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# Mandate of the Working Group Roles and Duties of Inspectors

In December 2016, the Board of Governors endorsed the Joint Board of Inspectors’ proposal to set up a working group to review the Inspectors’ general functions and their workload and to return to concepts such as the possibility of outsourcing support for evaluation to other Inspectors, for the purposes of evaluation of locally recruited teachers, whilst also taking account of the legal aspect of that possibility.

That working group was divided into two sub-groups: ‘Evaluation of Locally Recruited Teachers’ and ‘Role and Duties of the Inspectors of the European Schools’. The ‘Evaluation of Locally Recruited Teachers’ sub-group took charge of the part of the mandate concerning the organisation of evaluation of locally recruited teachers, the pilot project, planning, etc. As for the ‘Role and Duties of the Inspectors of the European Schools’ sub-group, it focused on the Inspectors’ functions and on the workload which they are expected to take on and on the possibility of outsourcing support for evaluation to other Inspectors.

The sub-group ‘Role and Duties of the Inspectors’ started its work under the Estonian Presidency, in doing so, marking one of its priorities, in mid-December 2017. A survey of the Inspectors was conducted, and the results were discussed in an extra meeting of the Joint Board of Inspectors, held on 5 February 2018.

During the discussions, it was concluded that a number of documents would need to be updated, in the light in particular of the system’s reform, or simply adapted according to the recommendations which the sub-group might need to propose.

In order to move forward transparently on an issue common to all the Inspectors appointed to the European Schools, the sub-group felt that its mandate and composition ought to be adapted.

In the meeting of the Board of Governors of 17-19 April 2018, the mandate of the Working Group was updated:

* The ‘Role and Duties of Inspectors’ sub-group would become a fully-fledged working group and would work within the limits set by the budgetary framework. There would therefore be no request for resources entailing extra costs.
* There would be additions to the initial mandate, including in particular revision and adaptation of all the documents concerning the role and function of Inspectors in the European Schools, especially the document ‘*Disposition B3* – Inspectors of the European Schools’, which is taken out from the minutes of the meeting of Board of Governors in January 2000.

The working group would also be invited to make recommendations about the appointment of new Inspectors, about the sharing and handling of duties within the Boards of Inspectors, etc.

* It was also proposed that the sub-group’s existing composition be changed somewhat.
* Beside the composition approved by the Board of Governors, the Working Group was expanded in such a way that all cycles were covered in a balanced way and the Presidency was represented. It was also proposed that the Pedagogical Development Unit be included at some of the Working Group’s meetings, in order to guide it in particular when certain documents came to be revised.

# Tasks of the Working Group

The Working Group concretized its assignment in the following tasks:

* To document and analyse existing documents about roles and duties of inspectors;
* To reflect on current/new tasks and their implications;
* To collect/update data on available time per inspector/delegation and national settings;
* To propose:
* core tasks of inspectors;
* possible new approaches, new ways of working, sharing and handling duties within the Board of Inspectors;
* profile (and recruitment) of inspectors;
* allocation of time devoted to the ES.
* To make recommendations about the appointment of new Inspectors;
* To revise and adapt the documents concerning the role and function of Inspectors.

# Existing documents

Since 2000 the role and duties of inspectors have not been officially changed. A last reform of the Governance System dates from 2009. This resulted in reduction in the number of Board Meetings but did not result in adjustments of the documents defining the role and duties of inspectors.

In the last 20 years, the BoG has taken several decisions that have implications for the role and duties of inspectors, such as the opening up of the ES-system (which resulted in the opening of Accredited European Schools), the introduction of Whole School Inspections (WSI) and of the evaluation of Locally Recruited Teachers (LRTs). At the same time, the number of pupils, teachers and sections increased, just as the number of LRTs.

The implications for the role and duties of inspectors are not reflected in official documents:

* Convention: 21994A0817(01), Official Journal L212, 17/08/1994;
* Final version of the decisions taken by the BoG at its meeting on 26 and 27 January 2000 (ref: 2000-D-215);
* Induction of new inspectors (ref: 2006-D-296-en-8);
* Reform 2009 (2009-D-353-en-4) → e.g. change of number/days of Board meetings, participation of accredited schools, approved by the BoG in April 2009;
* Rules of Procedure for the Board of Inspectors (ref: 2016-09-D-7-en), approved by the BoG in December 2016;
* The Pedagogical Development Unit (ref: 2019-09-D-37-en) → no decision of any official Board.

