



COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

Brussels, 11.10.2005
COM(2005)482 final

REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION

**Annual Report from the European Commission to the European Parliament on
the Functioning of the European Schools System**

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the first Annual Report from the European Commission to the European Parliament on the Functioning of the European Schools System. It follows a request from the European Parliament in the Bösch Report in 2002 on the future financing of the European Schools (ES). The present report presents an overview of the principal aspects of the functioning of the ES today (with comparative figures to identify major trends), and focuses on an examination of the pupil population, the staffing, the main pedagogical issues and financing. The Report goes on to highlight the key challenges facing the ES: the consequences of enlargement, the need to take account of the creation of EU Agencies and widen the availability of the European Baccalaureate, the governance of the school system, the difficult conditions of the large ES in Brussels and Luxembourg and the future of the small schools, particularly in view of the very small number of cat 1 pupils in the latter.

The ES system has operated successfully for just over half a century, providing a high quality education primarily to the children of the staff of the European Union (i.e. about 51% of the ES total pupil population in 2004 were children of EU staff) The system operates on an intergovernmental-type basis under a Convention signed by all Member States (MS) and the European Commission. As the said intergovernmental Convention clearly specifies, the very purpose of the ES is “to educate together children of the staff of the European Communities”¹. Besides them, “other children may attend the Schools, within the limits set by the Board of Governors”². Because of their combined roles as providers of nearly 60% of the funding of the ES system and as responsible employers with an interest in ensuring the continuing good functioning of a system which remains a vital element in attracting and recruiting staff of the highest calibre, the EU institutions have in recent years taken a growing interest in the European Schools.

Following the Bösch Report adopted by the European Parliament in 2002, the Commission in 2004 put forward a discussion document on the future of the ES system, which raises a number of issues relating to their governance, financing and educational services. This has opened a wide debate on the issues and challenges facing the European Schools as they enter their second 50 years of operation, existing as they are in a context of considerable change. The continuing enlargement of the Union and the creation of new EU bodies across Europe, coupled with changing approaches to education, pose new challenges which the ES system should address if it is to remain as visionary over the coming 50 years as it has been over the past. It is in this context that the Commission presents a first Annual Report to the European Parliament on the Functioning of the European Schools System. This report presents an overview of the system today, and addresses a number of key challenges for the future.

¹ *Convention Defining the Statute of the European Schools*, article 1.

² *Digest of Decisions of the Board of Governors* Ref # 95-D-19, pg 162 sets limit for cat 3 children to 20% of class.

2. STATISTICAL DATA & TRENDS

2.1. Pupil population

There are currently 13 European Schools³ in 7 Member States. There are 14 languages which are used for delivering the pupils' education in language sections, with 80 language sections in total. The pupils attending the ES are classified in three categories according to decisions taken by the Board of Governors (BoG), the governing authority for the ES. The first category (cat 1) comprises the children of staff of the EU institutions (and also children of certain other organisations as well as the children of the staff working for the ES system itself). They do not pay school fees. The second category of pupils (cat 2) comprises children whose parents' employers have signed an agreement with the ES and who pay school fees at the full annual cost per pupil of the ES which they attend. The third category of pupils (cat 3) are other children, not covered by the first two categories, and who are accepted by the director of the ES according to rules and decisions taken by the BoG. They too pay school fees, which cover a part of the cost per pupil in their schools.

There are now almost 20000 pupils in the ES. The system has witnessed an increase of 17% in the last 3 years. The bulk of this increase is accounted for by an increase of the cat 1 pupil numbers (23%), predominantly in Brussels and Luxembourg. The table below illustrates some indicative figures regarding growth in the total and cat 1 population in the ES, while more details are available in Annex 1.

Pupil population	1995	2001	2004	% growth from 1995	% growth from 2001
Total number of pupils	15756	16985	19862	26.1	16.9
Category 1 pupils	8965	10070	12412	38.4	23.3

At present, the large ES in Brussels and Luxembourg cater for over 12000 or 60% of all the children in all the ES. Moreover, these large schools provide educational services to 78% of all cat 1 pupils in the system, while the remaining 8 schools account for only 22% of the cat 1 pupils⁴

The majority, if not all, of the pupils from the new MS will be entering the Brussels or Luxembourg ES where the over-crowding conditions are already significant. Coupled with a mini 'baby boom' among existing staff, pressure here may become unsustainable in the very next years. In addition, the over-crowding situation in Brussels and Luxembourg has a negative effect on the pupil's learning environment and general welfare. It also affects the staff's working conditions and general atmosphere in the schools. Although the necessary

³ Another ES is due to open in Brussels in 2009 bringing the total number of ES in Brussels to 4 and of all ES to 14.

⁴ The ES in Munich serves the cat 1 children of staff of the European Patent Office and they represent 8% of all cat 1 pupils in all the ES. The ES in Varese provides educational services to pupils of the Joint Research Centre in Ispra, and they account for 5% of all cat 1 pupils in the system. The cat 1 population in the new ES in Alicante and Frankfurt represents 5% of the system total. Finally the 4 small ES in Culham, Bergen, Mol and Karlsruhe (the latter three catering to the pupils of staff of the Joint Research Centre) together have a cat 1 population which represents less than 4% of the total cat 1 population.


decisions have been taken and sites identified for the location of the second ES in Luxembourg (Luxembourg II will be situated in Mamer) and the fourth ES in Brussels (Brussels IV will be situated in Laeken), the opening dates for these schools are 2008 and 2009 respectively. The Brussels ES are estimated to increase by 900 cat 1 pupils by 2009 and the Luxembourg ES by 200 cat 1 pupils by 2008. The Commission has intervened with the national authorities concerned to respect the delivery date of each school and will continue to monitor the situation closely.

In the small ES there has been a decrease in the overall pupil numbers in the last few years and the obvious presence of the large numbers of cat 3 pupils suggests that these schools are maintained primarily by this category of pupils (see Annex 2). Approximate 80% of the pupils in the small ES are cat 3. The income of the cat 3 fees to the respective ES budget is about 20% however.

2.2. Personnel levels

The European Schools are staffed mainly (+/-80%) by teachers sent by national ministries of Education for a limited duration of detachment⁵. Some teaching staff (supply teachers / ‘chargés de cours’) as well as the schools’ administrative and ancillary staff (AAS) are hired locally by the school directors. Only the seconded/detached teachers have a comprehensive staff regulation outlining the terms and conditions of their employment. The AAS staff follow, by and large, the national regulations in place in the country where the ES is located. The locally hired, part-time teachers (chargés de cours) usually have a limited contract with the ES for one year but which is renewable. They are paid according to the number of lessons they provide per week.

In keeping with the increase in the pupil population, the staff levels in the ES and the Office of the Secretary General (OSG) have also increased. Many, if not all, of the additional teaching posts are the result of enlargement with the creation of 3 new language sections (Polish, Czech and Hungarian) in Brussels and another 3 (Polish, Czech and Hungarian) in Luxembourg. Indicated in the table below are the pupil/teacher ratios in the various ES.



⁵ Up to nine years.

