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**1. INTRODUCTION**

According to Article 12.4 of the Convention, *“…The Board of Governors shall determine each year, on a proposal from the Boards of Inspectors, the teaching staff requirements by creating or eliminating posts****. It shall ensure a fair allocation of posts among the Member States****. It shall settle with the Governments questions relating to the assignment or secondment of the secondary school teachers, primary school teachers and education counsellors of the School.”*

According to Article 25 of the Convention, *“The budget of the European Schools shall be financed by:*

* 1. *contributions from the Member States through the continuing payment of the remuneration for seconded or assigned teaching staff and, where appropriate, a financial contribution decided on by the Board of Governors acting unanimously;*
  2. *the contribution from the European Communities, which is intended to cover the difference between the total amount of expenditure by the Schools and the total of other revenue;*
  3. *contributions from non-Community organisations with which the Board of Governors has concluded an Agreement;*
  4. *the School's own revenue, notably the school fees charged to parents by the Board of Governors;*
  5. *miscellaneous revenue.*

*The arrangements for making available the contribution from the European Communities shall be laid down in a special agreement between the Board of Governors and the Commission.”*

**2. FUNDING OF THE EUROPEAN SCHOOLS IN 2012**

In 2012, the European Schools were funded by the Member States (20%), the European Institutions (59%), the European Patent Office (7%, mainly at Munich) and school fees (11%), the remainder being covered by a special levy and other revenue. The European Schools have not been able to pay the salary increases for the staff foreseen for the years 2011 and 2012 because the European Court of Justice has not yet taken a decision on EU officials’ salaries. There is therefore quite a large surplus as revenue.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Revenue** | **2012 (ended)** | **%** | **2013** | **2014** | **Difference 2013-2014** | **%** |
| Member States | 55,557,843 | 20% | 57,679,988 | 59,482,104 | 1,802,116 | 103.12% |
| EU contribution | 163,882,693 | 59% | 171,554,083 | 168,987,454 | -2,566,629 | 98.50% |
| EPO | 18,979,623 | 7% | 19,947,605 | 20,430,561 | 482,956 | 102.42% |
| Cat. II | 12,953,535 | 5% | 14,182,715 | 13,409,284 | -773,431 | 94.55% |
| Cat. III and fees | 17,142,810 | 6% | 17,102,138 | 17,798,095 | 695,957 | 104.07% |
| Special levy | 2,669,135 | 1% | 2,880,404 | 2,788,617 | -91,787 | 96.81% |
| Last year's surplus | 4,118,119 | 1% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% |
| Other revenue | 2,677,297 | 1% | 2,649,766 | 2,651,033 | 1,267 | 100.05% |
| **Total** | **277,981,055** | 100% | **285,996,699** | **285,547,148** | **-449,551** | **99.84%** |

**3. COST SHARING DECISIONS**

The principle of the structural approach (and not a financial method) was agreed by the Board of Governors in April 2008.This structural approach opened up the possibility of teaching by non-native speakers in certain limited cases and with quality control of linguistic competence to be carried out prior to recruitment and by establishing criteria for that purpose.

Basic principles were finally confirmed in April 2009 and the Board of Governors took an important decision concerning the implementation of the structural approach and the sharing of the posts of seconded staff amongst Member States (see Annex I).

According to the decision, an indicative reference for determining the number of seconded teachers is calculated for each Member State on the basis of the percentage of all categories of pupils who are nationals.

It was agreed that Member States are free to exceed this indicative reference on a voluntary basis and second more staff.

These indicative objectives were supposed to be used to start a dialogue with Member States in order to facilitate the process designed to ensure that all Member States contribute to the system.

According to the decision, *“in the case where there is a need to call on the EU budget to cover a possible deficit at the end of this process, this community contribution by means of the financing of locally recruited teachers shall be clearly identified and shall be subject to annual monitoring.”*

If the structural approach table is used to balance the financial contributions made by various Member States, Member States’ contributions to the Munich School have to be excluded, because the school reimburses the full secondment costs. This means that the table should be corrected if it is used for anything other than structural purposes.

**4. UK POSITION**

The UK delegation formally notified the Board of Governors at the April 2013 meeting that they would not replace any teachers who were leaving the European School system in August 2013. Furthermore, the Board was also informed of the UK delegation’s long-standing position regarding new Anglophone teaching posts.

This statement came as no surprise to the Board of Governors. As the UK made clear during its Presidency of the European Schools in 2011-2012, the current cost sharing system is unfair, places a disproportionate burden on a few Member States contrary to Article 12.4 of the European Schools Convention, and requires fundamental reform. The UK position on the urgent need for reform has not changed for a number of years and remains consistent with the discussions conducted during its Presidency.

