



Schola Europaea

Office of the Secretary-General

Pedagogical development Unit

Réf. : ANNEX TO THE DOCUMENT 2011-01-D-33-en-3

Orig. : EN

Internal structures in the nursery, primary and secondary cycles

Budgetary Committee

Meeting in Brussels on 15 and 16 March 2011 – Room -1/15

1. Introduction

The Board of Governors (BoG) has made a great deal of decisions concerning the coordination time for teachers, reduction of teaching hours and the internal structures of the school.

The fundamental principle of the reduction of teaching time for teachers was discussed in the Board of Governors in 1970. The meeting decided “that teaching hours could be reduced only in the case of teachers entrusted by the Board of Governors with a special task of interest to all the European Schools and extending over a period of at least one year. “ This basic decision has been modified several times during the past 40 years.

It is necessary to revise these old decisions and create a new and transparent way of allocating internal structures to the schools.

The first version of this document was presented to the Joint Teaching Committee in February 2011. Due to too short notice, the Joint Teaching Committee asked the Deputy Secretary General to discuss the document proposal with the Staff representatives and the directors. The Careers Guidance Working Group was invited to examine the document in March. All the other actors were asked to send their comments directly to the Deputy Secretary General.

The meeting with the representatives of the Staff committee took place on the 1.3.2011 and the directors will discuss the document in their meeting on the 14th of March. The Careers Guidance Working Group will examine the proposals on their meeting on the 7th of March.

2. Background information

The decisions of the BoG can be classified to at least 10 different categories:

- 1) Statutory timetable reductions for the Staff Committee representatives (BoG, 1993, 2003)
- 2) Internal structures of the nursery and primary cycles (BoG, 2004)
- 3) Subject coordination (BoG, 2000)
- 4) Internal structures for the secondary school administration e.g. the cycle coordinators (BoG, 1987, 1989)
- 5) Specific coordination tasks for specific work
 - a. Intermath (BoG, 1998)
 - b. Eurobio worksheets (BoG 1994, 2002)
 - c. Integrated science worksheets (BoG, 2004)
 - d. The Secretary of the Mathematics syllabus WG (BoG, 2009)
- 6) Learning Support Coordination in the primary and secondary cycles (BoG, 2004)
- 7) Timetabling (Decision of the meeting of Directors, 1985)
- 8) SEN coordination in the primary and secondary cycles (BoG, 2004)
- 9) SWALS coordination in the primary and secondary cycles (BoG, 2004)
- 10) Timetable reductions for Careers guidance and Counselling teachers and an extra lump sum payment of 16 hours for each participating careers teacher (BoG, 1991, 1999)

Some of the decisions are still valid and useful, but some of them are simply outdated and not applicable any more.

3. Discussion

The schools should have an effective middle management structure. The actual situation is not satisfactory. Based on the various decisions of the Board of Governors the schools have distributed the timetable reduction in very small amounts to a maximum number of teaching staff. In some schools each seconded teacher has a different type of coordination task which entitles him or her to have timetable reduction. In bigger schools nearly 100 weekly periods (4-5 full time teaching posts) are used for these purposes.

According to the reform principles the schools should set up a clear and transparent administrative and pedagogical management organisation in which the tasks and the responsibilities of everyone are clearly communicated to the whole school community.

4. Staff Committee representatives

The Board of Governors have made several decisions concerning the reduction of teaching hours for the members of the Staff Committee (1993, 2003). In addition, the Representative of the Board of Governors got a permission to grant the Staff Committee secretary a timetable reduction over and above the one granted to all members of the Staff Committee. This reduction may amount to up to five periods a week in the case of a secondary school teacher and up to five hours a week in the case of a primary school teacher.