The full impact of the creation of these language sections has not yet been absorbed as only the nursery and primary cycles have opened so far. The secondary levels will open gradually and it seems that the full effects in terms of teaching staff for these language sections will only be visible near 2010. By then, it is likely that a new round of enlargement will have required additional teaching staff in the ES. In addition to the 6 new language sections opened in Brussels and Luxembourg (3 in each location), teachers have been hired, as needed, in several ES to provide mother-tongue instruction in the other 6 languages from the new MS for which language sections were not yet created due to the low number of pupils expected.

The growth in the Ancillary and Administrative Staff (AAS) has particularly increased since 3 new ES were opened in 2001: Alicante, Frankfurt and Luxembourg 2. Other than in these ES, the most noticeable increase in AAS posts from 2001 to 2005 is to be found in Munich (37% increase in AAS posts in comparison to a 9.3% increase in pupils over the same period) and at the Office of the Secretary-General (33.8% increase compared to a 16.9% increase in pupil numbers throughout the ES system). An overview is provided below comparing 2005 staffing levels to 2001⁶. Annex 3 provides more information including a detailed breakdown for the seconded teachers and the AAS personnel in all ES for the 2005-2006 school year. The number of locally hired part-time teachers will be approximately the same next year, that is, about 430, but there may be a slight adjustment depending on the local situation; i.e. fluctuation in pupil numbers affecting the number of classes needed and/or detached teacher availability.

Seconded Teachers		Locally hired teachers		Total Teaching Staff		Teaching staff growth	AAS (locally hired)		AAS staff growth	Pupil Population		Pupil Increase
2001	2005	2001	2005	2001	2005	2005/2001	2001	2005	2005/2001	2001	2005	2005/2001
1199	1390	311	430	1510	1820	20,5%	243	311	27,8%	16985	19862	16,9%

2.3. Pedagogical Issues

The European Schools have long been recognised for the quality of the service they provide in terms of a multi-lingual and multi-cultural education in a unique manner and setting. In addition, the European Baccalaureate (EB), the leaving certificate offered in the ES, enjoys wide recognition among MS and the bearer is entitled to the same conditions for university entrance as those enjoyed by the nationals of the particular MS to whose higher educational institution he is applying.

The results of the pupils taking the final EB examinations are improving yearly. In fact, there has been a significant increase in the percentages of pupils who succeed in passing the EB as well as those scoring above 75%⁷. The average success rate of the EB in all ES was 98.1 in 2004 compared to 96.4 in 2000. The overall average mark acquired in the EB in 2004 has risen by 2% points from 74% in 2000 to 76% in 2004. In 2004, nearly half the pupils sitting the EB (49.6%) received a mark of 75% or higher. The number of pupils who scored higher

⁶ The Annual Report of the Secretary General to the BoG of the ES. Ref # 1612-D-2004.

⁷ Report on the European Baccalaureate. BoG 1-2 Feb 2005. Ref # 2004-D-3210.

than 80% on their exam has risen to 29%. Furthermore, 3 ES have had 100% success rates every year since 2000.

There are in addition, differences among language sections in terms of pass rates and good results. In six of the eleven language sections in which the European Baccalaureate is currently available, half the pupils achieved good results (>75%) in 2004, while the other five language sections scored below the system average of 49.6% for attaining good results. Annex 4 provides more details on the success rates and scores of the pupils in the European Baccalaureate, while Annex 5 illustrates the failure rates per school, language section and level in the years before the Baccalaureate examinations.

The most recent confirmation that the ES do indeed provide a good level of education is the results that the ES in Luxembourg scored in the OECD PISA II 2003 evaluation. The results of the 192 15 year-old children (in the Anglophone, Francophone and Germanophone language sections) who took this test were slightly higher in relation to their counterparts in the equivalent national Luxembourg schools. The European Commission is examining the possibility for other ES to undergo the PISA III 2006 tests. In addition, a survey to examine the academic studies and/or career paths followed by the pupils after the Baccalaureate and the reasons for their success or failure is also under consideration by the Commission services.

In the last few years a number of programmes for the ES have been developed or updated by the Board of Inspectors. In particular many of the language programmes and foreign language programmes dating back to the early seventies and eighties have been revised and approved by the BoG. In addition, several programmes for the non-core subjects have been improved and updated. At present about half of the existing programmes for the ES curricula have been written or re-written between 2000 and 2005. However, several still date back to the 1980s. An important addition to the ES curricula, are the programmes designed to assist pupils with difficulties or special needs.

The ES now offer a variety of teaching assistance and individual help to pupils with learning difficulties and/or handicaps. The new policies for pupils with Special Educational Needs (SEN) and those requiring Learning Support (LS) are based on the principle of integration of the pupil in the classroom and where the pupils can actively participate in a minimum of collective activities at the cognitive level. However, notwithstanding all on-going efforts, there are instances where the ES cannot cope with the concrete needs of the pupil. The Commission strongly supports the provision of assistance to children with special needs. However, the SEN and LS programmes require better monitoring in order to optimise services and to evaluate their impact. The Commission has asked the BoG for more detailed reports and for an evaluation of the implementation and success of the programmes in each ES.

Other special programmes have been developed in preparation for enlargement and the influx of pupils for whom language sections would not be created. The BoG recently adopted programmes that will assist pupils integrating in language sections that do not correspond with their mother-tongue. The SWALS (Students Without A Language Section), SEN and LS programmes, have received the strong support of the Commission and an increase in the ES budget for the material and human resources needed.

Since 1999, when the BoG adopted the first SEN policy, the number of pupils in this programme has increased dramatically. Indicated below is the evolution of the SEN budget

line in the ES⁸. As it can be seen, the budget dedicated to helping these pupils has been correspondingly increasing and is currently at the level of about €8700 per child⁹.

Evolution of ES budget line for the SEN (Students with Special Needs) programmes

Year	2003	2004	2005	2006
TOTAL (in euros)	1.680.670	2.045.499	2.331.233	2.604.399
No of pupils concerned	197	214	273	Est 300

Despite increases in the financial resources for helping children with special needs or learning difficulties, the implementation of these programmes varies. A number of complaints lodged with the European Ombudsman attest to this fact.

An examination of the repeat rates in the secondary¹⁰ cycle in the ES, illustrates that the peak in the repeat rates occurs in the 4th and 5th year of secondary school, where pupils are required to take a large number of obligatory subjects in science, languages and mathematics at a demanding level (see Annex 5). This and the drop out rates make it necessary to adapt the learning support policy to avoid such peaks and to offer a different course of studies leading to an alternative leaving certificate than the European Bacalaureate, as requested by parents in recent years. A new Working Group was created by the BoG to discuss this issue and will meet for the first time in September 2005.

2.4. Finance

The financial responsibility for the budget of the ES is divided among the contribution from the MS, the income generated from cat 2 and cat 3 fees and the provision from the EU budget of a balancing contribution. The MS contribute to the ES budget by way of paying their detached staff in the ES system their national salaries (the EU budget then fills the gap between the national salary and the ES salary). In 2004, this amounted to approximately 22% of the total ES budget. The income received from cat 2 and cat 3 school fees contributed 5% and 8% respectively. An additional 2% is derived from various small direct contributions to the individual schools (e.g. parents paying insurance, cost for photocopying etc). and the remaining 56% was provided by the Commission from the EU budget. For the ES in Munich, the European Patent Office assumes the financial role similar to that of the Commission's in the other ES. The EPO's financial contribution to the ES system is about 7% of the system total.


