lowering the proportion of category 3 pupils to 50%.

## 2.3. Teaching levels

### 2.3.1. Nursery

Tableau EL 3a : La population par cycles d'enseignement de 1997 à 2001								
Le cycle maternel								
Ecoles	1997	1999		2000		2001		Diff
	pop.	pop.	%	pop.	%	pop.	%	
Bergen	82	87	6,1%	71	-18,4%	94	32,4%	14,6%
Bruxelles I	247	247	0,0%	128	-48,2%	165	28,9%	-33,2%
Bruxelles II	195	235	20,5%	198	-15,7%	208	5,1%	6,7%
Bruxelles III	-	-	-	183	0,0%	210	14,8%	14,8%
Culham	97	95	-2,1%	91	-4,2%	99	8,8%	2,1%
Karlsruhe	73	74	1,4%	72	-2,7%	65	-9,7%	-11,0%
Luxembourg	427	439	2,8%	427	-2,7%	452	5,9%	5,9%
Mol	48	54	12,5%	51	-5,6%	52	2,0%	8,3%
Munich	84	86	2,4%	88	2,3%	97	10,2%	15,5%
Varese	118	113	-4,2%	110	-2,7%	104	-5,5%	-11,9%
TOTAL	1371	1430	4,3%	1419	-0,8%	1546	8,9%	12,8%
* Pour Bruxelles III: 2001/1999 (en %)								

The nursery population has shot up, with a 12.8% rise in 4 years, as a result in particular of the increases in pupil numbers at Brussels III, Luxembourg and Bergen.

### 2.3.2. Primary

Tableau EL 3b : La population par cycles d'enseignement de 1997 à 2001								
Le cycle primaire								
Ecoles	1997	1999		2000		2001		Diff
	pop.	pop.	%	pop.	%	pop.	%	
Bergen	325	351	8,0%	317	-9,7%	288	-9,1%	-11,4%
Bruxelles I	1243	1189	-4,3%	1203	-1,2%	1132	-5,9%	-8,9%
Bruxelles II	1125	1224	8,8%	1234	0,8%	1196	-3,1%	6,3%
Bruxelles III	-	-	-	-	-	191	0,0%	0,0%
Culham	385	384	-0,3%	368	-4,2%	386	4,9%	0,3%
Karlsruhe	417	454	8,9%	476	4,8%	472	-0,8%	13,2%
Luxembourg	1354	1348	-0,4%	1375	2,0%	1390	1,1%	2,7%
Mol	218	215	-1,4%	202	-6,0%	214	5,9%	-1,8%
Munich	497	541	8,9%	550	1,7%	582	5,8%	17,1%
Varese	568	570	0,4%	535	-6,1%	539	0,7%	-5,1%
TOTAL	6132	6276	2,3%	6260	-0,3%	6390	2,1%	4,2%

\* Pour Bruxelles III: 2001/1999 (en %)

Primary pupil numbers are up, as a result in particular of the development of Brussels III, Karlsruhe and Munich.

### 2.3.3. Secondary

Tableau EL : La population par cycles d'enseignement de 1997 à 2001								
Le cycle secondaire								
Ecoles	1997	1999		2000		2001		Diff
	pop.	pop.	%	pop.	%	pop.	%	
Bergen	448	402	-10,3%	405	0,7%	416	2,7%	-7,1%
Bruxelles I	1946	1211	-37,8%	1100	-9,2%	1114	1,3%	-42,8%
Bruxelles II	1576	1324	-16,0%	1354	2,3%	1441	6,4%	-8,6%
Bruxelles III	-	1076	-	1317	22,4%	1350	2,5%	2,5%
Culham	473	461	-2,5%	444	-3,7%	428	-3,6%	-9,5%
Karlsruhe	655	628	-4,1%	628	0,0%	629	0,2%	-4,0%
Luxembourg	1784	1844	3,4%	1840	-0,2%	1860	1,1%	4,3%
Mol	458	431	-5,9%	417	-3,2%	411	-1,4%	-10,3%
Munich	602	691	14,8%	697	0,9%	697	0,0%	15,8%
Varese	614	664	8,1%	696	4,8%	703	1,0%	14,5%
TOTAL	8556	8732	2,1%	8898	1,9%	9049	1,7%	5,8%

\* Pour Bruxelles III: 2001/1999 (en %)

Secondary pupil numbers have risen in particular at Munich, Varese, Brussels and Luxembourg.

## 2.4. Language sections

Last year, I presented the different language sections through their numerical development from 1997 onwards. The data available for the year 2001/02 do not show any dramatic reversal: the conclusions are still valid. I therefore preferred to confine myself to a summary presentation of the current status.

### 2.4.1. Population of the language sections

Tableau SECTIONS I: La population scolaire des sections linguistiques												
Ecoles	allem	angl	dan	esp	fin	franç	gre	ital	néer	port	sue	Total
Bergen	89	250	0	0	0	133	0	65	261	0	0	798
Bruxelles I	286	361	274	337	0	728	111	257	57	0	0	2411
Bruxelles II	361	508	0	0	246	627	0	320	279	313	191	2845
Bruxelles III	203	399	0	253	0	464	257	0	175	0	0	1751
Culham	203	282	0	0	0	254	0	86	88	0	0	913
Karlsruhe	330	303	0	0	0	269	0	210	54	0	0	1166
Luxembourg	411	633	325	236	121	795	187	279	300	243	172	3702
Mol	91	0	0	0	0	237	0	23	326	0	0	677
Munich	536	301	0	41	0	222	40	142	94	0	0	1376
Varese	253	324	0	0	0	261	0	349	159	0	0	1346
Total	2763	3361	599	867	367	3990	595	1731	1793	556	363	16985

I would point out that the Board of Governors has fixed at 159 (75+84) the number of pupils required to open a language section.

### 2.4.2. Summary table

Tableau SECTIONS II: La population scolaire de 1997 à 2001 Le développement des sections linguistiques												
Ecoles	allem	angl	dan	esp	fin	franç	gre	ital	néer	port	sue	
Bergen	-12,7%	-15,5%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	1,5%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%
Bruxelles I	-15,1%	-34,7%	-4,5%	-39,2%	0,0%	-18,1%	-67,3%	-12,6%	-68,9%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%
Bruxelles II	-5,2%	-19,7%	0,0%	0,0%	60,8%	-14,9%	0,0%	7,0%	5,3%	-0,3%	42,5%	
Bruxelles III	12,2%	14,3%	0,0%	44,4%	0,0%	18,1%	11,7%	0,0%	24,1%	0,0%	0,0%	
Culham	-6,0%	-10,8%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	2,0%	0,0%	-6,5%	7,3%	0,0%	0,0%	
Karlsruhe	-1,2%	21,7%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	7,6%	0,0%	-11,4%	-28,0%	0,0%	0,0%	
Luxembourg	-6,4%	1,4%	23,6%	4,4%	47,8%	3,4%	10,8%	-13,9%	-12,0%	-12,1%	149,3%	
Mol	-3,2%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	0,9%	0,0%	-66,2%	-0,3%	0,0%	0,0%	
Munich	21,0%	11,1%	0,0%	78,3%	0,0%	16,2%	81,8%	-0,7%	4,4%	0,0%	0,0%	
Varese	3,7%	-0,3%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	-0,8%	0,0%	2,0%	26,2%	0,0%	0,0%	
Total	6,7%	2,9%	8,9%	2,0%	56,6%	7,4%	12,3%	-7,1%	2,5%	-6,0%	78,8%	

The overall increase in the school population has been 6.1%.