The Board of Governors decided in 2003 to grant an additional timetable reduction to the representatives of the Staff Committee, as follows:

- 1 hour for the primary representatives of the Brussels I, II and III, Luxembourg I and II Schools and the School holding the presidency.
- 1 period for the secondary representatives of the Brussels I, II and III, Luxembourg I and II Schools and the School holding the presidency

4.1. Proposal

It is proposed to summarise and clarify the past decisions of Board of Governors concerning timetable reductions for the Staff Committee representatives:

The timetable reductions for the Members of the Staff Committee are granted as follows:

- **The weekly timetable reduction for the primary representatives is three hours and for the secondary school representatives three periods.**
- **An additional reduction is granted the primary representatives (one hour) and the secondary representatives (one period) of the Schools with more than 2000 pupils.**
- **The School holding the annual presidency will have an additional one hour (primary) and one period (secondary) reduction.**
- **The Secretary General has a permission to grant the Staff Committee secretary**

a timetable reduction over and above the one granted to all members of the Staff Committee. The Staff Committee secretary may amount to up to five periods a week in the case of a secondary school teacher and up to five hours a week in the case of a primary school teacher

5. Subject Coordination

It was agreed in the BoG in 2000, *“that the experiment with subject coordinators conducted in the large schools be extended to all the schools, by granting 25 coordination periods to each of the Brussels schools, 30 to the Luxembourg school and 7 coordination periods to each of the other schools.*

The allocation of these periods was left to the discretion of the directors, who would use the following criteria as a basis:

- *The number of teachers involved per subject.*
- *The number of teaching periods per subject.*
- *The specificity of the subjects concerned (e.g.: installation and management of labs).*

It was recommended that timetable reductions should not normally be granted to locally recruited teachers and that no teacher should be designated coordinator for more than one subject.

Each school must draw up a job description itself on the basis of the following list, which sets out only the most important duties.”

In the reform process the schools have asked to define their priorities and their main pedagogical objectives and launch concrete action plans to meet the given objectives. The actual way of sharing the limited internal structure resources has proven not to be effective for this purpose. Taking account of the number of subjects and the amount of the subject coordination time, the schools have been obliged to dispatch often 0,5 period or even less of the timetable reduction for each coordinator. This type of timetable reduction practise for subject coordinators has been purely nominal for an individual teacher and very costly for the school system - equivalent of more than 1 full time seconded teacher per school.

5.1. Proposal

The schools should have a possibility to appoint the key coordinators in the priority areas using the global amount of internal structure resources, when needed. Each task should have a clear job description including the responsibilities of the nominated coordinator.

A locally recruited teacher can be appointed to the task, but the total amount of hours or periods of the internal structure should not pass the given framework.

6. Specific system level tasks

6.1. Intermath

The Board of Governors agreed in 1998 to:

- grant each of the two Brussels II teachers a three-hour release from teaching duties to deal with the secretariat and the administration of Intermath.
- grant the 18-hour release from teaching duties to the working groups responsible for devising the Intermath work sheets, on the understanding that the costs of these releases would be defrayed by the Euromath Fund.

6.1.1. Proposition to amend the old decision:

A teacher dealing with the secretariat and the administration of Intermath can benefit a six-hour release from the teaching duties. These costs are paid fully from the Intermath Fund.

All the costs related to production, packing and distribution of Intermath work sheets are paid by Intermath Fund.

6.2. Timetable reduction for general revision of the mathematics syllabus

The Board of Governors agreed in 2009 to grant a three-period timetable reduction to the secretary of the Mathematics syllabus working group. **This reduction will end in 2012.**

6.3. EUROBIO and Integrated Science worksheets

The Board of Governors have made decisions (2002, 2004) concerning the production of the EUROBIO and Integrated Science worksheets.

Proposition:

The old decisions concerning the coordination of EUROBIO and Integrated Science Worksheets will be cancelled.

7. LS, SEN and SWALS coordination

The LS, SEN and SWALS coordination hours vary between the schools.

The tasks and the responsibilities of the LS, SEN and SWALS coordinators are defined in the separate documents approved by the Board of Governors or Joint Teaching Committee. The coordination allocation for LS, SEN and SWALS will be part of the Internal Structures resources of the school, so that the schools can allocate these tasks according to the local needs.