For the past several years, the total budget allocated to the European Schools system has been under-spent from 1 to 14.4 million euros annually (see Annex 6). Though this under-spending is due mainly to overestimated staff expenses, the under-spending in the operational budget lines, such as expenses for SEN pupils, intervention of experts, training for staff etc., is proportionately higher, as the table in Annex 7 illustrates. In addition, the differences among the ES, both as regards their initial budget requests and the final amount spent, seem to warrant an in-depth analysis in terms of sound financial management.

⁸ The SWALS and secondary LS programmes are too new to have comparative data at present.

⁹ Data provided by the Office of the Secretary General of the European Schools.

¹⁰ The ES have a universal policy on the conditions in which a pupil will repeat a year. It is found in article 60 of the General Rules of the ES.

There has been a steady, yearly increase in the ES budget and the contributions from the various components. The subsidy from the EU budget, administered by the Commission, has grown from €81.6 million in 1995 to €118.4 million euros in 2004 (a growth of 45%). In the same period of time, the pupil population grew by 33% from nearly 15000 pupils to almost 20000. The number of schools increased from 9 in 1995 to 12 in 2004, and the budget of the Office of the Secretary General has more than doubled in the same period from €4.0 million in 1995 to an allocated budget of €8.2 in 2005. The EU subsidy for the budget of the Office of the Secretary General is about 80%. The estimated EU contribution to the ES budget for 2005 is €127 million, the same as was allocated in 2004. However, the 2004 ES budget was under-spent by €14.4 million due to lower needs than anticipated. Therefore, the EU contribution of €127 million should be ample for the ES needs in 2005. Illustrated in the table below is the total spent ES budget and the EU contribution for the last 10 years¹¹.



As the EU institutions grow and the EU staff levels increase, it is reasonable to expect that the budget of the ES will increase. However, there is no clear correlation between the increasing cat 1 children at a ES and the EU funding of that school as the table below indicates. In fact the large ES receive a lower percentage of EU funds than their percentage of cat 1 pupils, whereas the small ES, receive a much higher percentage of EU funds than their percentage of cat 1 pupils would warrant. The cat 1 pupil population in the 4 ES in Bergen, Culham, Karlsruhe and Mol together account for 3.8% of the system’s total. In contrast, the EU contribution to the budgets of these 4 ES constitutes 18.8% of the total EU contribution to the ES system. In the table below, the comparisons of the percentages, both for cat 1 pupils and the EU contribution is in relation to the total cat 1 pupils in the ES system and the total EU subsidy for the ES system budget.


¹¹ The ES total budget and the EU contribution in 2000 and 2001 are unusually high due to a decision of the BoG to pay the relocation allowance to all teachers in the ES for longer than 9 years in the school year 2000-2001. It is estimated by the Financial Controller of the ES that this inflated the ES budget by €35 million in these 2 years but also reduced the subsequent years by €4-5 million annually.

Comparison between cat 1 pupils and EU subsidy per ES

	2003		2004	
	<i>% of cat 1 in ES system</i>	<i>% of total EU subsidy to ES</i>	<i>% of cat 1 in ES system</i>	<i>% of total EU subsidy to ES</i>
Alicante	2,1	3,1	2,5	4,8
Bergen	0,9	5,8	0,9	5,4
Bxl 1	14,5	14,4	14,7	14,4
Bxl 2	20,7	14,5	20,4	15,0
Bxl 3	18,4	13,6	18,7	13,2
Culham	1,0	5,5	0,9	4,7
Frankfurt	2,1	2,7	2,7	3,5
Karlsruhe	1,1	3,7	1,0	3,3
Lux 1	24,5	17,4	19,1	17,1
Lux 2		0,0	4,8	1,0
Mol	1,1	6,0	1,0	5,4
Munich	8,4	0,9	8,2	0,8
Varese	5,1	6,8	5,2	6,6
OSG		5,5		4,8

More information on the EU financial contribution per ES and the evolution of the ES budgets is provided in Annexes 8 and 9.

The 2004 data on cost per pupil and pupil population per ES is found in the table below¹². The ES have been placed according to their size, from largest to smallest¹³.



lu = Luxembourg 1; b2, b3, b1 = Brussels 2,3,1; mu = Munich; va = Varese; ka = Karlsruhe; al = Alicante; cu = Culham; ff = Frankfurt; be = Bergen; mo = Mol; l2 = Luxembourg 2

3. KEY CHALLENGES FACING THE EUROPEAN SCHOOLS

3.1. Enlargement

Recent and future enlargements add pressure on the ES system by further increasing its complexity and size in terms of new languages and growth in pupil numbers. The revised estimates for pupil numbers coming from the new MS are 1110 spanning between 2004 - 2007. Mainly the Brussels (80%) and Luxembourg (20%) ES will be affected. The other ES are not likely to be affected by enlargement. Annex 10 indicates the estimated pupil numbers in the Brussels and Luxembourg ES for the next five years, including children coming from the new MS.

Provisions made

The educational provisions for the children of staff from the 10 new Members States are carried out on the same basis as those for children of staff from the old Member States. The BoG has set numerical criteria for the establishment of language sections and once these are met, new language sections may be created.¹⁴ Only Polish, Czech and Hungarian language

¹² Table taken from the *Annual Report of the Financial Controller*. Ref # 2005-D-163, p. 12.

¹³ The data for the Luxembourg 2 ES is skewed and should be ignored as this school only operated for 4 months in 2004.

¹⁴ *The Criteria for Setting up, Closure or Maintenance of European Schools*. Ref # 2000-D-7510. pg 2. (75 children in primary and 84 in secondary are needed before a section can open)

sections and only in Brussels and Luxembourg have thus far been opened since these countries have the highest population among the new MS and it is expected that they will easily fulfil the numerical criteria.

At the present, therefore, pupils coming from 6 of the new MS¹⁵ (Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Slovakia, Slovenia and Malta) do not have a language section corresponding to their mother tongue and are being integrated into existing language sections. Their choice has been predominantly the Anglophone language section and to a much lesser extent the Germanophone and Francophone ones. This has created a situation in Brussels where up to a quarter of the pupils in a particular class may not be native-speakers.

Two special programmes have been implemented in order to provide extra language lessons to the pupils in this situation. Firstly, language lessons in their mother-tongue (up to 5 lessons per week) are ensured to all cat 1 and cat 2 pupils. This is an existing policy available in all ES and applied to pupils from the new MS as well, provided that an appropriately qualified teacher is available. Secondly, the pupils in a language section that does not correspond to their mother-tongue will receive extra tuition in the language of the section to help them catch up. The situation in the sections concerned will need close monitoring and evaluation however as these new programmes are at their infancy.

Effects on provision of services in the large ES

As yet, enlargement has not had a significant effect on the staffing levels in the ES. There are some teachers hired to provide mother-tongue teaching and other to provide lessons in the new language sections. By 2010, i.e. by that time the pupil population from the 10 new MS should have become stable, it seems likely that another round of enlargement will have taken place. The impact of that in terms of the ES system is not yet known and will be studied in the coming years. However, experience has shown that even the small language sections require about 15 detached teachers.