Further, the different documents do not describe the role and duties in the same way.

# 4. Towards a sustainable approach for the Functions, Organisation and Conditions of work of inspectors

**4.1. The core tasks of Inspectors**

In 2018, the Working Group did a thorough analysis of the tasks of the Inspectors at that time. It also conducted a survey amongst the inspectors to get an overview of different items related to their job, e.g. recruitment procedures in their national systems and time allocation. The results of the analysis and the survey can be found in Annex II of this document.

Some important conclusions of the analysis and survey were that:

* the number of tasks has grown over the years. New tasks such as the Whole School Inspections (WSI), the Audits and the evaluations of Locally Recruited Teachers (LRTs) were not yet included in the original official document that describes the functions, organization and conditions of work of inspectors of the European Schools (B 3, 2001)
* the overview of tasks of the inspectors is still valid and will remain valid in the upcoming years.
* in order to be able to cope with the work(load), solutions have to be found in new approaches and working methods, rather than in excluding certain tasks.

In its October 2018 meeting, the Joint Board of Inspectors discussed the first outcomes and conclusions of the Working Group. This resulted in different kinds of proposals. First of all, proposals for updating some of the decisions of the Board of Governors taken in 2000 regarding the Functions, Organisation and Conditions of work of inspectors[[1]](#footnote-1) (Ref: 2000-D-215). Secondly, proposals for new approaches and working methods in order to reduce the workload. This second group of proposals was presented in the February 2019 meeting of the JBI, followed by again an e-survey in which each inspector was given the opportunity to anonymously express his/her opinion. In total 67% of the inspectors responded to the survey.

Only proposals for new approaches and working methods that received a positive response from more than 50% (  50%) of the inspectors were finally taken into account. The others (  50%) which were rejected, being:

* Less evaluations of teachers by inspectors, but more coaching;
* All teachers’ evaluations done by a member of the Joint Board of Inspectors, not necessarily a national inspector;
* Less involvement of inspectors in selection committees of directors and deputy directors;
* Less national involvement in evaluations of directors and deputy directors.

For the time being, the methods for execution of these tasks remain unchanged.

Based on the results of the e-survey and discussions in the JBI the following tasks are considered as **core tasks** of inspectors:

* evaluation of seconded and locally recruited teachers
* conducting of whole school inspections (WSI)
* conducting of audits
* attendance at meetings of the Boards
* recruitment of teachers for secondment and their induction
* in-service training of teachers
* the implementation of major innovations
* subject-specific responsibility including development of the syllabuses and monitoring of their implementation
* the European Baccalaureate (EB)
* liaison between the relevant national system and the European School (ES) system.
  1. **Appointment of the inspectors**

Inspectors are appointed and work according to the needs of the ES-system. In recent years, lack of certain competences complicated the work of the JBI. A well-known example in this respect was the shortage of expertise in the area of the Sciences. To avoid these kinds of situations and to better meet the needs of the ES-system, the future recruitment procedure of inspectors is proposed:

Proposals:

* Delegations inform OGSES and the Presidency of intention to remove/replace an inspector as soon as possible.
* The Presidency establishes a list of those inspectors to be replaced and the competences to be covered, like subject expertise.
* The JBI identifies the needs, preferably this would be done in February. The needs are communicated to the delegations through an annual letter sent by the Presidency.
* Delegations that have to nominate an inspector take a note of the needs of JBI into consideration.
* Delegations shall respect the identified profile for ES inspectors, taking into account that both inspectors of a country complement each other;
* A nomination has to be approved by the BoG. In order for the BoG to be able to consider a nomination, it has to be accompanied by a CV.
* Specific expertise of new inspectors will be added to the central overview of the JBI.  
  1. **Available time for work as an ES inspector**

In the decisions of the BoG of 2000, (Ref: 2000-D-215), a minimum requirement of 40% up to maximum 60% of working time for a post of an ES inspector was set. However, since 2000 the tasks of inspectors have expanded considerably. Therefore, the minimum 80% per delegation for two inspectors does not suffice anymore to cover the current tasks.