8. CAREERS GUIDANCE

The BoG decided in 1991 to approve the timetable reductions, which “*are designed to enable the Schools to arrange for information to be provided about syllabuses and choices of options and to organise an educational and vocational guidance structure for pupils.*”

In 1998 the Board of Governors approved the following text:

- a. *The general allowance which the schools receive for careers guidance should be based on the actual numbers of careers teachers in each section and the budget amount should be divided equally among them. Each national section (not language section) should have a discharge (timetable reduction) allowance for careers guidance.*
- b. *Payment for the 5th Year Careers Guidance programme should be based on the number of classes involved in each school instead of the number of sections. (This method of payment has been proposed for the new 6th and 7th Year Careers Guidance programme)*
- c. *The method of payment for this programme should be harmonised across all European Schools. We recommend that an extra ‘lump-sum’ payment equivalent to 16 hours teaching time at the appropriate rate for the grade be paid to each participating careers teacher.* (*: Directors need to ensure that the time paid for has in fact been spent teaching the programme.)*
- d. *Regarding the compensation of the British careers teachers with responsibility for UK university applications, the Board awaits a specific proposal.”*

In addition, the Careers Guidance practises in the 5th secondary are explained in the Memorandum 2000-M-11 and the Careers Guidance organisation in years 6 and 7 in the document 5511-D-2001.

8.1 Discussion about the Career guidance practices

It is evident, that our students in the upper secondary school need professional careers guidance more than the students in the national school systems. The families need advice and support when making choices in the 5th secondary and it is absolutely necessary that our students in the 6th and 7th grade get correct and updated information about the further education alternatives.

The equal allocation of the timetable reductions between the “national sections” has not proven to be a good idea. Since 1998 the number of the “national sections” has doubled from 15 to 27.

Every European School has its specific school population with specific needs. The work load between the Careers guidance teachers in different language sections is not equal at all.

In general the allocation of the timetable reductions for Careers guidance teachers vary enormously between the schools. In addition, there is a practise to pay a lump sum of 16 periods for the careers guidance teachers which is paid as flat-rate overtime.

In recent years the processing of Higher Education Applications within the European Schools for Students in year 7 have consumed more and more time from careers guidance teachers – especially in some specific sections. Application to university is frequently a complex and time consuming process requiring personal one-to-one interactions with individual students (and sometimes their parents) involving extensive support from careers teachers working at the European Schools. As a result, some teachers need to devote considerable time and energy in addition to their normal teaching duties to provide the levels of support necessary. In many national school systems this type of service is not being provided by the schools, but is instead being outsourced.

8.1.1. The opinion of the Careers Guidance Working Group

According to the opinion of the Careers Guidance Working Group meeting on the 7th of March, it is necessary in the first place to solve the problem concerning the processing of the applications to Universities. In the second phase, it would be envisaged to create a new document concerning the Career guidance organisation.

The WG stated that the Careers Guidance practises have developed since 1990. It is recommended to revise and update the older decisions and practises.

8.1.2. Proposition

The Budgetary Committee is asked to give its opinion concerning the three alternatives to deal with the extra costs related to processing the applications to Universities (see Annex1):

- a. That the Board of Governors decides to provide funding for the European School system to enable the processing of Higher Education applications by pupils within their Schools.**
- b. That the Board of Governors decides that processing is funded by a fee, paid by the European Baccalaureate candidate.**
- c. That the Board of Governors decides that the funding is shared by the schools and the European Baccalaureate candidate, according to a cost-sharing model.**

It is also proposed that the Secretary General should have a mandate to prepare a document concerning Careers Guidance (i.e. in general, in the 5th year, and in the 6th and 7th year) for the October Joint Teaching Committee. The objective of the future document is to:

- clarify the actual set of rules and decisions;**
- distribute justified amount of the Careers Guidance resources to each school;**
- give instructions to the Schools concerning the remuneration of the Careers Guidance teachers and;**
- present guidelines concerning the processing of Higher Education applications.**

9. Internal Structures – harmonised calculation method

The statutory timetable reductions for Staff Committee representatives as well as the specific reductions (see point 6 of this document) for European School system level tasks are not included in the global amount of Internal Structures of a School.

The proposed calculation method is to allocate 1 hour of Internal Structures for the nursery and primary schools per 65 pupils. This amount includes cycle coordination, subject coordination, LS, SEN and SWALS coordination.