The Board of Governors passed a non-binding resolution in Stockholm in 2009 which linked the number of teachers seconded by a Member State proportionately to the number of its pupils. Under this system the UK would currently assign only 114 teachers (for 1760 pupils), as opposed to its existing level of 217 teachers. According to the UK delegation, very little progress has been made in respect of implementing this resolution – currently only eight Member States meet this agreed threshold.

The UK delegation also maintains that the disproportionate financial burden is neither acceptable nor sustainable. Consequently, the UK has no option but to adhere to the 2009 Board of Governors’ resolution and is therefore not planning to assign any additional teachers to the European School system until substantial progress has been made towards proportionality.

However, the UK delegation assured the members of the Board of Governors that the UK intends to work closely with the Office of the Secretary-General and individual schools to facilitate the recruitment of suitably qualified and locally-engaged teachers, including from the UK, by assisting with advertising campaigns and the provision of whatever support is necessary during this exercise.

The UK delegation proposed to explore with the Irish EU Presidency, the European Commission and others the option of placing this issue on the agenda of a future Education Council meeting for discussion between Ministers, with the aim of building consensus and achieving an acceptable resolution of the current situation.

The UK made it a matter of priority for its presidency to rethink the cost sharing mechanism and, more comprehensively, the funding mechanism of the European Schools for a new and fairer approach to the funding of European Schools [2011-07-D-8]. It believed that the system had reached its limits and a substantive debate on the system’s future was required.

**5. EDUCATION COUNCIL IN MAY 2013**

The situation in the European Schools was raised at the EU Education Council meeting on Thursday 16 May, with an Irish Presidency Statement drawing Ministers’ attention to the crisis and making a call for political action. The Irish Presidency made available its good offices to assist this process (see Annex II).

The press release following the Council meeting stated the following:

*“A number of Member States are of the view that there are serious underlying problems with the European School system’s current model, particularly with respect to cost-sharing. Statistics show that some countries are currently sending a disproportionate percentage of staff in proportion to the number of pupils of their nationality.*

*It is in the interests of all Member States to find a solution which can find unanimous support and which is in the best interest of learners and their families. The Irish Presidency stands ready to use its good offices to assist in any way it can and the Commission agreed that a solution must be found to the imbalance in cost-sharing at the highest level****.***

*The Commission underlined the importance of the European schools who have more than 25 000 pupils throughout Europe and proposed that an extraordinary meeting of EU Education ministers should be convened as soon as possible in order to discuss the current crisis.”*

**6. TROIKA**

Based on the outcome of the Council meeting, the Belgian European School Presidency decided to organise an enlarged Troika meeting on 24 June to plan and prepare the future cost sharing discussion. The Troika was reinforced by the Irish EU presidency, as well as by the representation of the future Lithuanian EU presidency and the Commission, in order to guarantee the matter’s smooth development.

The Office of the Secretary-General of the European Schools was mandated to prepare an options paper, premised on the fundamental principle that the costs of seconded staff associated with the European Schools must be shared fairly amongst all Member States (see Article 12.4. of the Convention).

It was decided by the Bulgarian Presidency to organise an extraordinary meeting of the Board of Governors in September 2013 with the explicit goal of agreeing a resolution on the basis of the options set out by the Secretary-General.  If a satisfactory conclusion cannot be reached at September’s extraordinary meeting, the outstanding issues will be referred to a meeting of the Board of Governors at ministerial level, to be organised on the margins of the November Education Council meeting.

The Secretary-General informed the Troika at its meeting about the possible actions already taken or to be taken in four different areas:

1. Seconded teachers,
2. Alternative sources of funding,
3. Pro-rata models
4. Cost savings

**6.1. SECONDED TEACHERS**

In the 2012-2013 school year there are 1492 seconded staff members in the European Schools. In general, the Member States have created good recruitment structures and processes in order to provide the European Schools with highly qualified seconded teachers.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | Difference 2011-2012 |
| Seconded teachers | 1405 | 1394 | 1364 | -30 |
| Total seconded staff | 1519 | 1507 | 1473 | -34 |
| Locally recruited teachers | 578 | 531 | 588 | 57 |
| Unfilled posts |  | 85 | 106 |  |

Unfortunately, and for very different reasons, 106 seconded posts were not filled by any delegation for 2012-2013. The number of unfilled posts shows a growing trend. The Secretary-General pointed out that the Member States which had acceded to the Convention should fulfil their obligations.

Despite the efforts of the Office of the Secretary-General to promote non-native speaker teaching posts, only about 20 non-native speaker teachers have been provided so far. For the 2013-2014 school year the Member States will fill 10 to 15 additional seconded non-native speaker posts.

The increasing need for Anglophone teachers is due to large number of SWALS in the Anglophone section and the popularity of English as L2, L3 and L4. At present over 50% of SWALS are in the Anglophone section.