In absolute terms, pupil numbers in the Italian and Portuguese sections have fallen. The Dutch, English and Spanish sections have seen a rise in pupil numbers, but their relative weight has declined. The rates of increase achieved by the Swedish, Finnish, Danish, French and German sections mean that their relative weight in the school population is now greater.

## 2.5. The Brussels Schools

The situation of the Schools in Brussels was at the centre of debate on EU enlargement and of the document produced for this purpose at the meeting of the Board of Governors on 6 and 7 November 2001.

Suffice it to reiterate that the development of the school populations of the three Brussels European Schools between 1997/98 and 2000/01 shows that the number of pupils on roll at Brussels I did fall as had been anticipated, that Brussels III played its intended role but that Brussels II still has a school population which exceeds its intended capacity as per the master plan.

Brussels III is an attractive proposition. The School will quickly reach the 2 400 pupils for which it was built. Its first primary classes opened in September 2001. It is preparing to put in place a complete primary cycle from September 2002 and in that context to take a larger

number of transfers from Brussels II than in the past.

### 3. Teachers

#### 3.1. Teaching staff

Tables ENS 1 and ENS 2 give figures for the teaching staff as a whole.

Schools	Total sec.staff	Seconded teachers	PT prim	PT sec	PT religion	Total
Bergen	76	72	4,5	8	3,7	92
Brussels I	162	150	11	17,1	12,4	203
Brussels II	179	167	11,4	24,9	13	228
Brussels III	121	110	5,5	18,8	7,5	153
Culham	78	73	3,4	5,3	2,1	89
Karlsruhe	89	81	4,9	8,7	3,9	107
Luxembourg	244	227	15,7	20,4	12,4	293
Mol	72	64	2,7	7	3,2	85
Munich	75	72	20,5	27	7,4	130
Varese	103	94	9,6	11	6,5	130
TOTAL	1199	1110	89,2	148,2	72,1	1510

Table ENS 1 shows the status of the teaching staff at the beginning of the 2000 school year as it emerges from the Schools' beginning-of-year reports. The teaching loads of locally recruited part-time teachers have been expressed in hours for lessons taught in the primary and in periods for lessons taught in the secondary and converted into full posts.

Table ENS 2 gives, for each year under review, a school's teaching staff and the percentage of the total number of teaching staff of the schools which this number represents. The percentage variation in the numbers in question from 1997 to 2001, and from 1999 to 2001 for Brussels III, is shown in the last column.

Le personnel enseignant global									
Ecoles	1997		1999		2000		2001		Diff
	pop	%	pop	%	pop	%	pop	%	
Bergen	97	6,8%	97	6,5%	94	6,4%	92	6,1%	-5,2%
Bruxelles I	299	20,9%	227	15,3%	196	13,3%	203	13,4%	-32,1%
Bruxelles II	235	16,4%	232	15,6%	216	14,6%	228	15,1%	-3,0%
Bruxelles III	0	0,0%	116	7,8%	146	9,9%	153	10,1%	4,8%
Culham	93	6,5%	91	6,1%	87	5,9%	89	5,9%	-4,3%
Karlsruhe	103	7,2%	103	6,9%	112	7,6%	107	7,1%	3,9%
Luxembourg	274	19,2%	284	19,1%	289	19,5%	293	19,4%	6,9%
Mol	89	6,2%	90	6,1%	86	5,8%	85	5,6%	-4,5%
Munich	117	8,2%	119	8,0%	124	8,4%	130	8,6%	11,1%
Varese	122	8,5%	126	8,5%	129	8,7%	130	8,6%	6,6%
TOTAL	1429	100,0%	1485	100,0%	1479	100,0%	1510	100,0%	5,7%

\* Pour Bruxelles III, 01/99 (en %)

There was a sharp increase in the number of teaching staff in 1998 and 1999 before it fell again in 2000. Over the period as a whole, the increase in the number of teaching staff was slightly lower than the growth of the school population.

Staff movement in comparison with the variation in pupil numbers is highly divergent from school to school. Table ENS 2a compares the growth in the school population (see Table EL 1) and that in the teaching staff (see Table ENS 2).

Tableau ENS 2a : personnel enseignant et population scolaire de 1997 à 2001		
	Population	Enseignants
Bergen	-6,67%	-5,15%
Bruxelles I		
Bruxelles II		
Bruxelles III*	11,90%	9,36%
Culham	-4,40%	-4,30%
Karlsruhe	1,83%	3,88%
Luxembourg	3,84%	6,93%
Mol	-6,49%	-4,49%
Munich	16,31%	11,11%
Varese	3,54%	6,56%
TOTAL	5,77%	5,67%

At the Bergen and Mol Schools, the decline in the school population was accompanied by an almost equivalent reduction in the teaching staff. On the other hand, the slight rise in pupil numbers at the Karlsruhe, Luxembourg and Varese Schools was matched by a larger increase in teaching staff. Finally, the Brussels I, II and III and Culham and Munich Schools took advantage of the school population trend, which was upward for some, downward for others, to lower the teaching posts-pupil ratio.

### 3.2. Seconded teaching staff

Table ENS 3 gives, for each year under review, a school's seconded teaching staff and the percentage of the total number of teaching staff of the school which this number represents. The percentage variation in the numbers in question from 1997 to 2001, and from 1999 to 2001 for Brussels III, is shown in the last column.

Tableau ENS 3 : Le personnel enseignant de 1997 à 2001									
Le personnel enseignant détaché									
Ecoles	1997		1999		2000		2001		Diff
	pop	%	pop	%	pop	%	pop	%	
Bergen	77	79,4%	77	78,6%	78	80,4%	76	82,6%	-1,3%
Bruxelles I	238	79,9%	183	60,0%	173	76,2%	162	79,8%	-31,9%
Bruxelles II	186	79,1%	187	77,3%	183	78,9%	179	78,5%	-3,8%
Bruxelles III	0	0,0%	86	0,0%	110	94,8%	121	79,1%	10,0%
Culham	78	83,9%	78	86,7%	77	84,6%	78	87,6%	0,0%
Karlsruhe	94	92,2%	89	85,6%	89	86,4%	89	83,2%	-5,3%
Luxembourg	237	86,5%	243	83,5%	247	87,0%	244	83,3%	3,0%
Mol	71	79,8%	74	82,2%	71	78,9%	72	84,7%	1,4%
Munich	69	59,0%	71	64,0%	71	59,7%	75	57,7%	8,7%
Varese	100	88,5%	102	82,9%	104	82,5%	103	79,2%	3,0%
TOTAL	1150	81,2%	1190	81,8%	1203	81,0%	1199	79,4%	4,3%

\* Pour Bruxelles III, 01/99 (en %)

Table ENS 3 gives, for each year under review, a school's seconded teaching staff and the percentage of the total number of teaching staff of the school which this number represents. The percentage variation in the numbers in question from 1997 to 2001, and from 1999 to 2001 for Brussels III, is shown in the last column.

### 3.3. Locally recruited part-time teachers

Table ENS 4 gives, for each year under review, the number of locally recruited part-time teachers, expressed in full posts, and the percentage of the total number of teaching staff of the school which this number represents. The percentage variation in the numbers in question from 1997 to 2001, and from 1999 to 2001 for Brussels III, is shown in the last column.