3.2. Decentralisation policy & Agency needs

With the creation of new Agencies throughout the Union, the provision of a multi-lingual, multi-cultural education (similar to that provided in the ES) for the children of the Agencies' staff is a major challenge. The low numbers of staff in most Agencies do not justify the creation of new European Schools. Therefore, there is a need to develop new models which provide for their differing needs in a flexible and appropriate way and which enable them to ensure a geographical balance in the recruitment of their personnel and to attract highly qualified staff in general. This becomes difficult, and in some cases almost impossible, if the Agency is located in a city or town that does not offer education in at least one of the vehicular languages. Even in locations where there are alternatives to the national educational system, in private schools for example, the Agencies request equal treatment with locations of establishments of the European Commission with a low number of children of EU staff, but which have the presence of a European School (Culham, Mol, Bergen, Karlsruhe).

¹⁵ The pupils coming from Cyprus are entering the Greek language section which corresponds to their mother-tongue.

The table below shows the number of children of EU staff in the existing small ES in Culham, Bergen, Karlsruhe and Mol for the school year 2003-2004¹⁶.

European School	Culham	Bergen	Karlsruhe	Mol
Number of children of EU staff	14	66	83	85

Officials working in other EU institutions i.e. Thessaloniki (CEDEFOP & EAR) and Seville (IPTS) and those anticipated for Parma (EFSA)¹⁷ have a similar, if not a greater number of children for whom a multilingual education must be provided. Annex 11 gives an estimate of the number of children in each agency in 2005.

Besides the emerging pressure to provide for the educational needs for the children of staff in locations where there is an Agency (or one will be created), the European Parliament in 2002¹⁸ asked the BoG to examine the possibility of widening the availability of the European Baccalaureate outside the European Schools, in co-operation with local schools. In April 2005, the BoG approved the framework of accreditation and the core elements of European Schooling as presented in the report from the relevant Working Group¹⁹. It will continue to meet to specify the procedural aspects of this co-operation and to evaluate the costs involved. Once everything is in place and the BoG approves the arrangements, it is foreseen that the EU institutions will be asked to contribute financially for the education received by the children of EU staff in such ‘associated/accredited’ schools.

As a result of this decision taken by the BoG, the national authorities in three locations - Parma (Italy), Dunshaughlin (Ireland) and Heraklion (Greece)- will be following the new evaluation procedure in order to have the services they offer (or will offer) measured against the established criteria for European Schooling provision. Each of those national authorities has undertaken the task of providing special multi-lingual education (European Schooling) to the children of the EU staff located in their territory. Their delivery methods vary according to the size of the Agency and the pupil numbers (see Annex 12). It is also envisaged that a decision from the BoG will be reached to allow the pupils in such schools who follow the European Schooling to sit the European Baccalaureate²⁰. It is expected that, once available to all pupils receiving the European schooling, the European Baccalaureate will on the one hand reward the efforts of those national authorities having put considerable financial and human resources into the creation of a new, highly qualified School on their territory, and on the other hand allow the EU budget to be better focused on its target priority according to the ES Convention, i.e. the education of children of EU staff.

¹⁶ The data for the Culham, Bergen, Karlsruhe and Mol ES has been taken from their 2003-2004 School Reports.

¹⁷ The number of children for EFSA in Parma is projected to be over 200 once the agency has finished recruiting its staff.

¹⁸ *Bösch Report (FINAL A5-0395/2002) on the Future Financing of the European Schools (2002/2083(INI))*

¹⁹ *Report of the Troika Working Group II “European Baccalaureate and Cooperation with Other Schools”*. Ref 2005-D-342-en-4

²⁰ This may involve amending the Convention.

3.3. Governance

A key and pivotal issue facing the European Schools is governance; the efficiency and the efficacy of their management. A system originally organised for a single school in Luxembourg, with four language sections and a BoG consisting of only the then 6 MS, now has to deal with 80 language sections in 14 different languages in 13 schools in 7 MS. The BoG and its preparatory committees now comprise 29 members: 25 representatives from MS (soon to be more) plus a representative of the European Patent Office²¹, the parents' associations, the teachers' staff committee and the European Commission. In October 2002 the new Convention of the ES came into force and, from this point on, most decisions require only a two thirds majority vote to be taken. Experience in the last two years, however, has shown that the BoG's ability to take decisions has not become easier as a result of the move from unanimity. As proposed in the Communication on the European Schools (COM(2004)519 final), the local autonomy in the governance of the schools should be increased. However, greater accountability must accompany the increased autonomy and the evaluation of the schools' functioning should be systematically undertaken.

Besides the highest authority, the BoG, the ES system has a plethora of committees, working groups and sub-groups, at both the central and local level. These include a number of preparatory committees: three Boards of Inspectors²², three Teaching Committees²³, the Administrative and Financial Committee²⁴, various other ad hoc Working Groups created by the BoG as well as the Administrative Boards of each ES which meet three times a year. These committees give their opinion or expert advice in order to alleviate the burden of the BoG on micro-management issues. The Commission, which participates in only a portion of these, counted over 130 meeting days in 2004 attended by its officials for the ES.

A Working Group which was assigned in 1995 the task of updating the General Rules of the ES presented the revised rules only this year. The task of consolidating the decisions taken by the BoG has not been completed yet. The latest "Digest of Decisions" dates back to 1995, and most documents including the decisions of the BoG are not posted on the website. Both the EP and the Commission have requested more transparency in the ES, including making publicly available the minutes and decisions of the BoG.

Even with the great number of committees, there is still no clear appeal procedure for the pupils and parents against decisions taken by the schools or the BoG itself. The ES system includes a Complaints Board, to which members of the ES community can address themselves. This Board in 2004, however, pronounced itself incompetent to treat subjects other than administrative matters usually regarding the ES staff²⁵. Hence, appeals regarding transfer of pupils, admission of SEN pupils, decisions of Discipline Committees, increase in

²¹ The EPO has a special agreement with the BoG where it pays most of the cost of the ES in Munich in much the same way as does the Commission for the rest of the ES and which entitles it to a seat in the BoG.

²² One for nursery and primary level, another for the secondary and a joint with a representative from each MS.

²³ One for nursery and primary level, another for the secondary and a joint with all the inspectors, directors and deputy directors as appropriate, representatives from parents, teachers and pupils and a representative from the Commission.

²⁴ This committee is comprised of representatives from each MS – usually from ministry of finance, the director, parents, teachers, pupils and Commission in most meetings.

²⁵ *Annual Report of the Financial Controller*, p. 6.

school fees and marks in the EB have been rejected. This is met with serious criticism from the end-users, who for some matters are seeking recourse in the national courts.

In spite of its single vote (out of 29) and, therefore, its limited power, the Commission is often held accountable by parents and EU staff for decisions taken by the BoG or directors of the ES. Some of them address the European Ombudsman who, despite recognising the limited power of the Commission in the BoG, has repeatedly requested that the Commission promotes good administration and transparency in the ES²⁶.

3.4. Category 3 pupils and the question of the viability of the small schools

Perhaps the most sensitive issue in the ES system has been the level of school fees charged in respect to cat 3 children. On the one hand the EP and Commission have requested that these fees come closer in line with the real costs while the parent, teacher, and director representatives argue against any substantial fee increase in order not to reduce the number of cat 3 children in the ES.