One way to reduce this overload is to create new language sections for SWALS. This will reduce the number of SWALS gradually, starting from the lower levels.

The Board of Governors has already taken several decisions in this field:

• A Bulgarian section was created at Brussels IV in September 2012

• A Romanian section will open at Brussels IV in September 2013

However, it must be pointed out that any creation of new language sections in Brussels remains subject to the availability of a fifth school. At the same time the Member States would naturally have the possibility of providing the European Schools with seconded teachers.

**6.2. ALTERNATIVE SOURCES OF FUNDING**

The Board of Governors took an important decision to increase revenue in December 2012. It was decided to increase category III school fees by 25% and to reduce the reduction in fees granted for siblings. The possible impact of this action on revenue is unknown as yet.

Inspired by the positive co-funding of the Karlsruhe School, the Secretary-General has contacted in writing the Dutch, Italian and Spanish Member States, which host a European School in their territory, in order to initiate a search for local partners in accordance with the possibilities allowed by Articles 28 and 29 of the Convention.

A meeting with the Director of the European School, Bergen, NOB from *Noord Holland* Province, the Municipality of Bergen, the Dutch Foreign Ministry, JRC Petten, NOB and the Ministry of Education took place at the beginning of July.

**6.3. PRO-RATA MODELS**

There is a wide range of various types of pro-rata models which have been discussed by the Cost Sharing Working Group at its meetings. The models based on GNP, or models based on the percentage of pupils and average cost per pupil, requiring recalculation of the financial contributions of Member States, have not received support from most of the Member States.   
  
It should be pointed out that the Convention does not rule out this type of change to the funding system whilst maintaining the system of seconding teachers by Member States.

**6.4. UK PROPOSAL**

The UK delegation has made a written pro-rata model proposal which was presented at the Troika meeting.

According to the budget figures contained in the 2012 Annual Report of the Secretary-General of the European Schools (attached and highlighted for ease of reference), the total European Schools budget was €274 million.  In other words an average pupil cost in 2012 of €11,506. The report then breaks down the total as follows:

Member States’ contribution is 20%       €56 million

Commission’s contribution is 60%          €164 million

Other contributions (EPO, Fees) is 20% €54 million

Total =                                                           €274 million

Using these figures each Member State could pay an amount into a central fund based on the percentage of pupils they have in the system. For example, a Member State with a pupil percentage of 10% would pay 10% of the €56 million Member State contribution (i.e. €5.4 million) and so on. According to the ‘Proportionality’ table in the Annual Report, the UK has 1760 pupils – 7.66% of the total number. Therefore the UK would pay €4.3 million (7.66% of €56 million).

After all Member States had contributed their share, the money received would then be used to reimburse Member States which second teachers to the school system. This would mean that it would not cost a Member State any additional money irrespective of how many teachers it seconded. And, more importantly, every Member State would be paying its fair share of the cost of teaching (See Annex IV).

**6.4.1. DISCUSSION ABOUT THE UK PROPOSAL**

The UK proposal is very clear. Unfortunately, at the Troika meeting, two of the Member States, namely Lithuania and the future presidency, Bulgaria, expressed reservations about direct funding based on the proportion of pupils and without taking into account national salary levels, which vary hugely, ranging between €1,394 (BU) and €84,456 (LU).

The unanimous agreement on the non-binding structural balance would be seriously challenged by the UK proposal. Without the salary factor the model would create some unfair and surprising outcomes as can be seen in Annex IV, in which the Member States’ salary contributions for 2012 are shown. It might be possible that because of relatively high national salaries, a country sending fewer seconded teachers than the official structural indicative table foresees would have fulfilled its obligations and could request reimbursement of its overpayment (e.g. Denmark, see Annex IV). The model could be developed further.

**6.5. STRUCTURAL MODEL**

It was proposed at the Troika meeting that an alternative model should be presented.

The enlargement of the European Union has increased the number of pupils without a language section (SWALS) in our schools. The proportion of SWALS in 2012 was about 10% (2312 SWALS out of 23,869) of the total number of pupils, which corresponds to about 10% of the seconded teacher posts). These pupils are generally in the English, French or German language section. This increases the need for Anglophone, Francophone and German-speaking seconded teachers in those language sections.

On the other hand, the Member States which have few or no language sections but large numbers of SWALS have difficulties in seconding teachers at the level required by the agreed structural indicative table. In fact, many Member States have filled all their ‘language section’ posts and provided some non-native speaker teachers, and yet they do not reach the required level.

The structural model uses the possibility provided by Article 25.1 of the Convention, which states: *“The budget of the European Schools shall be financed by contributions from the Member States through the continuing payment of the remuneration for seconded or assigned teaching staff and, where appropriate, a financial contribution decided on by the Board of Governors acting unanimously”*

The structural model (see Annex V) is based on the structural indicative table of seconded staff members approved by the Board of Governors in 2009. The national average salary levels have been incorporated into the model (Annex V).