Tableau ENS 4 : Le personnel enseignant de 1997 à 2001									
Les charges de cours									
Ecoles	1997		1999		2000		2001		Diff
	pop	%	pop	%	pop	%	pop	%	%
Bergen	20	20,4%	20	20,6%	17	18,1%	16	17,4%	-20,0%
Bruxelles I	60	19,7%	44	19,4%	42	19,9%	41	20,2%	-31,7%
Bruxelles II	49	20,2%	45	19,4%	36	16,7%	49	21,5%	0,0%
Bruxelles III	0	0,0%	30	0,0%	38	26,0%	32	20,9%	-15,8%
Culham	15	16,7%	13	14,3%	10	11,5%	11	12,4%	-26,7%
Karlsruhe	8	7,7%	14	13,6%	21	19,3%	18	16,8%	125,0%
Luxembourg	37	12,7%	41	14,4%	45	15,6%	49	16,7%	32,4%
Mol	18	20,0%	16	17,8%	15	17,4%	13	15,3%	-27,8%
Munich	48	43,2%	48	40,3%	51	42,5%	55	42,3%	14,6%
Varese	13	10,6%	24	19,0%	27	20,9%	27	20,8%	107,7%
TOTAL	268	18,4%	295	19,9%	302	20,3%	311	20,6%	16,0%

\* Pour Bruxelles III, 01/99 (en %)

The volume of teaching duties allocated to locally recruited part-time teachers and converted into full-time posts has risen steadily since 1997, the first year under review. Locally recruited part-time teachers now account for 20.6% of the total teaching staff in post in 2001. Culham, Mol, Luxembourg and Karlsruhe are the schools with the fewest such teachers, Munich is the School which uses their services by far the most extensively.

The situation at the Munich School has remained fairly constant in recent years. The replacement of locally recruited part-time teachers by seconded staff had only a limited effect during the period under review because at the same time the volume of teaching duties was increasing appreciably.

### 3.4. Some indicators

Some indicators, showing the ratios of teachers to pupils, follow. There are two tables for each ratio: one gives *teacher-pupil* ratios, which will be useful in a set of indicators of the *teacher-pupil*, *cost per pupil*, etc., type, while the other more classic table gives *pupil-teacher* ratios.

#### 3.4.1. Enseignants par élève – élèves par enseignant

Tableau ENS 5a: Indicateur enseignant - élève de 1997 à 2001									
Le personnel enseignant global									
Ecoles	1997		1999		2000		2001		Diff
	pop	%	pop	%	pop	%	pop	%	%
Bergen	97	0,1135	97	0,1166	94	0,1185	92	0,1153	1,6%
Bruxelles I	298	0,0867	227	0,0858	196	0,0806	203	0,0842	-2,9%
Bruxelles II	235	0,0811	232	0,0837	216	0,0775	228	0,0801	-1,2%
Bruxelles III	0	0,0000	116	0,1085	146	0,0973	153	0,0874	-10,2%
Culham	93	0,0974	91	0,0975	87	0,0963	89	0,0975	0,1%
Karlsruhe	102	0,0891	103	0,0892	112	0,0952	107	0,0918	3,0%
Luxembourg	274	0,0769	284	0,0784	289	0,0794	293	0,0791	3,0%
Mol	89	0,1229	90	0,1286	86	0,1287	85	0,1256	2,1%
Munich	117	0,0989	119	0,0903	120	0,0899	130	0,0945	-4,5%
Varese	113	0,0869	126	0,0935	129	0,0962	130	0,0966	11,1%
TOTAL	1418	0,0883	1485	0,0906	1475	0,0890	1510	0,0889	0,68%

\* Pour Bruxelles III, 00/99 (en %)

Table ENS 5a 3 gives, for each year under review, the number of teaching staff and the *teacher-pupil* ratio. The percentage variation in this ratio from 1997 to 2001, and from 1999 to 2001 for Brussels III, is shown in the last column.

If a school provides teaching for groups of 25 pupils each receiving tuition corresponding to 1.26 teaching posts, the school will have an indicator of 0.0504 (1.26/25). A higher indicator corresponds to greater consumption of teaching periods or to smaller class sizes (fewer pupils per group). The mean indicator reached in 2001 corresponds to a school allocating 1.26 teaching posts to 14.2 pupils. Luxembourg's indicator corresponds to a school organized in groups of 15.9 and Bergen's to a school organized in groups of 10.9.

From 1997 to 2001, the *teacher per pupil* indicator rose by 0.0006%. This increase represents 10.2 full-time posts for 16 985 pupils.

Tableau ENS 5b: Indicateur élève-enseignant de 1997 à 2001									
Ecoles	1997		1999		2000		2001		Diff
	pop	%	pop	%	pop	%	pop	%	
Bergen	97	8,8144	97	8,5773	94	8,4362	92	8,6739	-1,6%
Bruxelles I	298	11,5302	227	11,6520	196	12,4082	203	11,8768	3,0%
Bruxelles II	235	12,3234	232	11,9526	216	12,8981	228	12,4781	1,3%
Bruxelles III	0	-	116	9,2155	146	10,2740	153	11,4444	11,4%
Culham	93	10,2688	91	10,2527	87	10,3793	89	10,2584	-0,1%
Karlsruhe	102	11,2255	103	11,2136	112	10,5000	107	10,8972	-2,9%
Luxembourg	274	13,0109	284	12,7535	289	12,6021	293	12,6348	-2,9%
Mol	89	8,1348	90	7,7778	86	7,7674	85	7,9647	-2,1%
Munich	117	10,1111	119	11,0756	120	11,1250	130	10,5846	4,7%
Varese	113	11,5044	126	10,6905	129	10,3953	130	10,3538	-10,0%
TOTAL	1418	11,3251	1485	11,0397	1475	11,2380	1510	11,2483	-0,68%

\* Pour Bruxelles III, 01/99 (en %)

### 3.4.2. Educational advisers-pupils

Tables ENS 7 are constructed on the model of tables ENS 6. As the *educational adviser-pupil* ratio would be expressed in numbers including many decimals, it seemed preferable to give the *educational adviser-200 secondary pupils* ratio.

Tableau ENS 7a : Indicateur conseiller d'éducation - élèves de 1997 à 2001									
Ecoles	1997		1999		2000		2001		Diff
	pop	ind	pop	ind	pop	ind	pop	ind	
Bergen	2	0,8929	2	0,9950	2	0,9877	1	0,4808	-46,15%
Bruxelles I	12	1,2333	9	1,4864	9	1,6364	8	1,4363	16,46%
Bruxelles II	10	1,2690	9	1,3595	9	1,3294	9	1,2491	-1,57%
Bruxelles III	0	0	7	1,3011	7	1,0630	7	1,0370	-2,44%
Culham	2	0,8457	2	0,8677	2	0,9009	2	0,9346	10,51%
Karlsruhe	4	1,2214	2	0,6369	4	1,2739	4	1,2719	4,13%
Luxembourg	10	1,1211	9	0,9761	10	1,0870	10	1,0753	-4,09%
Mol	3	1,3100	3	1,3921	3	1,4388	3	1,4599	11,44%
Munich	3	0,9967	3	0,8683	3	0,8608	3	0,8571	-14,00%
Varese	5	1,6287	5	1,5060	5	1,4368	5	1,4225	-12,66%
TOTAL	51	1,1921	51	1,1681	54	1,2138	52	1,1489	-3,63%

\* Pour Bruxelles III, 01/99 (en %)

Under the rules adopted by the Board of Governors, a post of educational adviser may be created for each group of 200 secondary cycle pupils. The limit of 1 educational adviser per 100 pupils may not be exceeded. A school with posts of educational adviser in accordance with the rules would have an indicator of 1.