Based on the analysis of the current and core tasks the WG made an estimation of time needed per task and travelling. It resulted the following:

Proposals:

* For two inspectors per member state, at least 120% time will be made available with a minimum of 50% per inspector.
* Together, the two inspectors that represent a Member State, have to cover the competences needed to carry out the duties in European Schools.
  1. **Working methodology in future**

Separate Boards for Nursery/Primary (BIP) and Secondary (BIS) have definitely value for certain topics. However, a strong **Joint Board approach** enables the inspectorate to make better use of available competences, to strengthen common pedagogical approaches, the quality of teaching and learning and transition from one cycle to another.

New tasks which have been taken under the responsibility of the inspectors since 2000, e.g. whole school inspections (WSI), audits of accredited schools, evaluations of locally recruited teachers (LRT), require or benefit from a **Team approach**. Working in teams contributes to harmonization, efficiency and higher quality of methodologies.

It is proposed that where particular expertise is needed, this can be sourced from either BIP or BIS. It is also proposed that a Team-approach be the rule rather than the exception in case of WSI, Audits and evaluations of LRTs and similar kinds of activities. This working methodology requires good coordination, organisation and planning of the work.

**4.5 Coordination and organisation**

Pedagogical quality benefits from an efficient coordination and transparent organisation. Regular reflection on needs, tasks, duties and responsibilities of inspectors, is essential.

The JBI is responsible for assuring the pedagogical quality of the system. The main organisational tool for this is the Working Group Quality Assurance which always includes the President of the JBI or his/her nominated representative. The WG QA should guarantee strong coordination which enables the Presidency to monitor and implement priorities.

In order to make more efficient use of available human resources, clarification is required in order to define what can best be done by whom and how (Front-teams and Back office). Especially in team activities, a distinction between the preparatory and operational work supports an effective organisation.

If certain tasks are done by rotating inspectors/group of inspectors, coherent and harmonised (e-) processes and (e-)tools can be developed which will not only improve efficiency but also quality.

Proposals:

* + to improve the coordination, The Working Group Quality Assurance is required to:
* to develop and implement a clear multi-annual evaluation cycle about the reflection on tasks, duties and responsibilities of inspectors, with an annual report to the JBI in October on the previous school year.
* to guarantee that working groups focus on the priorities of the presidencies, decisions of the Board of Governors and regular tasks.
* to guarantee that working groups respect a project approach (mandate, planning/deadlines, reporting etc.).
* an organigram for a modified organisational structure that could enable the Working Group Quality Assurance to perform its tasks, could be created.
  + to organise the Joint Board approach and Team approach activities and to use resources effectively work flows for preparatory/follow up work and operational work would be created. Preparatory/follow up work, including e.g. data-handling, will mainly be done by the staff in OGSES. Operational work is/will be done by inspectors and/or external experts who have the direct contacts with the schools and will monitor and report regarding the quality of education.
* To support the Joint Board- and Team-approach *Inspection Standards* will be developed. Inspection Standards refer to general procedures, indicators and toolkits.
  + To support the Joint Board- and Team-approach a *Code of Practice* will be developed. The Code of Practice refers to matters such as a proportional contribution to the work, the respecting of deadlines, the confidentiality of information and respectful communication with management and teachers.

**4.6 Planning**

Most inspectors have other national tasks and duties. Therefore, it is important to plan ahead in order to make optimal use of the time they have available for the (Accredited) European schools.

It is strongly recommended that the working time of the inspectors allocated to ES should be fully used for pedagogical-didactical tasks, according to the needs of the system (. In order to respect the expertise needed for certain tasks, teams have to be well-balanced, taking into account a mix of competences. A fair, proportional and efficient distribution of tasks between inspectors will be supported and therefore, tasks will be centrally attributed.

In addition to offer a proper induction of new inspectors, they will be offered the opportunity to explore the different tasks, under the guidance and supervision of more experienced colleagues.

Proposals:

* + Inspectors sign up in advance for weeks in which they are available for team activities.
  + A Central Planning Committee, consisting of at least the President of the JBI or his/her nominated representative and the head of the Pedagogical Unit, will be put in place to:
* develop and execute planning procedures for all team activities;
* set up a forward planning for all team activities to be approved in the February JBI-meeting for the next school year;
* compose well-balanced teams.
  + to support planning of (working group) meetings, inspectors give permission for access to their professional calendars.

# Implications

Depending on decisions, the proposals in chapter 4 have implications for the inspectors, the central office and the delegations.