The cat 3 fees have been increased considerably in the last 3 years. This may have caused a slight reduction in the cat 3 population in some ES. The overcrowding situation in the Brussels schools also restricted the number of cat 3 pupils admitted there. However, despite a small reduction in cat 3 population (from 36% in 2002 to 32% in 2004), the income from cat 3 fees in the ES budget has increased from 6.5% in 2002 to 8.4% in 2004. The current cat 3 fees in the ES for 2004-2005 are: €2178 for the nursery cycle, €3028 for the primary cycle and €4132 for the secondary cycle with a 50% reduction for the second and 75% reduction for the third and subsequent child in the same family.

The Commission firmly believes that category 3 children should continue to have a place in the ES. Nonetheless, an appropriate balance needs to be struck between ensuring an affordable level of fees on the one hand and limiting the amount of subsidy paid by the European tax payer on the other. In the case of some of the small ES, where category 3 pupils amount for about 80% of the total student population, this issue becomes more pressing and even raises concerns about the long term viability of the schools concerned. (See Annexes 2 and 8.) Furthermore, the high levels of exoneration from cat 3 fees in these small ES should be addressed since they involve 65% of all exonerations given in all the ES (i.e. 571 cases out of a total of 882).

The Gaignage criteria²⁷ adopted in 2000 set benchmarks for the creation of ES by indicating a minimum number of pupils per language sections and state that at least 50% of the pupils in a ES outside Brussels and Luxembourg should be cat 1. The same document states that a language section or even a ES may close “when the small number of category 1 pupils on roll no longer justifies the School’s continuing existence”²⁸. The EP also focused on this issue in the Bösch report in 2002 and requested the BoG to take action. Following this, 7 very small language sections in the 4 ES of Bergen, Culham, Karlsruhe and Mol (which had only 17 category 1 children in all 7 language sections²⁹) are being phased out.

²⁶ The Commission has presented a document on this issue (*Proposed Actions for Greater Transparency and Good Administration in the European Schools System*) and is waiting for the ES to implement it.

²⁷ *The Criteria for Setting up, Closure or Maintenance of European Schools*. Ref # 2000-D-7510.

²⁸ *The Criteria for Setting up, Closure or Maintenance of European Schools*. Ref # 2000-D-7510, p. 3.

²⁹ Annex to document entitled *Application of the ‘Gaignage’ Report Criteria for Language Sections* tabled at the BoG meeting in January 2004.

Because the current situation raises important concerns as to the long term future of these schools, the European Commission is launching an external study on the viability of the 4 small ES. The results of their findings should be ready in 2006 and the Commission will of course present them to the BoG. It is foreseen in the terms of reference that the consultants entrusted with the study will visit the 4 ES and meet with the representatives of the school community as well as collaborate closely with the Commission, the Secretary General and his Office for data and other pertinent information. Also included in the terms of reference is the task of proposing alternative methods of providing for the educational needs of the children of EU staff in the 4 ES concerned along with transitional and social measures in the event of closure, respecting the difficulty for current pupils to find alternative solutions.

4. CONCLUSION

The European Schools are an important element of the EU institutions' social policy and their good functioning, as they contribute into making EU institutions an attractive employer on the long-term for highly qualified staff from across Europe. The European Commission therefore believes that it is crucial that, while building on the visionary model established in 1954, the ES are put in a position to meet successfully the challenges of the future.

In its role as a major employer of the primary end-users and as main provider of the financing of the ES system, the Commission feels it has the duty to closely monitor the functioning of the ES system, with a view to ensure that ES continue to prepare our young people for our increasingly competitive and knowledge-based information society, whilst at the same time providing good value for money to the EU Institutions and the European taxpayers. Therefore, although the schools operate within an inter-governmental framework established by the Convention, the Commission believes that it should be a constructive partner in identifying and facilitating improvements to the system.

For this reason, the Commission in July 2004 launched a Communication (COM(2004)519 final) on the Options for Developing the European Schools, which specifically highlights the need for improvement in governance, finance and educational provision. In particular, the Commission believes that the overview of the ES system presented in this report demonstrates that it is faced with a number of important challenges. While the ES were avant-garde at the time of their creation, some aspects now need to be modernised. After 50 years of operation, the time has come for a review of the functioning of the ES in order for them to improve further the quality and nature of education offered, become increasingly efficient and cost effective, put in place a modern and appropriate system of governance which provides for greater participation of the key stakeholders, and operate with greater transparency and follow best practices in education. This first Annual Report should therefore be seen in the context of the Commission's Communication on the future of the schools. Together, these two documents seek to identify means to develop and improve the system further through consultation and discussion with the national authorities and experts, and all those involved in the European Schools system.

ANNEX 1

Trends in Pupil Numbers in the European Schools 2001-2004

Table 1: Total ES population by school and % comparison to total population in all ES

Schools	2001		2002		2003		2004		Difference between 2001 and 2004
	Pop.	% of all ES	Pop.	% of all ES	Pop.	% of all ES	Pop.	% of all ES	Pop.
Alicante			464	2,55	858	4,52	950	4,78	950
Bergen	798	4,70	728	3,99	695	3,66	664	3,34	-134
Brussels I	2411	14,19	2135	11,71	2289	7,21%	2394	7,21%	-17
Brussels II	2845	16,75	2782	15,26	2769	14,59	2917	14,69	72
Brussels III	1751	10,31	2550	13,99	2592	4,66	2773	4,48	1022
Culham	913	5,38	903	4,95	884	4,66	889	4,48	-24
Frankfurt			299	1,64	633	3,33	809	4,07	809
Karlsruhe	1166	6,86	1176	6,45	1091	5,75	1074	5,41	-92
Luxembourg I	3702	21,80	3724	20,43	3753	19,77	3101	15,61	-601
Luxembourg II							827	4,16	827
Mol	677	3,99	676	3,71	641	3,38	643	3,24	-34
Munich	1376	8,10	1421	7,80	1455	7,66	1504	7,57	128
Varese	1346	7,92	1369	7,51	1323	6,97	1317	6,63	-29
Total	16985	100	18227	100	18983	100	19862	100	2877

The Brussels and Luxembourg pupil population is 12012 out of the 19862 in all the ES (i.e. 60%)

Table 2: Category 1 population by School and % comparison to total population in that school

Schools	2001		2002		2003		2004		2004			
	Cat 1	%	Cat 1	%	Cat 1	%	Cat 1	%	Children of school staff	% of cat 1 in ES		
Alicante			119	25.65%	236	27.51%	308	32.42%	50	16,23		
Bergen	123	15.41%	109	14.97%	107	15.40%	108	16.27%	35	32,41		
Brussels I	1730	71.75%	1470	68.85%	1657	72.39%	1825	76.23%	118	6,47		
Brussels II	2358	82.88%	2311	83.07%	2359	85.19%	2536	86.94%	101	3,98		
Brussels III	1345	76.81%	2051	80.43%	2100	81.02%	2319	83.63%	87	3,75		
Culham	104	11.39%	113	12.51%	113	12.78%	107	12.04%	82	76,64		
Frankfurt			88	29.43%	238	37.60%	329	40.67%	46	13,98		
Karlsruhe	119	10.21%	121	10.29%	123	11.27%	130	12.10%	48	36,92		
Lux. I	2773	74.91%	2784	74.76%	2797	74.53%	2372	76.49%	121	5,10		
Lux. II							593	71.70%	27	4,55		
Mol	130	19.20%	143	21.15%	127	19.81%	127	19.75%	37	29,13		
Munich	846	61.48%	915	64.39%	963	67.77%	1018	66.88%	62	6,09		
Varese	542	40.27%	579	42.29%	585	44.22%	640	48.60%	95	14,84		
Total	10070	59.29%	1080	3	59.27%	1140	5	60.19%	12412	62.45%	909	7,32