Tableau ENS 7b : Indicateur conseiller d'éducation - élèves de 1997 à 20001									
Ecoles	1997		1999		2000		2001		Diff
	pop	ind	pop	ind	pop	ind	pop	ind	
Bergen	2	224	2	201	2	203	1	416	85,71%
Bruxelles I	12	162	9	135	9	122	8	139	-14,13%
Bruxelles II	10	158	9	147	9	150	9	160	1,59%
Bruxelles III	0	0	7	154	7	188	7	193	25,46%
Culham	2	237	2	231	2	222	2	214	-9,51%
Karlsruhe	4	164	2	314	4	157	4	157	-3,97%
Luxembourg	10	178	9	205	10	184	10	186	4,26%
Mol	3	153	3	144	3	139	3	137	-10,26%
Munich	3	201	3	230	3	232	3	233	16,28%
Varese	5	123	5	133	5	139	5	141	14,50%
TOTAL	51	168	51	171	54	165	52	174	3,76%

Overall, the secondary pupils-educational advisers ratio rose slightly from 1997 to 2000. The schools with proportionally the most educational advisers are Brussels I, Mol and Varese, while the schools which are least well staffed with educational advisers are Munich, Culham and Bergen.

## 4. Administrative and ancillary staff

### 4.1. Total administrative and ancillary staff

Table PAS 1 shows, for each school, all its AAS staff from 1997 to 2000. The posts are taken from the respective budgets and do not necessarily correspond to the staff actually in post on the reference date.

Tableau PAS 1 : Le personnel administratif de 1997 à 2001 selon l'organigramme extrait des budgets						
Ecoles	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	Diff
						(en %)
Bergen	14	14	14	14,5	14,5	3,6%
Bruxelles I	42,25	42,25	39,25	37,25	37,75	-10,7%
Bruxelles II	28,5	30,5	28,5	28,5	27,5	-3,5%
Bruxelles III	0	0	9	13,5	24,5	172,2%
Culham	15,5	16	16	16,5	17	9,7%
Karlsruhe	15	15,5	16	16,5	17	13,3%
Luxembourg	36,5	42,5	43	43,5	43	17,8%
Mol	14,5	14,5	14,5	14,5	14,5	0,0%
Munich	12	12	12,5	12,5	13,5	12,5%
Varese	21,5	21,5	21,5	21,5	21,69	0,9%
BRCS	15,75	17,75	17,75	19,25	19,25	22,2%
TOTAL	215,5	226,5	232	238	250,19	16,1%

\* Pour Bruxelles III : 01/99

Tableau PAS 2 : Elèves par membre du PAS de 1997 à 2001 selon l'organigramme extrait des budgets						
Ecoles	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	Diff (en %)
Bergen	61,07	58,64	59,43	54,69	55,03	-9,9%
Bruxelles I	81,33	79,29	67,39	65,29	63,87	-21,5%
Bruxelles II	101,61	99,87	97,30	97,75	103,45	1,8%
Bruxelles III	0	0	118,78	111,11	71,47	-39,8%
Culham	61,61	56,50	58,31	54,73	53,71	-12,8%
Karlsruhe	76,33	75,74	72,19	71,27	68,59	-10,1%
Luxembourg	97,67	84,87	84,23	83,72	86,09	-11,9%
Mol	49,93	47,52	48,28	46,07	46,69	-6,5%
Munich	98,58	105,00	105,44	106,80	101,93	3,4%
Varese	60,47	60,93	62,65	62,37	62,06	2,6%
BRCS	0	0	0	0	0,00	0,0%
TOTAL	74,52	71,35	70,66	69,65	67,89	-8,9%
* Pour Bruxelles III : 01/99						

Overall, AAS numbers have risen more quickly than the school population. The schools whose AAS numbers have risen most in relation to their population are Brussels I, Luxembourg, Culham and Bergen. Those whose school population has risen more quickly than their AAS numbers are Munich and Varese.

## 5. Costs

Until 1998, expenditure developed more or less in line with inflation rates. From 1999 to 2001, attention needs to be drawn to the impact of two exceptional factors. Firstly, the effect of the start-up of Brussels III in 1999 weighed on the 1999 budget, but even more so on the 2000 and subsequent budgets. In addition, it was decided to pay the severance grants under Article 85 of the Staff Regulations during the 2000 and 2001 financial years. There will not be this latter constraint on the 2002 overall budget, but the effects of the initial financial costs entailed by the start-up of the Alicante and Frankfurt Schools will be felt.

Table COUT 1: Development of the budgets from 1996 to 2001

For the years 1996 to 1999, the figures (in euro) refer to actual expenditure, those for the year 2000 show expenditure according to the provisional balance sheet and those for the year 2001 are the appropriations entered in the budget.

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	Diff 01/97
Bergen	9.751.417	10.344.077	10.590.168	12.613.903	12.485.698	28,0%
Bruxelles I	29.464.470	30.251.098	29.386.627	28.640.940	28.226.386	-4,2%
Bruxelles II	22.532.853	23.866.422	24.527.102	27.563.430	27.424.908	21,7%
Bruxelles III	0	0	5.231.730	14.232.451	17.063.462	226,2%
BRCS	5.567.010	5.049.424	5.348.393	5.675.667	6.554.765	17,7%
Culham	9.758.808	10.503.719	10.797.586	13.892.283	13.164.212	34,9%
Karlsruhe	10.173.922	10.304.481	11.202.614	12.759.044	11.895.663	16,9%
Luxembourg	27.390.562	29.012.394	30.221.863	33.977.968	34.210.582	24,9%
Mol	9.261.748	9.373.312	9.273.803	10.334.241	10.559.021	14,0%
Munich	11.519.371	11.734.445	12.717.308	15.593.596	16.232.026	40,9%
Varese	12.708.747	12.924.338	13.214.968	15.362.270	15.536.782	22,3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>148.128.908</b>	<b>153.363.710</b>	<b>162.512.162</b>	<b>190.645.793</b>	<b>193.353.505</b>	<b>30,5%</b>

les indications chiffrées sont en euro

Pour les années de 1996 à 1999, les chiffres se réfèrent aux dépenses effectives, ceux de l'année 2000 reproduisent les dépenses selon le bilan provisoire, ceux de l'année 2001 présentent les crédits inscrits au budget.

Tableau COUT 2 : Indicateur - coût par élève*						
Ecoles	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	Diff 01/97
Bergen	11405	12599	12729	15907	15646	37,2%
Bruxelles I	8575	9030	11110	11777	11707	36,5%
Bruxelles II	7781	7835	8845	9894	9572	23,0%
Bruxelles III	0	0	4894	9488	9635	96,9%
Culham	10219	11619	11573	15385	14371	40,6%
Karlsruhe	8886	8777	9699	10850	10237	15,2%
Luxembourg	7683	8043	8344	9329	9241	20,3%
Mol	12792	13604	13248	15470	15505	21,2%
Munich	9737	9313	9649	11681	11797	21,1%
Varese	9776	9866	9811	11456	11509	17,7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>8877</b>	<b>9177</b>	<b>9587</b>	<b>11159</b>	<b>10968</b>	<b>23,5%</b>

en euro

The expected cost per pupil in 2001 ranges between EUR 9 241 (Luxembourg School) and EUR 15 646 (Bergen School). The least expensive schools are Luxembourg, Brussels II and Brussels III, the most expensive are Karlsruhe, Bergen, Mol and Culham.