It is proposed that the Member states could be requested to top up their seconded posts’ shortfall in the form a financial contribution according to the national average salary level (see Annex V). Thus the total cost for a seconding country would be equivalent to the cost if they filled all their seconded posts based on their proportion of pupils. This model would create a credible basis for the financial contributions of around €4 million per year. This revenue would be used to offset the secondment costs for those Member States which second teachers over their quota and which request a refund.

This arrangement would allow the Member States with few or no language sections to compensate the respective Member States for the cost of their SWALS.

**6.5.1 DISCUSSION ABOUT THE STRUCTURAL MODEL**

The Board of Governors agreed in Helsinki in 2008 that *“Member States are free to exceed this indicative reference on a voluntary basis and second more staff.”* It is to be noted that several Member States are currently contributing ‘over quota’ to the European School system, as agreed.

According to the Education Council discussion in June 2013, “*a number of Member States are of the view that there are serious underlying problems with the European School system’s current model, particularly with respect to cost-sharing. Statistics show that some countries are currently sending a disproportionate percentage of staff in proportion to the number of pupils of their nationality.”*

If the Board of Governors were to approve the structural model, it would be necessary to create a transparent financial mechanism to reallocate the €4 million collected. This revenue would be shared between those Member States which second teachers over their quota and which request a refund. The amount collected would not cover the financial needs if all the countries exceeding the indicative reference table targets were to request a refund. So the structural model would only partially solve the structural funding problem in the system.

**7. FINDING SAVINGS**

The European School population continues to grow steadily, at a rate of about 400-900 pupils per year.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2011-2012** | **2012-2013** | **2013-2014** | **Difference 2012-2013** | **%** |
|  | **(Sept 2011)** | **(Sept 2012)** | **(Sept 2013)** |  |  |
| Cat. I institutions | 14987 | 15967 | 16411 | 444 | 2.78% |
| % share | 64.10% | 65.80% | 66.40% | 0.70% |  |
| Cat. I Schools/OEB | 2414 | 2531 | 2626 | 95 | 3.75% |
| Cat. I total | 17401 | 18498 | 19037 | 539 | 2.91% |
| Cat. II | 1152 | 1190 | 1148 | -42 | -3.53% |
| Cat. III | 4817 | 4592 | 4517 | -75 | -1.63% |
| **Total** | **23370** | **24280** | **24702** | **422** | **1.74%** |

In order to balance the financial impact of the increase in the population and to avoid an increase in the European Schools’ budget and the European Institutions’ contribution, the Board of Governors has taken several important decisions of a structural nature designed to find savings for the coming years:

* **Salary revision** according to the 2004 revision of the EU Staff Regulations **for seconded teachers (- 30%)**,  decided in April 2011 and effective for new staff recruited from September 2011 onwards
* **Salary revision** according to the 2004 revision of the EU Staff Regulations **for locally recruited teachers (- 20%)**,decided in April 2011 and effective for new staff recruited from September 2011 onwards
* Regrouping, limiting options – decided by the Board of Governors in 2011 and updated in 2013
* Reform of the European Baccalaureate (several changes implemented; new structure in 2015).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** | **Difference**  **2013-2014** | **%** |
| Cost per pupil | 12,088 | 11,921 | 11,562 | -359 | -3.01% |
| Number of pupils | 23,370 | 24,280 | 24,702 | 422 | 1.74% |

The European Schools have managed to stabilise and even reduce the cost per pupil in recent years despite the growing demand for education and the opening of new school buildings in Brussels and in Luxemburg. The positive developments so far are due to the revision of the Staff Regulations but mostly to increased efficiency in organising education.

The number of category I pupils is increasing annually by 2-3 %. At the same time the EU’s contribution is stagnating and as a result the EU contribution per category I EU pupil is expected to fall by over 6% in 2013-2014.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** | **Difference** | **%** |
| **2012-2014?** |
| EU contribution per EU pupil | 11,035 | 10,975 | 10,302 | -673 | -6.13% |
| Cat. I | 14,987 | 15,967 | 16,411 | 444 | 2.78% |
| EU pupils |

The ‘Organisation of studies in the secondary cycle’ Working Group presented its interim report at the April 2013 meeting of the Board of Governors. The mandate of the Working Group has been *to draft of a proposal for the new structure of studies in the secondary cycle, in order to improve its flexibility and efficiency, and for the financial aspects, as specified in the cost sharing debate.*

If no alternative solutions are found for funding and cost sharing, the European School system would be obliged to look for new savings in order to find funding to pay the costs of the teachers who will not be provided by the UK or other Member States.