**Inspectors**

* The inspector works for the ES system.

On the basis that a national inspector is assigned to the **ES system** for a percentage of his/her time, it should be understood that therefore the assignment of tasks should be at the discretion of the Board of Inspectors.

* Less autonomy   
  If tasks will be assigned by a central Planning Committee, inspectors cannot register for specific tasks and/or places anymore.
* More team, less individual   
  If certain tasks become the responsibility of the JBI, rather than of individual inspectors, team approaches will become the rule rather than the exception. Inspection Standards and a Code of Practice for inspectors could support the more team-oriented approach.
* Not exclusively subject- or section-related

A lot of the tasks done by teams involve observations, meetings etc. that are not specifically linked to the sections of an inspectors’ language or his/her subject.

* Working Group Quality Assurance

The mandate, role and duties of the WG QA will have to reflect on the proposals.

**Office**

* If working methods evolve towards clear work flow descriptions for the preparation/organization//follow-up work and the operational work with more tasks, implications need to be examined by the Central Office.
* Participation of the Head of the Pedagogical Unit in a Central Planning Committee.
* The OSGES/JBI offers an annual update to the delegations regarding system needs as they relate to the competences/content expertise of inspectors.

**Delegations**

* The national delegations inform the Central Office in timely fashion and the JBI regarding expected retirement and/or replacement of inspectors.
* Increase availability of national inspectors (up to at least 120% for 2 inspectors; recommended at least 50% per inspector).
* Take account of requirements in relation the profile and appointment of inspectors.

**Document review:**

* Induction of new inspectors (ref: 2006-D-296-en-8);
* The Pedagogical Development Unit (ref: 2019-09-D-37-en)

New documents to be created:

* Instead of B.3 (Inspectors of the European Schools)
* Inspection Standards, including Toolkit and Code of Practice, will be created.

# Summary on the proposals of the Working Group and the proposed follow up

The table below summarizes the proposals set out in points 4.2 to 4.6 and the follow-up to them.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **POINT IN THE DOCUMENT** | **Proposals in the document that received a favorable opinion by the JBI on the 9.10.2019** | **Follow up** |
| 4.2  Appointment of the Inspectors | Proposals:   * Delegations inform OGSES and the Presidency of intention to remove/replace an inspector as soon as possible. * The Presidency establishes a list of those inspectors to be replaced and the competences to be covered, like subject expertise. * The JBI identifies the needs, preferably this would be done in February. The needs are communicated to the delegations through an annual letter sent by the Presidency. * Delegations that have to nominate an inspector take a note of the needs of JBI into consideration. * Delegations shall respect the identified profile for ES inspectors, taking into account that both inspectors of a country complement each other; * A nomination has to be approved by the BoG. In order for the BoG to be able to consider a nomination, it has to be accompanied by a CV. * Specific expertise of new inspectors will be added to the central overview of the JBI. | WG creates a procedure to be put in place to recognise and inform the needs of expertise in JBI.  WG develops a document on the roles and duties of Inspectors to replace B3 document and for approval of BoG.  The delegations attach the CV of the nominated inspector to the nomination information. |
| 4.3  Available time for work as ES inspector | Proposals:   * For two inspectors per member state, at least 120% time will be made available with a minimum of 50% per inspector. * Together, the two inspectors that represent a Member State, have to cover the competences needed to carry out the duties in European Schools. | The contribution of MSs will for JBI will be more in balance. Delegations need to adapt the time availability of inspectors. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **4.3 Working methodologies are Joint Board approach and Team approach** | | |
| 4.5  Coordination and organisation | Proposals:   * + to improve the coordination, The Working Group Quality Assurance is required to: * to develop and implement a clear multi-annual evaluation cycle about the reflection on tasks, duties and responsibilities of inspectors, with an annual report to the JBI in October on the previous school year. * to guarantee that working groups focus on the priorities of the presidencies, decisions of the Board of Governors and regular tasks. * to guarantee that working groups respect a project approach (mandate, planning/deadlines and reporting etcetera). * an organigram for a modified organisational structure that could enable the Working Group Quality Assurance to perform its tasks, could be created.   + to organise the Joint Board approach and Team approach activities and to use resources effectively work flows for preparatory/follow up work and operational work would be created. Preparatory/follow up work, including e.g. data-handling, will mainly be done by the staff in OGSES. Operational work is done by inspectors and/or external experts who have the direct contacts with the schools and will monitor and report regarding the quality of education. * To support the Joint Board- and Team-approach *Inspection Standards* will be developed. Inspection Standards refer to general procedures, indicators and toolkits.   + To support the Joint Board- and Team-approach a *Code of Practice* will be developed. The Code of Practice refers to matters such as a proportional contribution to the work, the respecting of deadlines, the confidentiality of information and respectful communication with management and teachers. | WG QA develop and implement a multi-annual evaluation cycle to reflect on tasks, duties and responsibilities of inspectors to be presented in JBI in October.  WG QA creates an organigram about the QA structure, where the joint-, team- and project-approach is adopted, to present the QA procedures and responsibilities.  Based on the organigram the different work flows are defined. This is done in cooperation with the WG QA, PEDA. Unit, BAC Unit, IT Unit and Presidency. Other units are consulted when needed.  WG creates the Inspection Standards including Toolkit and Code of Practice. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 4.6  Planning | Proposals:   * + to improve the coordination, The Working Group Quality Assurance is required to: * to develop and implement a clear multi-annual evaluation cycle about the reflection on tasks, duties and responsibilities of inspectors, with an annual report to the JBI in October on the previous school year. * to guarantee that working groups focus on the priorities of the presidencies, decisions of the Board of Governors and regular tasks. * to guarantee that working groups respect a project approach (mandate, planning/deadlines, reporting etc.). * an organigram for a modified organisational structure that could enable the Working Group Quality Assurance to perform its tasks, could be created. | OGSES coordinates the inquiry to inspectors about their availability for team activities during the second semester, before the end of the school year at latest.  A Central Planning Committee (President and/or nominated representative, PDU, AES cell) in consultation of JBI create a coordinated calendar for team activities. This is to be approved in JBI in February.  A Central Planning Committee composes well balanced teams for different purposes. |
| Documents to be adapted accordingly after approval of the proposals | Documents to be reviewed:   * Induction of new inspectors (ref: 2006-D-296-en-8); * The Pedagogical Development Unit (ref: 2019-09-D-37-en) * Follow up of all other relevant documents   New documents to be created:   * Instead of B.3 (Inspectors of the European Schools), Inspection Standards, including Toolkit and Code of Practice, will be created. | WG Induction of Inspectors is working on this already.  WG of RDI. |