From 1997 to 2001, the cost per pupil rose by 23.5%. The largest increases were recorded by

the Culham, Bergen and, surprisingly, Brussels I schools, the smallest increases by Varese, Munich and Mol.

## **6. Buildings**

The schools' Infrastructure continues to receive particular attention from the directors and the Representative, chairman of their administrative boards.

Broadly speaking, the national authorities everywhere are committed to maintenance of the buildings and redevelopment and extension of the existing infrastructure or construction of new buildings.

The national authorities deserve thanks for the concern which they show.

### **6.1. Munich**

As a result of the increase in pupil numbers, at nursery and primary levels in particular, conditions at the Munich School are cramped. *Bundesvermögensabteilung der Oberfinanzdirektion München*, the German authority responsible, has approved a scheme for the School's extension, including a new complex for the primary cycle, a multi-purpose hall and a caretaker's lodge. Initially, the new buildings were supposed to be ready for occupation at the beginning of the new school year in September 2003.

Unfortunately, there has been some slippage in the authorization procedure. Permission has been given for the drawing up of detailed plans for the extension scheme. Building work will start in July 2002. The School hopes to be able to start the 2003 school year with a new layout of its premises.

### **6.2. Karlsruhe**

The Karlsruhe School has been awaiting general renovation of the buildings since 1994. The complex arrangements for financing the School put in place when it was set up, whereby maintenance costs payable by the owner are defrayed by the City of Karlsruhe, have given rise to much hesitation and ultimately uncertainty about the principle and the possible timetable for this refurbishment.

The beginnings of a solution to this problem seem to have been found. The City of Karlsruhe has decided to earmark the sum of DEM 4 300 000 in its budgets to finance the first phase of the work. According to the School's Director, the *Land* Baden-Württemberg is also apparently prepared to consider making a financial contribution.

The Director has come up with an initiative to create a new area in the School which would serve as a canteen and multi-purpose hall.

These initiatives have come just at the right time to increase the School's dynamism. Many thanks to the authorities and key personalities who have taken the right decisions.

### **6.3. Varese**

Thanks to the Italian government's special contribution, the Varese School has been able to undertake and complete a programme of maintenance, conversion, refurbishment and upgrading so that the premises now conform to Italian safety standards. The general state of repair of the School buildings is currently very good and offers all users satisfactory working conditions in a particularly pleasant environment.

The School still has two construction problems, one of which, extension of the canteen, is in the process of being resolved. The construction scheme was authorized by the Italian authorities and building work started during the summer. The second problem is the inadequacy of rooms, for the primary cycle particularly. Conversion of corridors into small classrooms has reached its limits. For years now, the School has been requesting the

construction of a new 20-room building, which could easily be accommodated on the existing site

#### **6.4. Luxembourg**

The Luxembourg School has settled into its converted or newly built premises. The general concept and pedagogical facilities are deemed excellent, even though there are still some specific problems. One of the problems which concerns the members of the school community is the 'open school' concept used, which makes surveillance of the school complex very difficult.

A second problem was the rough surface of the playground, which led to falls and caused injuries. The *Administration des Bâtiments* (Buildings Administration) the competent Luxembourg authority, has had the surface replaced, so that it is now smoother and more 'user-friendly'.

The main problem is undoubtedly the fact that the Luxembourg School has 3702 pupils on roll and is filled to capacity. The Board of Governors has acknowledged that a second school needs to be built as a matter of urgency. The Luxembourg Government has been notified.

#### **6.5. Brussels I**

At its meeting on 6 and 7 November 2001, the Board of Governors had occasion to hear a report on the satisfactory conditions in which the new school school year started at the Brussels I School in September 2001.

The *Régie des Bâtiments* (Public Buildings Authority) carried out asbestos removal work during August 2001 and the beginning of the new school year did not have to be deferred, as happened in September 2000.

Brussels I has been able to accommodate the nursery cycle, and the primary year 5 and secondary classes on its Uccle site. The primary years 2, 3 and 4 classes are temporarily accommodated on the premises of the Brussels III School's Ixelles site.

Construction of the new secondary cycle building is continuing apace. Thanks to a new separation between the School and the building site and the erection of a footbridge, teaching can proceed normally without major inconvenience.

The work is scheduled to have been completed by 31 August 2002, which will enable the following actions to be taken: the secondary can take possession of its new building, the primary can move into its building at Uccle and bring back its classes from Ixelles, Brussels III can set up its primary cycle through its own recruitment and through transfers from Brussels I and Brussels II.

A management plan for the asbestos still present on the site will have to be drawn up and implemented. The *Régie des Bâtiments* is addressing the question.

Given the seriousness and urgency of the problem of the beginning of the 2000-2001 school year, the response of the directors of the *Régie des Bâtiments*, Mr LAURIKS and Mr EVENEPOELE, of the competent Minister, Mr Rik DAEMS, and of Belgium's Federal Government was speedy and thorough. I conveyed to them the thanks of the Board of Governors.

#### **6.6. Brussels II**

As part of phase II of the master plan, renovation work in a number of areas was completed.

Definitive solutions are being found to a few local problems, notably that of the 3rd floor

primary classrooms, where the heat generated by the sun creates a real problem.

The construction of a large multi-purpose hall for examinations, concerts, plays, etc., is scheduled for July 2002.

The problem of a parking area for the school buses, which currently park in the playground, still has to be resolved.

#### **6.7. Alicante and Frankfurt**

The new schools have been set up but do not yet exist physically. For the moment, efforts to have appropriate buildings ready in September 2002 seem to be increasingly hampered by construction problems, leading to slippage of the deadlines.

In Frankfurt, the presence of asbestos on the site on which the school is to be built delayed clearing work, with the result that the authorities have now virtually given up hope of having the building ready for occupation by the nursery and primary. The City of Frankfurt is looking for temporary accommodation to allow the school to open in September 2002.

In Alicante, the construction scheme has been finalized, the 30 000 m<sup>2</sup> site is available and the tendering procedure is under way. The authorities still hope that the construction work can be completed in time to accommodate the nursery and primary on the site. Here too, I have drawn the authorities' attention to the fact that they must make preparations to provide temporary accommodation if necessary, in the form of existing school premises or premises which can be made available quickly.

### **7. Life in the Schools**

In their beginning-of-year reports, the schools' directors develop in detail the different aspects of life in their schools.

The schools developed a remarkable school, social, cultural, sporting and recreational life at different levels and in various directions. The commitment of the teachers, the parents and, of course, the pupils is undoubtedly a decisive factor in this success.

The policy of the Schools regarding educational provision for pupils with learning problems has been to provide Learning Support in language and mathematics and to allow for the establishment of an agreement between the parents of particular pupils and the individual schools in the case of pupils with more serious educational problems. This policy has continued to be applied and the numbers of pupils benefiting from it - 160, nursery, primary and secondary combined - has grown steadily over the years.

The SEN Policy Group has met on two occasions during the school year and is in the process of completing a report which summarizes the functioning of this policy. As soon as this document is finalized by the Policy Group it will be submitted for comment to the preparatory committees and thereafter to the Board of Governors.