**8. PROPOSAL**

The Board of Governors needs to decide which option should be prepared further with a view to its discussion at the extraordinary Board of Governors’ meeting that will take place during the Education Council in November:

1. The UK proposal (Annex IV), or
2. The structural model (Annex V).

In addition the Board of Governors could request:

* 1. the Secretary-General to negotiate with several Member States in order to open new language sections in Brussels, provided that the negotiations with the Belgian authorities concerning the fifth European School progress.
  2. the Secretary-General to continue negotiating with the Member States to find possible new alternative sources of funding
  3. the ‘Organisation of studies in the secondary cycle’ Working Group to present a new proposal for the Joint Teaching Committee’s October 2013 meeting.

**ANNEX I**

**Approved by the Board of Governors at its meeting in Stockholm on 21-23 April 2009**

**SHARING OF THE COSTS OF SECONDED STAFF AMONGST THE MEMBER STATES (Cost Sharing)**

All seconded posts needed should be taken into account, not just teachers[[1]](#footnote-1) but also Directors and Deputy Directors and other posts (Office, etc.), including unfilled posts (BoG, 7 March 2008, doc. Addendum).

As a starting point, an indicative reference will therefore be determined for each Member State on the basis of the percentage of all categories of pupils who are nationals (BoG decision, January 2008**,** see Annex III).

It has been agreed that Member States are free to exceed this indicative reference on a voluntary basis and second more staff.[[2]](#footnote-2)

The principle of the structural approach (and not a financial method) was agreed by the BoG in January 2008. This structural approach opens up the possibility of teaching by non-native speakers in certain limited cases.

Quality control of linguistic competence will be carried out prior to recruitment and by establishing criteria for this purpose.

Indicative objectives will be used to start a dialogue with Member States in order to facilitate the process designed to ensure that all Member States contribute to the system.

In the case where there is a need to call on the EU budget to cover a possible deficit at the end of this process, this community contribution by means of the financing of locally recruited teachers shall be clearly identified and shall be subject to annual monitoring.

**ANNEX II**
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***European Schools***

*The Council took note of information from the Presidency concerning the secondment of teachers in the European schools*[[3]](#footnote-3)*. There are 14 European schools located close to the European institutions. All were set up under an intergovernmental agreement with the aim of teaching the children of staff in the EU institutions in their maternal language, although - depending on their location - they can also take pupils from other backgrounds.*

*A number of Member States are of the view that there are serious underlying problems with the European School system’s current model, particularly with respect to cost-sharing. Statistics show that some countries are currently sending a disproportionate percentage of staff in proportion to the number of pupils of their nationality.*

*It is in the interests of all Member States to find a solution which can find unanimous support and which is in the best interest of learners and their families. The Irish Presidency stands ready to use its good offices to assist in any way it can and the Commission agreed that a solution must be found to the imbalance in cost-sharing at the highest level****.***

*The Commission underlined the importance of the European schools who have more than 25 000 pupils throughout Europe and proposed that an extraordinary meeting of EU Education ministers should be convened as soon as possible in order to discuss the current crisis.*

**ANNEX III:** An indicative reference will therefore be determined for each Member State on the basis of the percentage of all categories of pupils who are nationals (BoG decision, January 2008)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicative reference table with Munich 2012/2013** | **Number of pupils per country** | **% of pupils per country** | **Seconded staff members** | **(%) of seconded staff members** | **Seconded staff members quota** | **Difference** |
| **Nationality** |
| **German** | **3527** | 15.35% | **236** | 15.82% | **229** | **7** |
| **Austrian** | **324** | 1.41% | **23** | 1.54% | **21** | **2** |
| **Belgian** | **2371** | 10.32% | **205** | 13.74% | **154** | **51** |
| **British** | **1760** | 7.66% | **219** | 14.68% | **114** | **105** |
| **Bulgarian** | **310** | 1.35% | **5** | 0.34% | **20** | **-15** |
| **Cypriot** | **38** | 0.17% | **0** | 0.00% | **2** | **-2** |
| **Danish** | **650** | 2.83% | **33** | 2.21% | **42** | **-9** |
| **Spanish** | **1910** | 8.31% | **92** | 6.17% | **124** | **-32** |
| **Estonian** | **207** | 0.90% | **4** | 0.27% | **13** | **-9** |
| **Finnnish** | **667** | 2.90% | **34** | 2.28% | **43** | **-9** |
| **French** | **3012** | 13.11% | **184** | 12.33% | **196** | **-12** |
| **Greek** | **803** | 3.49% | **44** | 2.95% | **52** | **-8** |
| **Hungarian** | **319** | 1.39% | **16** | 1.07% | **21** | **-5** |
| **Irish** | **475** | 2.07% | **61** | 4.09% | **31** | **30** |
| **Italian** | **2331** | 10.14% | **101** | 6.77% | **151** | **-50** |
| **Latvian** | **192** | 0.84% | **1** | 0.07% | **12** | **-11** |
| **Lithuanian** | **309** | 1.34% | **8** | 0.54% | **20** | **-12** |
| **Luxembourg** | **230** | 1.00% | **21** | 1.41% | **15** | **6** |
| **Maltese** | **72** | 0.31% | **4** | 0.27% | **5** | **-1** |
| **Dutch** | **1042** | 4.53% | **82** | 5.50% | **68** | **14** |
| **Polish** | **433** | 1.88% | **25** | 1.68% | **28** | **-3** |
| **Portuguese** | **578** | 2.52% | **31** | 2.08% | **38** | **-7** |
| **Romanian** | **262** | 1.14% | **0** | 0.00% | **17** | **-17** |
| **Slovak** | **199** | 0.87% | **4** | 0.27% | **13** | **-9** |
| **Slovenian** | **120** | 0.52% | **3** | 0.20% | **8** | **-5** |
| **Swedish** | **584** | 2.54% | **41** | 2.75% | **38** | **3** |
| **Czech** | **252** | 1.10% | **15** | 1.01% | **16** | **-1** |
| **TOTAL** | **22977** | 100.00% | **1492** | 100.00% | **1492** | **0** |