The Brussels and Luxembourg cat 1 population is 9645 out of the 12412 in all the ES (i.e. 78%)

ANNEX 2

Category 3 Pupil Numbers in the European Schools 2001-2004

Schools	2001		2002		2003		2004	
	Pop.	%	Pop.	%	Pop.	%	Pop.	%
Alicante			342	73.71%	618	72.03%	639	67.26%
Bergen	670	83.96%	604	82.97%	579	83.31%	547	82.38%
Brussels I	652	27.04%	638	29.88%	599	26.17%	532	22.22%
Brussels II	345	12.13%	331	11.90%	265	9.57%	230	7.88%
Brussels III	379	21.64%	479	18.78%	455	17.55%	416	15.00%
Culham	761	83.35%	734	81.28%	722	81.67%	730	82.11%
Frankfurt			202	67.56%	373	58.93%	431	53.28%
Karlsruhe	982	84.22%	968	82.31%	859	78.74%	810	75.42%
Luxembourg I	704	19.02%	709	19.04%	719	19.16%	577	18.61%
Luxembourg II							140	16.93%
Mol	547	80.80%	527	77.96%	501	78.16%	493	76.67%
Munich	403	29.29%	370	26.04%	374	25.70%	366	24.34%
Varese	687	51.04%	664	48.50%	599	45.28%	502	38.12%
Total	6130	36.09%	6568	36.03%	6663	35.10%	6413	32.29%

Table 3: Category 3 population by School and % comparison to total population in that school



The data for above graph are taken from the *Annual Report of the Financial Controller*. Ref # 2005-D-163.

Tables 1, 2 and 3 are taken from the *Annual Report of the Secretary General to the Board of Governors of the European Schools*. Ref # 1612-D-2004

ANNEX 3

Staffing Levels in the European Schools for 2005-2006

EN

EN

**AAS posts in organigram
as of Jan 2006;
Seconded posts in
organigram as of Sept
2005**

	EUROPEAN SCHOOL													Office of Secretary General of the European Schools	TOTAL	
	Alicante	Bergen	Bruxelles1	Bruxelles2	Bruxelles3	Culham	Frankfort	Karlsruhe	Luxembourg1	Luxembourg2	Mol	München	Varèse			
Secretaries/assistants/commis																
Secretaries/assistants/commis	4	3	7,25	5,5	7	3	3,5	4,5	7	3,5	3	7	6,78	14,75	79,78	
Accountants/bursars/assistants	2	2	3,5	3	3	3	2	3	5	2	3	4	3	6	44,5	
ICT technician/ICT assistants	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	6	20	
Technicians/workers	3	3	7	6	5	2	3	3	7	3	4	4	5	0	55	
Librarians	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	**	1	**	2	**	0	12	
Nursery class assistants	4	2,5	7,5	8	7	3	4	3	11	9	1	5	3	0	68	
Nurses/medical assistants	1	0,5	1,7	1,5	1,5	0,5	1	0,8	1,5	1	1	1	1	0	14	
Preparateur/teaching assistants	2	2	4	4	4	3	1,5	2,5	6	0,5	2	3,5	3	1,5	39,5	
Total AAS posts	18	15	32,95	30	30,5	16,5	17	18,8	39,5	21	15	27,5	22,78	28,25	332,78	

Detached / seconded Staff - levels in ES organigram for 2005-2006																
Directors / Deputy Directors	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	2	3	3	3	0	39	
Teachers	68	64	177	188	178	66	58	81	235	52	65	86	100	0	1418	
Bursars	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	10	
Librarians			1						3		1		1		6	
Office of Secretary General														7	7	
Total Seconded Staff	72	68	182	192	182	69	62	84	243	55	70	90	104	7	1480	

Seconded and AAS staff	90	83	215	222	212,5	85,5	79	102,8	282,5	76	85	117,5	126,8	35,25	1813
Pupil population (2005)*	944	690	2433	2923	2766	854	808	1076	3112	734	647	1514	1348		19849
Cat 1 pupils (2005)*	307	109	1870	2543	2334	100	332	131	2389	527	130	1022	655		12449
No of pupils per staff	10	8	11	13	13	10	10	10	11	10	8	13	11		11
No of cat 1 pupils per staff	3	1	9	11	11	1	4	1	8	7	2	9	5		7

* Figures provided in April 2005 by the Office of Secretary General of the European Schools

** Librarians are seconded personnel in this school

ANNEX 4

Statistic on Results Obtained in the European Baccalaureate (Bac)

Table 1: % of pupils who successfully passed the in the Bac in the ES, 1995-2004

Year	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Pass rate	95.7%	95.7%	95.5%	97.2%	96%	96.4%	97.2%	98.3%	97.2%	98.1%

Table 2: % of pupils who scored 80% or higher in Bac in the ES, 1995-2004

Year	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
>80%	21%	21.1%	18.8%	22.4%	23.4%	27.3%	28%	29%	33%	29%

Table 3: % of pupils who scored 75% or higher in Bac in ES, 1995-2004

Year	1995 – 1999 Average			2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
>75%	41.3%			45.7%	45.9%	45.5%	51.5%	49.6%

Table 4: Average Bac score of all pupils in ES, 2000-2004

Year	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Average EB mark	7.4	7.4	7.5	7.6	7.6

Comparative Data on Language Section Results in the European Baccalaureate, 2004

Table 5: % of pupils succeeding in the Bac in 2004 by Language Section

2004	SW	FI	DK	NL	IT	EN	ES	DE	FR	GR	PT
pass rate	100	100	100	99,2	99,1	99,1	97,7	97,7	97,2	95,5	95,3

Table 6: % of pupils succeeding in the Bac on average between 1995-2004, by Language Section

Avg 1995-2004	FI	DK	EN	SW	NL	DE	GR	IT	ES	FR	PT
pass rate	100	99,8	98,5	98,3	98,3	97,3	97,2	97,2	95,6	95,4	94



Table 7: % of pupils scoring >75% in the Bac in 2004, by Language Section

2004	FI	SW	GR	DE	DK	EN	average	PT	IT	NL	FR	ES
>75%	92	71	68	62	62	58	49,6	44	39	39	37	36


Table 8: % of pupils scoring >75% in the Bac, on average 1995-2004, by Language Section

Avg 1995-2004	FI	SW	DK	GR	DE	EN	average	IT	ES	NL	FR	PT
>75%	79,9	73,8	63,2	60,7	56,2	54,47	51,6	39,6	36,7	34,9	34,9	33,5