### **8. Organs of the system**

I am not going to summarize all the work undertaken during the year 2000 in the various bodies making up the European Schools system, for two reasons : firstly, certain boards and committees present their own reports and secondly, the outcome of these activities is well publicized since the results appear in the form of reports or of proposals for decisions on the Board of Governors' agenda.

I shall endeavour below to outline the activities and to highlight the issues addressed to which



a solution has been found or is still awaited.

### **8.1. Board of Governors**

**Meetings:** 31 January 2001, 2 and 3 February 2001, 24 and 25 April 2001, 6 and 7 November 2001.

### **8.2. Troika**

As I stated in my report last year that the Board of Governors had set up a standing committee in the form of a working group on the future of the Schools, it should be pointed out that this group halted its work with the departure of its chairman, Mr Roland GAINAGE.

At its Alicante meeting, the Board of Governors put in place a new structure charged with steering the debate on optimization of the Schools in the run-up to EU enlargement and the Schools' future in this new context: this new structure is the Troika, comprising the past presidency, the current presidency and the future presidency.

The Troika will focus its work on the impact of EU enlargement on the Schools and will address both the educational and administrative/financial issues arising.

**Meetings:** 13 December 2001

### **8.3. Boards of Inspectors**

**Meetings of the Primary Board of Inspectors:** 13 March 2001 - 18 and 19 June 2001 - 11, 12 and 13 September 2001 - 21 November 2001.

**Meetings of the Secondary Board of Inspectors:** 14 March 2001 - 18 June 2001 - 11 September 2001 - 20 November 2001.

**Meetings of the Primary/Secondary Boards of Inspectors:** 15 March 2001 - 22 November.

### **8.4. Teaching Committees**

**Meetings of the Primary Teaching Committee:** 14 March 2001 - 23 November 2001.

**Meetings of the Secondary Teaching Committee:** 16 March 2001 - 21 November 2001.

**Meetings of the Primary/Secondary Teaching Committees:** 15 March 2001 - 22 November 2001.

### **8.5. Meetings of the Administrative and Financial Committee**

**Meetings:** 30 January 2001 - 16 February 2001 - 27-30 March 2001 - 12 June 2001 - 8 October 2001 - 5 and 6 December 2001.

### **8.6. Administrative Boards**

**Meetings:**

Bergen: 23 January 2001 - 30 May 2001 - 24 October 2001

Brussels I: 12 February 2001 - 2 May 2001 - 9 October 2001

Brussels 2: 13 February 2001 - 3 May 2001 - 10 October 2001

Brussels 3: 14 February 2001 - 4 May 2001 - 12 October 2001

Culham: 26 January 2001 - 15 June 2001 - 26 October 2001

Karlsruhe: 8 February 2001 - 7 June 2001 - 4 October 2001

Luxembourg: 20 February 2001 - 1 June 2001 - 19 October 2001

Mol: 15 February 2001 - 7 May 2001 - 22 October 2001

*Munich: 9 February 2001 - 8 June 2001 - 5 October 2001*

*Varese: 6 February 2001 - 5 June 2001 - 3 October 2001*

*Alicante: 21 September 2001*

*Frankfurt-am-Main: 14 September 2001*

#### **8.7. Directors**

*Meetings: 9 March 2001 - 11 June 2001 - 16 October 2001 - 29 and 30 November 2001*

### **8.8. The Office of the Representative**

#### **8.8.1. Organization**

The Office's internal structuring in 5 units – administrative and accounts unit, pedagogical unit, ICT unit, financial control unit and general secretariat – was not changed.

#### **8.8.2. Computerization**

A particular effort was made to move computerization forward. A number of fundamental decisions were taken, notably the decision to start the process of migration to WINDOWS and MS OFFICE software.

The DATAWAREHOUSE project long suffered from an incomplete description of the project. Its incorporation into the Management Reporting project enabled the deadlock to be broken and implementation to begin.

The year 2000/01 also saw the publication on the web of the basic documents in the official languages. The Digest of Decisions and the curricula are to follow.

#### **8.8.3. The paperless office**

Certain problems were not resolved in 2000/01. One problem in particular is the elimination of paper as a means of communication, with the outside world especially. The continuing massive presence of paper documents leads to storage, archiving and work flow control problems at the Office. An invitation to tender has been issued. A solution will probably be found and implemented in 2002.

#### **8.8.4. Differential adjustment cases**

Since centralization of the handling of differential adjustment cases in January 1998, the Office's administrative and accounts unit has dealt with 1 549 cases. As a sometimes considerable period of time elapses between taxation in the country of origin of taxable income and reception of the tax notice issued to the teacher and forwarded to the relevant department at the Office, the best analysis which can be made of the current status of the handling of cases relates to the years 1996 and 1997. For those years, 67.1% and 59.23% cases respectively have been settled. For certain sites, the percentage of cases settled can be as high as 95% (Mol, Munich and Varese) and even 100% (Office, for the years 1997, 1998 and 1999). Centralization has led to improved application of Article 49 of the Staff Regulations, which specifically concerns regularization of the adjustment on the basis of the final tax certificate.

The tables show the status of the handling of cases for the years 1996 to 2000. Table ADM 1 shows the situation by School, while Table ADM 2 shows it by Member State of origin.

Some Schools are quicker than others in collecting together the documents enabling the differential adjustment to be calculated. They often meet with great reluctance on teachers' part to produce the documents requested by the administration. This reluctance seems to be peculiar to the nationals of certain Member States more than others, as Table ADM 2 shows.

In June 2000, the Representative sent to the Schools and to the staff representatives a

detailed memorandum on the application of the relevant provisions of the Staff Regulations and the procedure and method of calculating the differential adjustment. The memorandum contains an up-to-date list of the documents to be submitted to the administration. The reluctance is no doubt due in part to the fact that the teachers in question dispute the validity of the request for documents made by the administration. Meanwhile, a number of decisions of the Board of Appeal should have clarified the situation. However, if the number of cases which cannot be dealt with because the paperwork is incomplete remains large, measures to remedy the situation will have to be recommended to the Board of Governors.

*Key to tables ADM 1 and 2*

*ADM 1: Status of calculation by school on 17.12.2001  
in ( ) status of calculation in December 2000*

<i>A traiter</i>	<i>Basic DA for the teacher</i>
<i>Déjà traité</i>	<i>DA adjusted by the ORBG</i>
<i>En cours</i>	<i>Document under analysis at the ORBG</i>
<i>Reste</i>	<i>The teacher or the School has not yet submitted the documents</i>
<i>% Reste</i>	<i>Percentage of teachers who have not yet submitted the documents</i>
<i>(non reçus)</i>	

*ADM 2: Status of calculation by Member State of origin*

<i>A traiter</i>	<i>Basic DA for the teacher</i>
<i>Déjà traité</i>	<i>DA adjusted by the ORBG</i>
<i>En cours</i>	<i>Document under analysis at the ORBG</i>
<i>Reste</i>	<i>The teacher or the School has not yet submitted the documents</i>
<i>% Reste</i>	<i>Percentage of teachers who have not yet submitted the documents</i>
<i>(non reçus)</i>	