**ANNEX IV: UK proposal without Munich (pupils or seconded staff members), (data 2012/2013)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Nationality** | **Number of pupils by country** | **Breakdown of pupils by Member State (%)** | **Seconded Staff: Teachers, Educational Advisers, Librarians and Directors and Deputy Directors** | **Seconded staff: Bursars** | **Seconded staff: OSGES** | **TOTAL Seconded staff in post** | **(%)** | **Seconded staff required according to pupils of the MS** | **Difference** | **Staff salaries in 2012** | **Percentage of funding** | **Over/Under Contributor by** |
| **German** | **2,778** | **13.25%** | **197** | **2** | **2** | **201** | **14.51%** | **183** | **18** | **10,721,559** | **19.74** | **3,523,698** |
| **Austrian** | **287** | **1.37%** | **17** |  |  | **17** | **1.23%** | **19** | **-2** | **701,360** | **1.29** | **-42,263** |
| **Belgian** | **2,322** | **11.08%** | **193** | **5** |  | **198** | **14.30%** | **153** | **45** | **10,083,131** | **18.57** | **4,066,776** |
| **British** | **1,610** | **7.68%** | **203** |  |  | **203** | **14.66%** | **106** | **97** | **7,434,406** | **13.69** | **3,262,860** |
| **Bulgarian** | **297** | **1.42%** | **5** |  |  | **5** | **0.36%** | **20** | **-15** | **6,972** | **0.01** | **-762,562** |
| **Cypriot** | **38** | **0.18%** | **0** |  |  | **0** | **0.00%** | **3** | **-3** | **0** | **0.00** | **-98,459** |
| **Danish** | **610** | **2.91%** | **31** |  |  | **31** | **2.24%** | **40** | **-9** | **1,645,160** | **3.03** | **64,636** |
| **Spanish** | **1,793** | **8.55%** | **86** | **1** | **2** | **89** | **6.43%** | **118** | **-29** | **2,664,866** | **4.91** | **-1,980,838** |
| **Estonian** | **203** | **0.97%** | **4** |  |  | **4** | **0.29%** | **13** | **-9** | **36,858** | **0.07** | **-489,120** |
| **Finnish** | **653** | **3.12%** | **32** |  | **1** | **33** | **2.38%** | **43** | **-10** | **1,197,728** | **2.21** | **-494,210** |
| **French** | **2,756** | **13.15%** | **175** |  |  | **175** | **12.64%** | **182** | **-7** | **5,482,375** | **10.09** | **-1,658,483** |
| **Greek** | **697** | **3.33%** | **39** |  | **2** | **41** | **2.96%** | **46** | **-5** | **770,334** | **1.42** | **-1,035,609** |
| **Hungarian** | **301** | **1.44%** | **16** |  |  | **16** | **1.16%** | **20** | **-4** | **100,799** | **0.19** | **-679,099** |
| **Irish** | **440** | **2.10%** | **59** |  |  | **59** | **4.26%** | **29** | **30** | **2,774,308** | **5.11** | **1,634,258** |
| **Italian** | **2,097** | **10.00%** | **87** |  | **1** | **88** | **6.35%** | **138** | **-50** | **2,501,774** | **4.61** | **-2,931,600** |
| **Latvian** | **191** | **0.91%** | **1** |  |  | **1** | **0.07%** | **13** | **-12** | **3,052** | **0.01** | **-491,833** |
| **Lithuanian** | **306** | **1.46%** | **8** |  |  | **8** | **0.58%** | **20** | **-12** | **45,696** | **0.08** | **-747,157** |
| **Luxembourg** | **222** | **1.06%** | **18** | **1** |  | **19** | **1.37%** | **15** | **4** | **1,604,665** | **2.95** | **1,029,458** |
| **Maltese** | **72** | **0.34%** | **3** |  |  | **3** | **0.22%** | **5** | **-2** | **60,429** | **0.11** | **-126,125** |
| **Dutch** | **956** | **4.56%** | **75** | **1** |  | **76** | **5.49%** | **63** | **13** | **3,529,104** | **6.50** | **1,052,086** |
| **Polish** | **413** | **1.97%** | **24** |  |  | **24** | **1.73%** | **27** | **-3** | **213,295** | **0.39** | **-856,797** |
| **Portuguese** | **564** | **2.69%** | **31** |  |  | **31** | **2.24%** | **37** | **-6** | **743,425** | **1.37** | **-717,912** |
| **Romanian** | **237** | **1.13%** | **0** |  |  | **0** | **0.00%** | **16** | **-16** | **0** | **0.00** | **-614,072** |