School	Population			Internal structures 2010	Proposed Internal structures
	Nursery	Primary	N+P	Hours	1 hour/ 65 pupils
Alicante	120	356	476	10	7
Bergen	62	222	284	5	4
BXL I	240	1091	1331	25	20
BXL II	306	1123	1429	34	22
BXL III	262	940	1202	18	18
BXL IV	168	570	738	15	11
Culham	45	279	324	6	5
Frankfurt	142	417	559	10	9
Karlsruhe	106	296	402	7	6
LUX I	339	903	1242	20	19
LUX II	213	730	943	23	15
Mol	72	249	321	5	5
Munich	117	834	951	18	15
Varese	102	502	604	11	9
TOTAL	2294	8512	10806	207	166

The proposed calculation method for the secondary cycle is to allocate 1 period of Internal Structures for 40 students in the secondary cycle. This amount includes cycle coordination, subject coordination, timetabling, LS, SEN and SWALS coordination reductions.

SECONDARY			
School	Population	Internal structure 2010 periods	Proposed Internal Structure 1 period/40 students
Alicante	559	25	14
Bergen	324	9	8
BXL I	1743	68	44
BXL II	1660	47	42
BXL III	1700	48	43
BXL IV	71	1	2
Culham	483	12	12
Frankfurt	526	11	13
Karlsruhe	541	13	14
LUX I	2233	85	56
LUX II	0	0	0
Mol	468	14	12
Munich	950	11	24
Varese	714	11	18
TOTAL	11972	355	299

The secondary schools which have over 1000 pupils should have a right to 6 additional periods of Internal Structures.

10. Conclusions

The distribution of the timetable reductions should be made in a transparent way.

The director of the school should annually present the use of the Internal Structure resources to the Admin Board in September/October.

Each task should have a clear job description, which should be communicated to the school community.

A locally recruited teacher can be appointed to the task, but the total amount of hours or periods of the internal structure should not pass the given framework.

11. Proposals

The Budgetary Committee is invited to give an opinion on the following proposals:

- a. The decisions concerning the production of EURO BIO and Integrated Science Worksheets will be cancelled.**
- b. The decision concerning Intermath will be modified according to the proposal in the point 6.1.1.**
- c. The schools will receive an annual amount of internal structure resources based on the school population:**
 - i. nursery and primary cycles 1 hour / 65 pupils. This amount includes cycle coordination, subject coordination, LS, SEN and SWALS coordination.**
 - ii. secondary cycle 1 period / 40 students. This amount includes cycle coordination, subject coordination, timetabling, LS, SEN and SWALS coordination reductions.**
 - iii. The secondary schools which have over 1000 pupils have a right to 6 additional periods of Internal Structures.**

The schools should have an efficient and transparent middle management. The director of the school should present annually to the Admin Board the use of the given resources for internal structures. Each task should have a clear job description, which should be communicated to the school community.

- d. The decisions concerning timetable reduction for the Staff Representatives will be amended according to the proposal in the point 4.1.**

- e. To give a mandate to the Secretary General to prepare a document concerning Careers Guidance for the October Joint Teaching Committee**
- f. The Budgetary Committee is asked give its opinion concerning the three alternatives to deal with the extra costs related to processing the applications to Universities (See Annex 1) :**
 - i. That the Board of Governors decides to provide funding for the European School system to enable the processing of Higher Education applications by pupils within their Schools.**
 - ii. That the Board of Governors decides that processing is funded by a fee, paid by the European Baccalaureate candidate.**
 - iii. That the Board of Governors decides that the funding is shared by the schools and the European Baccalaureate candidate, according to a cost-sharing model.**

ANNEX 1

Summary of Higher Education applications made by European School students

Data from school year 2007/08

Total number of European Baccalaureate candidates	1360
Total number of applications	2016
Total number of periods spent processing applications	3473

Average periods spent on applications by advisors per student (=3473/1360)	2.55
---	------

Notes:

- A school period is 45 minutes.
- Many students make multiple applications to various universities and different countries, which explains the higher number of applications than of BAC pupils.
- The figures in the table above fluctuate each year, so a value of 2.5 periods per student is taken and will be known as P.

Costs

Total cost = P x N x 66,8 euro

where N = the number of EB candidates in a year (e.g. 1360 in 2007/08)

P = 2.5 as shown above

66,8 euro = a typical local hourly overtime rate in 2010

giving an approximate total cost to the system of

$2.5 \times 1360 \times 66,8 \text{ euro} = 227.366 \text{ euro}$

Cost per student* = $227.366 \text{ euro} / 1360 = 167.75\text{€}$

* Approximate, dependent on local coefficient and overtime rate for 45 minutes.