Tableau ADM 1: Ajustement différentiel					Etat du calcul par école au 17.12.2001					
entre ( ) l'état du calcul en décembre 2000										
A traiter	AD de base pour l'enseignant									
Déjà traité	AD ajusté par le B.R.C.S.									
En cours	Document au B.R.C.S. en cours d'analyse									
Reste	L'enseignant ou l'Ecole n'a pas encore introduit les documents									
% Reste	Pourcentage des enseignants qui n'ont pas encore introduit les documents									
	1996					1997				
Écoles	à traiter	déjà traités	en cours	non reçus	% non reçus	à traiter	déjà traités	en cours	non reçus	% non reçus
B.R.C.S.	5	4	0	1 (1)	20%	4	4	0	0 (0)	0%
BERGEN	36	20	0	16 (22)	44%	43	30	0	13 (17)	30%
BRUXELLES 1	97	69	2	26 (26)	27%	112	85	2	25 (26)	22%
BRUXELLES 2	73	63	0	10 (13)	14%	87	71	1	15 (17)	17%
BRUXELLES 3										
CULHAM	23	7	1	15 (16)	65%	26	11	1	14 (15)	54%
KARLSRUHE	26	24	0	2 (3)	8%	32	28	0	4 (7)	13%
LUXEMBOURG	102	70	2	30 (46)	29%	131	77	7	47 (69)	36%
MOL	39	37	0	2 (2)	5%	49	36	3	10 (13)	20%
MUNCHEN	21	21	0	0 (1)	0%	23	22	0	1 (3)	4%
VARESE	40	33	1	6 (8)	15%	41	38	0	3 (10)	7%
TOTAL	462	348	6	108 (138)	23%	548	402	14	132 (177)	24%
	1998					1999				
Écoles	à traiter	déjà traités	en cours	non reçus	% non reçus	à traiter	déjà traités	en cours	non reçus	% non reçus
B.R.C.S.	4	4	0	0 (0)	0%	5	5	0	0 (0)	0%
BERGEN	45	29	0	16 (20)	36%	54	33	4	17 (39)	31%
BRUXELLES 1	125	76	11	38 (50)	30%	141	45	45	51 (106)	36%
BRUXELLES 2	108	60	11	37 (100)	34%	131	38	31	62 (130)	47%
BRUXELLES 3						60	10	26	24 (54)	40%
CULHAM	29	11	1	17 (22)	59%	33	9	2	22 (31)	67%
KARLSRUHE	39	23	6	10 (19)	26%	53	22	6	25 (40)	47%
LUXEMBOURG	148	71	9	68 (90)	46%	176	51	31	94 (147)	53%
MOL	49	40	6	3 (9)	6%	53	25	25	3 (40)	6%
MUNCHEN	29	25	0	4 (5)	14%	35	20	2	13 (24)	37%
VARESE	50	37	2	11 (18)	22%	54	36	4	14 (32)	26%
TOTAL	626	376	46	204 (333)	33%	795	294	176	325 (643)	41%
	2000									
Écoles	à traiter	déjà traités	en cours	non reçus	% non reçus					
B.R.C.S.	7	1	2	4	57%					
BERGEN	81	7	17	57	70%					
BRUXELLES 1	207	11	47	149	72%					
BRUXELLES 2	209	2	13	194	93%					
BRUXELLES 3	106	2	29	75	71%					
CULHAM	91	5	1	85	93%					
KARLSRUHE	101	24	18	59	58%					
LUXEMBOURG	271	8	32	231	85%					
MOL	75	7	13	55	73%					
MUNCHEN	78	3	0	75	96%					
VARESE	114	21	26	67	59%					
TOTAL	1340	91	198	1051	78%					

AJUSTEMENT DIFFERENTIEL															
Etat du calcul par Etat membre d'origine															
A traiter	AD de base pour l'enseignant														
Déjà traité	AD ajusté par le B.R.C.S.														
En cours	Document au B.R.C.S. en cours d'analyse														
Reste	L'enseignant ou l'Ecole n'a pas encore introduit les documents														
%	Pourcentage des enseignants qui ont fourni leur document														
% Reste	Pourcentage des enseignants qui n'ont pas encore introduit les documents														
Etat membre	1996					1997					1998				
	A traiter	Déjà traité	En cours	Reste	% Reste	A traiter	Déjà traité	En cours	Reste	% Reste	A traiter	Déjà traité	En cours	Reste	% Reste
GB	23	12	1	10	43%	38	16	0	22	58%	54	18	3	33	61%
D	123	105	0	18	15%	134	121	0	13	10%	136	117	4	15	11%
A	1	0	1	0	0%	3	2	1	0	0%	4	2	2	0	0%
B	150	130	0	20	13%	153	135	1	17	11%	157	119	9	29	18%
Dk	35	31	0	4	11%	37	30	3	4	11%	37	28	3	6	16%
E	4	1	1	2	50%	8	3	1	4	50%	16	4	2	10	63%
FIN	9	7	0	2	22%	12	9	0	3	25%	17	5	4	8	47%
F	14	10	0	4	29%	29	22	2	5	17%	42	25	5	12	29%
GR	5	0	1	4	80%	12	8	1	3	25%	19	6	2	11	58%
IRL	21	8	1	12	57%	27	8	2	17	63%	29	7	3	19	66%
I	9	4	1	4	44%	14	6	1	7	50%	14	5	3	6	43%
L	23	13	0	10	43%	24	14	0	10	42%	28	11	0	17	61%
NL	35	19	0	16	46%	36	16	1	19	53%	41	14	3	24	59%
P	1	0	0	1	100%	5	0	1	4	80%	12	0	3	9	75%
S	9	8	0	1	11%	16	12	0	4	25%	20	14	0	6	30%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>462</b>	<b>347</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>548</b>	<b>402</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>626</b>	<b>375</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>33%</b>
Etat membre	1999					2000									
	A traiter	Déjà traité	En cours	Reste	% Reste	A traiter	Déjà traité	En cours	Reste	% Reste					
GB	68	22	3	43	63%	216	11	22	183	85%					
D	159	95	26	38	24%	209	42	24	143	68%					
B	173	63	51	59	34%	169	0	2	167	99%					
Dk	37	19	10	8	22%	37	8	11	18	49%					
E	21	1	6	14	67%	59	0	4	55	93%					
FIN	20	3	7	10	50%	22	0	4	18	82%					
F	85	38	28	19	22%	181	3	74	104	57%					
GR	27	1	13	13	48%	41	0	5	36	88%					
IRL	33	8	3	22	67%	48	1	5	42	88%					
I	41	18	4	19	46%	159	22	25	112	70%					
L	25	7	1	17	68%	32	2	3	27	84%					
NL	58	5	18	35	60%	92	1	11	80	87%					
P	14	0	2	12	86%	34	0	2	32	94%					
S	25	11	2	12	48%	28	0	3	25	89%					
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>795</b>	<b>294</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>325</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>1340</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>1051</b>	<b>78%</b>					

## 9. Major issues

Under this title, I proposed last year to focus on four subjects

- school infrastructure,
- EU enlargement
- quality development,
- optimization of the system.

I realize that these subjects were very much present in the work of the different bodies and that they are therefore well suited to an assessment of the results achieved in the year 2001/02.

### **9.1. Infrastructure**

A report on school infrastructure problems in Brussels, Luxembourg, Alicante and Frankfurt was made in the section devoted to school buildings or mention will be made of them below. The purpose of the reminder is to highlight once again the importance and urgency of the matter.