| **Slovak** | **197** | **0.94%** | **4** |  |  | **4** | **0.29%** | **13** | **-9** | **26,411** | **0.05** | **-484,020** |
| **Slovenian** | **117** | **0.56%** | **3** |  |  | **3** | **0.22%** | **8** | **-5** | **53,508** | **0.10** | **-249,642** |
| **Swedish** | **556** | **2.65%** | **40** |  |  | **40** | **2.89%** | **37** | **3** | **1,732,836** | **3.19** | **292,227** |
| **Czech** | **247** | **1.18%** | **15** |  |  | **15** | **1.08%** | **16** | **-1** | **173,783** | **0.32** | **-466,200** |
| **TOTAL** | **20,960** | **100.00%** | **1366** | **10** | **8** | **1384** | **99.93%** | **1384** | **0** | **54,307,834** | **100.00** | **0** |
| **Note: STATISTICS WITHOUT MUNICH SCHOOL**  By adding to the total of 22,977, the **892** pupils who are not nationals of the 27 Member States, the total pupil population is **23,869**. | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**ANNEX V: Structural model without Munich (pupils or seconded staff members), (data 2012/2013)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Nationality** | **Number of pupils per country** | **Breakdown of pupils per Member State (%)** | | | **Seconded staff: Teachers, Educational Advisers, Librarians and Directors and Deputy Directors** | **Seconded staff: Bursars** | | **Seconded staff: OSGES** | | **TOTAL Seconded staff in post** | **(%)** | | **Seconded staff required according to pupils of the Member State** | | **Difference** | | **2013 revenue according to staff on the spot from 01.01. to 31.08. Extrapolation 01.01. to 31.12. 2013** | | **Average national salary per seconded staff member** | | **Deficit because of required posts unfilled** | | **Surplus in Member State's favour** | |
| **German** | **2,778** | 13.25 | | | **197** | **2** | | **2** | | **201** | 14.51 | | **184** | | **17.4** | | **10,825,812** | | **53,860** | | **0** | | **939,025** | |
| **Austrian** | **287** | 1.37 | | | **17** |  | |  | | **17** | 1.23 | | **19** | | **-2.0** | | **684,822** | | **40,284** | | **-79,135** | | **0** | |
| **Belgian** | **2,322** | 11.08 | | | **193** | **5** | |  | | **198** | 14.30 | | **153** | | **44.6** | | **10,233,160** | | **51,683** | | **0** | | **2,303,304** | |
| **British** | **1,610** | 7.68 | | | **203** |  | |  | | **203** | 14.66 | | **106** | | **96.6** | | **6,870,738** | | **33,846** | | **0** | | **3,269,998** | |
| **Bulgarian** | **297** | 1.42 | | | **5** |  | |  | | **5** | 0.36 | | **20** | | **-14.6** | | **13,382** | | **2,676** | | **-39,143** | | **0** | |
| **Cypriot** | **38** | 0.18 | | | **0** |  | |  | | **0** | 0.00 | | **3** | | **-2.5** | | **0** | | **0** | | **0** | | **0** | |
| **Danish** | **610** | 2.91 | | | **31** |  | |  | | **31** | 2.24 | | **40** | | **-9.3** | | **1,665,644** | | **53,730** | | **-500,108** | | **0** | |
| **Spanish** | **1,793** | 8.55 | | | **86** | **1** | | **2** | | **89** | 6.43 | | **118** | | **-29.5** | | **2,521,764** | | **28,334** | | **-835,251** | | **0** | |
| **Estonian** | **203** | 0.97 | | | **4** |  | |  | | **4** | 0.29 | | **13** | | **-9.4** | | **37,170** | | **9,293** | | **-87,479** | | **0** | |
| **Finnish** | **653** | 3.12 | | | **32** |  | | **1** | | **33** | 2.38 | | **43** | | **-10.1** | | **1,244,175** | | **37,702** | | **-382,644** | | **0** | |
| **French** | **2,756** | 13.15 | | | **175** |  | |  | | **175** | 12.64 | | **182** | | **-7.1** | | **5,439,810** | | **31,085** | | **-221,063** | | **0** | |
| **Greek** | **697** | 3.33 | | | **39** |  | | **2** | | **41** | 2.96 | | **46** | | **-5.1** | | **808,220** | | **19,713** | | **-99,678** | | **0** | |
| **Hungarian** | **301** | 1.44 | | | **16** |  | |  | | **16** | 1.16 | | **20** | | **-3.9** | | **106,200** | | **6,638** | | **-25,817** | | **0** | |