ANNEX 5



% Repeat Rates / Year Level in Secondary



ANNEX 6

Total Allocated vs Executed Budgets Comparison in the ES System 2000-2004

Year	2000		2001		2002		2003		2004	
	alloc	exec	alloc	exec	alloc	exec	alloc	exec	alloc	exec
<i>School</i>										
Luxembourg	34.456.692	33.977.968	34.210.582	32.957.559	32.284.456	31.574.527	31.945.707	31.229.866	34.562.372	32.671.205
Lux II (4months)									2.722.894	2.058.524
Brussels I	29.819.176	28.135.116	28.226.386	25.912.899	23.755.967	22.817.588	23.962.277	22.694.123	26.021.831	24.202.763
Brussels II	27.928.123	27.563.406	27.424.908	27.394.960	23.662.085	23.940.633	24.468.782	24.792.967	26.646.298	26.388.699
Brussels III	12.600.341	14.219.152	17.063.462	17.101.474	19.130.383	18.858.833	22.285.783	22.415.008	24.246.378	23.545.733
Munich	15.680.626	15.271.062	16.232.026	15.241.501	14.826.346	14.784.591	15.892.679	15.782.917	18.572.297	16.815.075
Varese	15.295.071	15.362.270	15.536.782	14.732.380	14.667.823	14.493.087	15.274.106	15.060.188	15.794.950	15.585.131
Karlsruhe	12.634.553	12.762.941	11.895.663	11.567.255	11.870.902	10.933.169	11.480.626	11.276.785	11.753.185	11.228.532
Culham	12.307.344	13.889.837	13.164.212	12.101.021	12.200.603	11.437.042	12.330.374	11.114.141	12.277.338	10.861.824
Bergen	12.757.157	12.404.488	12.485.698	11.450.350	11.536.600	10.623.375	11.858.242	10.808.872	11.483.558	10.677.106
Mol	10.964.087	10.334.241	10.559.021	10.055.345	10.199.853	9.970.209	10.704.772	10.231.665	10.994.523	10.245.052
Alicante					1650000	1514192	5748702	5316744	9.921.031	8.268.170
Frankfurt					1700000	1149324	5637352	4638920	8.698.131	7.440.340
Ofc Sec-Gen	6.243.796	5.675.667	6.554.765	5.894.574	6.885.436	6.399.617	7.186.488	6.808.403	7.987.360	7.286.970
TOTAL	190.686.966	189.596.148	193.353.505	184.409.318	184.370.454	178.496.187	198.775.890	192.170.599	221.682.146	207.275.124
Not spent		1.090.818		8.944.187		5.874.267		6.605.291		14.407.022

ANNEX 7

Percentage of Budget Utilised in Each European School and the Office of the Secretary General Compared to the Initial Budget Requested for 2004

European School	Lux I	Lux II	Brussels I	Brussels II	Brussels III	Munich	Varese	Karlsruhe	Culham	Alicante	Bergen	Frankfurt	Mol	Office of Sec-Gen	TOTAL E.S. SYSTEM
Number of pupils	3835	734	2396	2847	2688	1483	1368	1163	918	914	759	740	674		19785
Total Salaries: detached and locally hired teachers and managers, administrative staff, staff outside organisgramme, all social charges and benefits.	94,0%	72,3%	93,8%	99,4%	96,3%	87,8%	98,7%	95,5%	87,6%	83,0%	92,7%	82,5%	92,7%	91,7%	93,1%
Operational expenses: Training, conferences, missions, special projects, SEN programme, etc.	128,4%	71,8%	51,7%	70,8%	98,4%	82,7%	85,8%	64,7%	91,7%	94,2%	64,6%	89,0%	92,8%	92,9%	82,3%
Functional and administrative expenses: furniture, equipment, printing, cleaning, tel, fax, insurances, didactic material etc.	95,6%	93,4%	99,7%	99,7%	103,8%	114,4%	99,9%	101,1%	99,6%	84,8%	99,6%	108,9%	97,2%	90,7%	98,6%
UTILISATION OF TOTAL BUDGET ALLOCATED	94,5%	75,6%	93,0%	99,0%	97,1%	90,5%	98,7%	95,5%	88,5%	83,3%	93,0%	85,5%	93,2%	91,2%	93,5%

ANNEX 8

EU financial contribution to the ES annual budget by school

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000*	2001*	2002	2003	2004
Alicante								1.281.828	3.435.247	5.723.283
Bergen	5.833.608	6.356.958	6.388.801	6.979.595	6.995.189	8.483.134	7.116.390	5.985.727	6.349.789	6.346.386
Bxl 1	19.335.913	21.719.305	20.988.385	20.601.472	21.029.992	20.300.446	18.811.353	15.527.268	15.836.882	17.010.951
Bxl 2	12.696.913	16.204.386	15.311.326	16.270.505	16.388.104	19.046.855	19.015.360	14.431.672	15.915.807	17.694.770
Brxl 3					4.037.630	10.221.836	11.878.666	12.543.329	14.973.514	15.655.353
Culham	4.917.980	5.000.816	6.401.414	5.582.132	7.188.649	8.514.679	7.119.891	6.525.151	6.054.878	5.546.959
Frankfurt								1.112.500	2.927.508	4.160.513
Karlsruhe	4.879.493	6.408.693	6.276.596	5.512.057	5.814.821	7.856.360	5.607.756	5.561.889	4.093.215	3.946.485
Lux 1	16.823.725	18.139.950	18.840.845	19.877.870	18.676.738	22.310.293	20.696.593	18.996.446	19.146.114	20.277.176
Lux 2										1.208.960
Mol	6.504.273	6.126.532	6.033.871	6.272.071	5.906.547	6.993.195	6.189.821	6.077.399	6.540.924	6.350.337
Munich	635.231	611.001	624.840	668.984	634.208	932.846	951.062	836.321	973.247	970.078
Varese	6.655.026	6.960.505	7.545.227	7.404.896	7.595.073	9.132.190	8.129.409	7.538.961	7.482.328	7.800.585
OSG	3.335.958	4.580.649	5.019.041	4.394.012	4.714.003	5.027.289	5.238.656	5.647.616	6.075.597	5.665.198
Total	81.618.120	92.108.795	93.430.346	93.563.594	98.980.954	118.819.123	110.754.957	102.066.107	109.805.050	118.357.034

The ES budget and the EU contribution to it for the years 2000 and 2001 are unusually high as a result of a BoG decision to pay the removal allowances to all teachers who had been in the system for longer than 9 year in that school year. This early payment of the removal allowances, besides resulting in higher costs for the ES in the school year 2000-2001, also means that subsequent budgets are lower because the removal allowances already paid are not encountered in the year in which they occur.

It is estimated (by the OSG) that this decision had the effect of increasing the 2000 and 2001 ES budgets and specifically the EU subsidy by 35 million euros more than normal and by reducing the subsequent years by approximately 4-5 million euros per year.