### **9.2. Tomorrow's problems: enlargement**

In connection with the question of EU enlargement, I drew attention in my report to the Board of Governors to the problems which we will have to resolve:

Infrastructure problems in Brussels, the opening of a fourth school becomes absolutely essential,

Infrastructure problems in Luxembourg, the opening of a second school becomes absolutely essential,

Problems associated with the proliferation of small schools designed to meet the educational and academic needs of the staff of a growing number of workplaces of EU institutions, bodies and agencies,

Problems of running the large and small schools if the accession of new members leads to the opening of new language sections,

Problems with preparation, consultation and decision-making processes in bodies on which 26, 28 or 30 contracting parties are represented,

Problems involved in managing schools, curricula and staff, of a hitherto unknown level of complexity.

1 A (temporary) solution to some of these problems was found at the meeting of the Board of Governors on 6 and 7 November 2001. I informed the Governments of Belgium and the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg of the invitation issued to them by the Board of Governors with a view to the opening of a fourth School in Brussels and of a second School in Luxembourg.

2 Other problems, such as small Schools and small language sections, were referred to the Troika. There remains the problem of the system's management at the highest level, that of the Board of Governors itself. The collaboration and political options of 27 delegations will need to be incorporated into the preparation, consultation and decision-making processes.

### **9.3. Contact with applicant countries**

Contact has been established with the permanent representations of certain applicant States. Information has been exchanged. Contact will need to become systematic.

### **9.4. Quality development**

Quality is not associated with one particular area. If a School wishes to engage in quality development, it is obliged in practice to embark on the drawing up of a school development plan, of a precise timetable, of a set of evaluation instruments and consultation strategies. The

document approved by the Board of Governors clearly underlined the principle that such a project can only be instigated by the school and the school community of which it is formed.

But all the bodies outside the school also need to be favourably disposed towards such a policy and contribute to the project's success through their analyses, attitude and actions.

Quality development is, therefore, an issue to be addressed both by the parties directly involved within the school – management, teachers, pupils and parents – and by outside bodies, notably the Boards of Inspectors, the AFC, the Representative and of course the Board of Governors itself.

I sent a letter to that effect to the directors, to the chairmen of the Boards of Inspectors and to the chairman of the AFC. The purpose of the letter was to invite the bodies in question to set out a plan of actions to be taken as part of quality development.

#### **9.4.1. Boards of Inspectors**

The two Boards of Inspectors are preparing a joint document on the inspectorate's role in a context where the quality policy would be initiated and developed at the Schools' instigation, notably by means of self-evaluation.

#### **9.4.2. Directors**

At its meeting on 6 and 7 November 2001, the Board of Governors expressed a wish to see, at its January 2002 meeting, a report from the Schools on the action taken to promote quality assurance and development.

I requested the directors to incorporate a note on the subject in the body of the text or to add a separate note to the beginning-of-year report which would be appended when the report was distributed.

I have summarized the information available in the table below.

Bergen	A number of initiatives in the areas of internal and external communication, primary-secondary transition, use of ICT, cooperation between teachers, in-service training, the study hall and the library, the safety plan.
Brussels I	<p>In 2000/01, the delayed start of the school year meant that it was not possible to progress at the desired pace. Efforts focused mainly on increasing European awareness, thanks to several initiatives aimed at breaking down barriers, particularly linguistic ones, between language sections.</p> <p>In 2001/02, two issues are the focus of attention: bullying of pupils and integration of SEN pupils.</p>
Brussels II	No direct mention in the beginning-of-year report.
Brussels III	A paper on the school development plan aimed at forging the school's own specific image and the desire to control quality development.
Culham	The School has not yet drawn up a 'school development plan' but intends to send a questionnaire to parents for the purpose of establishing what expectations parents have with respect to the quality of the School's provision.
Karlsruhe	Organization of 'pedagogical days' (in-service training seminars) on the subject of quality control and self-evaluation.
Luxembourg	<p>Organization of a 'pedagogical day' on the subject of quality control and self-evaluation: the multi-annual self-evaluation process has started.</p> <p>Need to increase internal in-service training provision.</p> <p>Need to increase timetable reductions for coordination.</p>
Mol	<p>No direct mention in the beginning-of-year report.</p> <p>Evaluation Committee: harmonization of pedagogical and didactic practice in the different sections.</p>
Munich	<p>In 2000/01, formation of a Q (for 'quality') group and production of a document, within the management team, on continuation of the process.</p> <p>In 2001/02, teachers, parents, pupils and AAS have been invited to participate in a 'stock-taking' exercise. The outcomes will be the subject of a 'pedagogical day'.</p> <p>The Q group has formed two subgroups: one will produce a document on the School's objectives, the other will steer the development process, which should lead to a school development plan.</p> <p>A 'pedagogical day' in November led to major quality development initiatives.</p>
Varese	<p>Organization of a 'pedagogical day' on the subject of quality control and self-evaluation</p> <p>Follow-up to the 'pedagogical day':</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Information for the teachers, the members of the joint Education Committee</li><li>-Setting of priorities within the framework of a 'school development plan for the year 2000-2001 and the medium term'</li><li>-Implementation of concrete measures in the areas selected</li><li>-Results of implementation established and presented to the Administrative Board.</li></ul>



#### 9.4.3. Conclusions

Overall, the Schools are favourably disposed towards the devising, with all the components of the educational community, of a school development plan, which would find written expression in a sort of basic charter of the School that would determine the particular course chosen to

- achieve the objectives of an educational institution
- achieve the objectives of a European School
- form a centre of community life

and enable performance parameters to be set and thus to arrive at an ongoing process of self-evaluation of quality.

In fact, implementation of a quality policy is still only just beginning. Some Schools have already taken the first steps as part of a multi-annual plan, while others are still at the stage of occasional use of a 'pedagogical day' to explore the subject.

The need for an overall approach, for a 'school development plan', is not yet seen as *the* course to be taken by those involved in most of the Schools.

A major step was taken by the Boards of Inspectors at their joint meeting on 22 November 2001 when they endorsed proposals relating to the task of the Inspectors and of the Boards of Inspectors in the context of the quality assurance and development policy. Under these proposals, the Inspectors would act as external evaluators at the Schools' request. They would leave it to the Schools to define the plan, the objectives and the evaluation criteria and would look at them from the outsider's perspective, something which is always necessary.

If the Board of Governors wishes to give impetus to implementation of its policy, it will have to take seriously the two demands made by certain directors: it will be necessary firstly to allow the Schools to organize in-service training sessions in this area and secondly to grant additional timetable reductions (release from teaching duties) to coordinate activities.

#### 9.5. Optimization of the system

At its meeting in Alicante on 24 and 25 April 2001, the Board of Governors set up the Troika, comprising the past presidency, the current presidency and the future presidency.

The Troika is charged with steering the discussions on optimization of the European Schools system.

The Troika intends to focus primarily on the issue of enlargement and to address the following subsidiary issues:

- The Schools' construction schemes
- Integration of pupils into language sections of whose language they do not have a perfect command
- Rationalization of school organization
- Fair financial burden-sharing

The Troika has already held an exchange of views on the first three issues and has taken initiatives which will be the subject of a specific item on the agenda.

I consider that a methodical and concrete debate on optimization of the European Schools system is taking shape.

## **10. Conclusion**

In discharging my responsibilities I endeavour to be conscientious, clear, consistent and far-sighted. The objective is to enable the European Schools system to develop, taking account of how it operates at the present time but with a definite concern to evolve towards new forms of organization geared to the changing European context.

I hope that this report will provide the Board of Governors with sufficient information and help it to move forward decisively.

I wish to thank all who have made a contribution in terms of experience, analyses, encouragement and friendship, thus enabling me to do my job with enthusiasm.