| **Irish** | **440** | 2.10 | | | **59** |  | |  | | **59** | 4.26 | | **29** | | **29.9** | | **2,860,863** | | **48,489** | | **0** | | **1,451,067** | |
| **Italian** | **2,097** | 10.00 | | | **87** |  | | **1** | | **88** | 6.35 | | **139** | | **-50.6** | | **2,482,898** | | **28,215** | | **-1,426,709** | | **0** | |
| **Latvian** | **191** | 0.91 | | | **1** |  | |  | | **1** | 0.07 | | **13** | | **-11.6** | | **3,893** | | **3,893** | | **-45,240** | | **0** | |
| **Lithuanian** | **306** | 1.46 | | | **8** |  | |  | | **8** | 0.58 | | **20** | | **-12.2** | | **41,784** | | **5,223** | | **-63,825** | | **0** | |
| **Luxembourg** | **222** | 1.06 | | | **18** | **1** | |  | | **19** | 1.37 | | **15** | | **4.3** | | **1,740,942** | | **91,629** | | **0** | | **396,809** | |
| **Maltese** | **72** | 0.34 | | | **4** |  | |  | | **4** | 0.29 | | **5** | | **-0.8** | | **61,328** | | **15,332** | | **-11,616** | | **0** | |
| **Dutch** | **956** | 4.56 | | | **75** | **1** | |  | | **76** | 5.49 | | **63** | | **12.8** | | **3,554,790** | | **46,774** | | **0** | | **600,067** | |
| **Polish** | **413** | 1.97 | | | **24** |  | |  | | **24** | 1.73 | | **27** | | **-3.3** | | **223,191** | | **9,300** | | **-30,599** | | **0** | |
| **Portuguese** | **564** | 2.69 | | | **31** |  | |  | | **31** | 2.24 | | **37** | | **-6.3** | | **762,778** | | **24,606** | | **-154,232** | | **0** | |
| **Romanian** | **237** | 1.13 | | | **0** |  | |  | | **0** | 0.00 | | **16** | | **-15.7** | | **0** | | **0** | | **0** | | **0** | |
| **Slovak** | **197** | 0.94 | | | **4** |  | |  | | **4** | 0.29 | | **13** | | **-9.0** | | **31,649** | | **7,912** | | **-71,348** | | **0** | |
| **Slovenian** | **117** | 0.56 | | | **3** |  | |  | | **3** | 0.22 | | **8** | | **-4.7** | | **64,983** | | **21,661** | | **-102,482** | | **0** | |
| **Swedish** | **556** | 2.65 | | | **40** |  | |  | | **40** | 2.89 | | **37** | | **3.3** | | **1,712,153** | | **42,804** | | **0** | | **139,562** | |
| **Czech** | **247** | 1.18 | | | **15** |  | |  | | **15** | 1.08 | | **16** | | **-1.3** | | **197,021** | | **13,135** | | **-17,355** | | **0** | |
| **TOTAL** | **20,960** | **100.00** | | | **1.367** | **10** | | **8** | | **1.385** | **100.00** | | **1.385** | | **0** | | **54,189,170** | | **39,126** | | **-4,193,723** | | **9,099,833** | |
| **Note:** | | |  |  | | |  | |  | | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |
| By adding to the total of 22,977, the **892** pupils who are not nationals of the 27 Member States, the total pupil population is **23,869**. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  |  |
|  | | |  |  | | |  | |  | | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  |

1. Only seconded teachers are taken into account. A number – which cannot be reduced – of locally recruited teachers, accounting for approximately 25% of the total number of teachers in the European School system, is essential to:

   - cover the hours requirements in certain subjects and languages where the creation of full-time posts is not permissible,

   - meet the needs of timetable constraints (cross-language section courses, availability of rooms, etc.),

   - teach special courses: religion, ethics, Learning Support, SEN, catch-up classes in languages. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. April 2008, Helsinki [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. You can find the Irish EU-presidency information note from the address:

   <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/13/st09/st09390.en13.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)