ANNEX 9

Total Budget for the European School System 1995-2006

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Alicante								1.514.192	5.316.744	8.268.170	10.387.360
Bergen	9.408.815	9.553.937	9.751.417	10.344.077	10.590.168	12.404.488	11.450.350	10.623.375	10.808.872	10.677.106	10.752.172
Brussels 1	29.400.370	29.964.831	29.464.470	30.251.098	29.386.627	28.135.116	25.912.899	22.817.588	22.694.123	24.202.763	27.089.538
Brussels 2	20.219.149	22.427.046	22.532.853	23.866.422	24.527.102	27.563.406	27.394.960	23.940.633	24.792.967	26.388.699	27.272.550
Brussels 3					5.231.730	14.219.152	17.101.474	18.858.833	22.415.008	23.545.733	25.617.400
Culham	7.813.517	8.266.480	9.758.808	10.503.719	10.797.586	13.889.837	12.102.021	11.437.042	11.114.141	10.861.824	11.208.821
Frankfurt								1.149.324	4.638.920	7.440.340	9.398.748
Karlsruhe	9.974.327	10.534.488	10.173.922	10.304.481	11.202.614	12.762.941	11.567.255	10.933.169	11.276.785	11.228.532	11.171.442
Luxembourg 1	25.828.255	26.631.439	27.390.562	29.012.394	30.221.863	33.977.968	32.957.559	31.574.527	31.229.866	32.671.205	33.272.011
Luxembourg 2										2.058.524	6.420.443
Mol	9.510.287	9.509.110	9.261.748	9.373.312	9.273.803	10.334.241	10.055.345	9.970.209	10.231.665	10.245.052	10.703.110
Munich	10.810.071	11.371.787	11.519.371	11.734.445	12.717.308	15.271.062	15.241.501	14.784.591	15.782.917	16.815.075	18.711.626
Varese	10.560.393	12.506.354	12.708.747	12.924.338	13.214.968	15.362.270	14.732.380	14.493.087	15.060.188	15.585.131	15.801.545
Office Sec- Gen	4.048.813	5.222.526	5.567.010	5.049.424	5.348.393	5.675.667	5.894.574	6.399.617	6.808.403	7.286.970	8.188.302
Total	137.573.997	145.987.998	148.128.908	153.363.710	162.512.162	189.596.148	184.410.318	178.496.187	192.170.599	207.275.124	225.995.068

NB: the 1995 – 2004 figures are actual spent budget whereas the 2005 are the provisional allocated budget to the schools.

ANNEX 10

2006-2010 FORECAST OF PUPIL NUMBERS IN THE BRUSSELS AND LUXEMBOURG EUROPEAN SCHOOLS

All 3 European Schools in Brussels

	2003/4 Actual	2004/5 Estimate	2004/5 Actual	2005/6 Estimate	2006/7 Estimate	2007/8 Estimate	2008/9 Estimate	2009/10 Estimate
New Cat I pupils from: new MS + old MS		200 + 150	333	300 + 150	300 + 150	250 + 150	250 + 150	0 + 150
Cat. III pupils leaving ES		- 150	-141	- 110	- 140	- 140	- 120	-120
TOTAL	7.930	8.130	8.122	8.470	8.780	9.040	9.320	9.350

The 2 European Schools in Luxembourg

	2003/4 Actual	2004/5 Estimate	2004/5 Actual	2005/6 Estimate	2006/7 Estimate	2007/8 Estimate	2008/9 Estimate	2009/10 Estimate
New Cat I pupils from: new MS + old MS		25 + 30	68	60 + 40	50 + 50	50 + 50	25 + 60	0 + 60
Cat. III pupils leaving ES		- 50	-65	- 40	- 50	- 35	- 50	-40
TOTAL	3.835	3.840	3.846	3.900	3.950	4.015	4.050	4.070

ANNEX 11

COMMUNITY AGENCIES

	Agency	Location	Staff in 2005	Estimated number of pupils ³⁰
1.	CEDEFOP	Thessaloniki**	91	55
2.	EUROFOUND	Dublin	94	56
3.	AEE / EEA *	Copenhagen	115	69
4.	ETF	Turin	104	62
5.	OEDT/EMCDDA*	Lisbon***	77	46
6.	OHMI/OHIM*	Alicante	675	405
7.	EU - OSHA	Bilbao	37	22
8.	OCVV/CPVO*	Angers	38	22
9.	CdT	Luxembourg	181	108
10.	EUMC	Vienna	37	22
11.	EAR	Thessaloniki**	115	69
12.	EFSA	Parma	194	116
13.	AESM/EMSA*	Lisbon***	95	57
14.	AESA/EASA*	Cologne	200	120
15.	ENISA	Heraklion	40	24
16.	ECDC	Stockholm	29	17
17.	EMEA	London	379	227
18.	AFE/ERASI*	Lille – Valenciennes	72	43
19.	Galiléo	?	15	9
20.	FRONTEX	Warsaw	17	10
3rd	Eurojust	The Hague	87	52
3rd pilier	CEPOL	Bramshill	18	11
TOTAL		All locations	2710	1622

* English acronym

** Total agency staff in Thessaloniki 91+115 = 206 ; estimated number of pupils = 124

*** Total agency staff in Lisbon 77 + 95 =172; estimated number of pupils = 103

³⁰ Statistics show the ration of pupils enrolled in a European School per staff member is 0.6 :1. This ratio is applied for the estimates above.

ANNEX 12

Experimental Approaches to Delivering European Schooling in Parma Italy, Dunshaughlin Ireland and Heraklion Greece.

A first alternative model of an “associated or accredited” school is being established in Parma. There, the Italian authorities have almost reproduced a miniature ES which offers the complete range of ES programmes and which is organised in 3 language sections; English, Italian and French. The school, ‘Scuola per l’Europa’, was visited by a team of inspectors from the ES and they and the parents were very pleased with this experiment in an alternative delivery of European Schooling. The nursery and primary levels are operating this year with 35 pupils, the first 3 years of secondary are scheduled to open in Sept 2005, years 4-5 secondary in Sept 2006 and years 6-7 secondary in Sept 2007. Enrolments for Sept 2005 have already reached 210 pupils as the educational provision is attractive to other parents, besides the Agency staff, who are also interested to have their children partake in a European Schooling. The Italian authorities have borne and will continue to bear the full cost of this pilot project for another 3 years.

In a second case, the Irish authorities offer a different type of provision for the children of staff in the “Centre for European Schooling” in Dunshaughlin (near Grange) than that started last year in Parma. The Irish authorities have dealt with this requirement on an individual basis and have discussed and respected the expressed main concerns of the parents: proficiency in the child’s mother tongue, appropriate English and second language programmes, and that the leaving certificate awarded to the child has wide recognition³¹. The 28 children (most in primary) from the Food and Veterinary Office (FVO) are integrated into national Irish schools where they receive instruction in English (a vehicular language and one that would facilitate mobility to another international or ES school) but also attend special courses at the “Centre for European Schooling”. Unlike the Parma model, no special classes are created for them or others interested in receiving a European Schooling in language sections. They do however receive instruction in foreign languages, European Hours and Mother-tongue tuition as in the ES, and cooperate with the ES in Mol for some exchanges and teaching by distance learning of some courses. After the latest BoG decision, the Irish authorities will try to organise lessons to meet the core criteria for European Schooling for the secondary.

A third model is the planned cooperation of a national school with the ES system in Heraklion, Greece is yet again a different model in providing European Schooling. As the children of the European Network and Information Security Agency (ENISA) will be very few (about 20 at most) the Parma example with 3 language sections cannot be functional. The Dunshaughlin model on the other hand where the children are integrated into the local schools (taught in English) is not feasible as the national schools in Heraklion provide instruction in Greek. The proposed organisation of the “Public School of European Education in Heraklion” is to provide the core elements of European Schooling in two language sections: English and Greek. They will start the project in Sept 2005 and like the Italian and Irish authorities they will bear all costs themselves and will submit their request to be evaluated for compliance to the core criteria for European Schooling and later for accreditation to become an “associated or accredited” school with the ES system.

³¹ Centre for European Schooling in Dunshaughlin, Ireland. April 2005. Ref # 2005-D-34.