# Recommendation

The WG recommends that future proposals and decisions of the BOG, JTC, JBI, BIS and BIP should not only refer to possible financial implications but should also agree on implications for human resources (inspectors, OGSES, management of schools).

# Opinion of the Joint Board of Inspectors

The Joint Board of Inspectors judged that the date of 20 September 2020 allowed too little time for the Planning Committee to be put in place and proposed presenting the proposals to the Board of Governors without a precise and definitive timeframe. Furthermore, it believed that the proposal relating to the Planning Committee should be aligned with the Presidency’s priority requesting the creation of three posts in the Pedagogical Development Unit. The setting up of this Planning Committee would not impact solely the PDU’s human resources but also on those of the Human Resources and Accredited Schools Units.

# Opinion of the Budgetary Committee

The Budgetary Committee pointed out that the proposal was deemed to have zero financial impact and it was therefore able to forward its favourable opinion to the Board of Governors.

# Proposals

The Board of Governors is invited

* to mandate the Working Group to finalise in cooperation with the Office of the Secretary-General the proposal for a nomination procedure of national inspectors which better addresses the needs of the system of the European Schools,
* to – **as a first step** – reaffirm its decision of 2000 (Ref: 2000-D-215) establishing the obligation for each delegation to provide each national inspector with a time allocation of a minimum of 40% (up to maximum 60%) of a fulltime equivalent (FTE) to fulfil their tasks linked to the European Schools and – **as a second step** – to increase the time allocation of both inspectors up to a total of 120% per delegation (with a minimum time allocation of 50% per national inspector), by September 2022 at the latest,
* to support the promotion of a team approach and commit themselves to allow inspectors to participate in the activities defined by the governing bodies of the European Schools,
* to encourage the Office of the Secretary-General to set up with the Presidency of the Board of Inspectors a long term planning in particular for team activities.

1. Decisions of the Board of Governors that are not affected by recent system developments, remain unchanged. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)