

# EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2004



2009

---

*Session document*

FINAL  
**A6-0200/2005**

20.6.2005

## **REPORT**

on options for developing the European Schools system  
(2004/2237(INI))

Committee on Culture and Education

Rapporteur: Mary Honeyball

## CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
MOTION FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION .....	3
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT .....	10
OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON BUDGETS .....	14
PROCEDURE .....	19

## MOTION FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION

### on options for developing the European Schools system (2004/2237(INI))

*The European Parliament,*

- having regard to the Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on options for developing the European Schools system,<sup>1</sup>
  - having regard to the Convention defining the Statute of the European Schools,<sup>2</sup>
  - having regard to its resolution of 17 December 2002 on the financing of the European Schools,<sup>3</sup>
  - having regard to the annual report of the Secretary General of the European Schools to the Board of Governors meeting in Brussels on 1-2 February 2005<sup>4</sup>,
  - having regard to Rule 45 of its Rules of Procedure,
  - having regard to the report of the Committee on Culture and Education and the opinion of the Committee on Budgets (A6-0200/2005),
- A. whereas the purpose of the Schools is to educate together children of the staff of the European Communities; whereas besides the children covered by the Agreements provided for in Articles 28 and 29 of the Statute of the European Schools, other children may attend the Schools within the limits set by the Board of Governors; whereas the recruitment and retention of suitably qualified officials is necessary for the smooth functioning of the European institutions, and whereas the provision of mother-tongue education for the children of such officials, the recognition of the equal value of academic years successfully completed in the Member States and at the European Schools, and the European Baccalaureate, all contribute to this,
- B. whereas the European Schools were established with this consideration in mind,
- C. whereas the European Schools system fosters the concept of European citizenship; whereas keeping the present Schools in existence, on the one hand, and, secondly, setting up new schools and expanding the system in other ways, could accordingly help to strengthen European integration;
- D. whereas there are now thirteen European Schools, enrolling more than 19 000 pupils, and whereas one more school will probably be established by 2010,
- E. whereas pupil numbers at some Schools, especially in Brussels, have now risen beyond

---

<sup>1</sup> COM(2004)0519, 20.7.2004.

<sup>2</sup> OJ L 212, 17.08.1994, p .3.

<sup>3</sup> OJ C 31 E, 5.2.2004, p. 91.

<sup>4</sup> document 1612-D-2004-en-1; [http://www.eursc.org/SE/htmlEn/IndexEn\\_home.html](http://www.eursc.org/SE/htmlEn/IndexEn_home.html)

acceptable levels, and teaching standards are consequently declining,

- F. whereas average costs per pupil at the European Schools compare favourably with those at other schools attended by the children of officials of cognate bodies; whereas, nevertheless, costs per pupil vary widely between the individual schools and correlate strongly with school size,
- G. whereas, while the European Community contributes well over half of the running costs of the European Schools, the European Commission is the only European institution represented on the Board of Governors of the European Schools, and whereas the Commission is the only member of the Board of Governors which has the right to vote both on the Board of Governors and on the Administrative Board of each school,
- H. whereas the system of governance of the European Schools must combine a capacity for strategic planning and oversight together with a reasonable degree of autonomy for the individual schools,
- I. whereas the administration of the European Schools, including decisions about the admission of pupils and the waiving of fees, should be as clear, consistent and transparent as possible throughout the entire Schools system,
- J. whereas the curriculum leading to the European Baccalaureate is academically demanding and may not be suitable for academically weaker pupils; whereas the Schools at present offer no other school-leaving certificate,
- K. whereas, at present, educational provision for pupils with certified special educational needs varies from one School to another,
- L. whereas the maximum class size (32 pupils) is larger than would be permitted under the relevant legislation in a number of Member States; whereas, moreover, many classes contain pupils whose mother tongue is different from that of the language section to which they have been admitted as well as pupils with learning difficulties or special teaching needs,
- M. whereas, with the exception of the Brussels I school, the schools in Brussels and in Luxembourg are overcrowded and whereas, while decisions have been taken on the establishment of two more schools, the buildings will not be ready for use until 2010, with serious implications for the education provided at these schools,
- N. whereas the educational philosophy of the European Schools and the curriculum leading to the European Baccalaureate serve as models of multilingual and multicultural education which the Member States may wish to imitate,
- O. whereas the people of Europe agreed in the EC Treaty (Article 149) that Community action shall be aimed at developing the European dimension in education, particularly through the teaching and dissemination of the languages of the Member States,

### ***The Convention defining the Statute of the European Schools and the Commission Communication***

1. Welcomes the Commission's launch, through its Communication, of a consultative exercise about the future development of the system of European Schools, taking into account the enlargement of the European Union, the interests of the new Member States, the creation of additional EU agencies outside Brussels and Luxembourg and the urgent need to revise and evaluate and, if necessary, to reform a system which was established 50 years ago and which originally catered for only four languages;
2. Recalls that the Convention defining the Statute of the European Schools stipulates that the role of the European Schools is to provide for the joint education of the children of the staff of the European Communities as a way of ensuring the proper operation of the Community institutions, and also stipulates that other children may attend the Schools within the limits set by the Board of Governors;

### ***The decentralised agencies and the new Member States***

3. Believes that a solution to the question of all workplaces of decentralized agencies must be found as a matter of urgency; regrets that such solution had not been found at the moment when the workplaces of these agencies were decided, with the exception of the European Food Safety Authority in Parma;
4. Believes that Member States hosting one of the new decentralised agencies must take greater financial responsibility for the education of the children of staff, and that appropriate solutions must be found for each of the new places of work; believes that, in these cases, cooperation between the European Schools and regional or local schools able to deliver the curriculum leading to the European Baccalaureate is an option; believes that such cooperation should aim to promote high-quality education and European integration, maintain linguistic diversity and facilitate labour mobility;
5. Insists that, where the necessary criteria are met, language sections for the languages of the new Member State be established as a matter of urgency and that all pupils should be receiving mother-tongue teaching;
6. Calls on the Commission to examine the possibility of establishing European schools in the new Member States;

### ***The future financing of the European Schools system, Category III pupils and the smaller schools***

7. Believes that the balancing contribution from the Communities must not develop into an open-ended commitment; considers it self-evident that the European Schools system should operate effectively in terms of budgetary planning and control and should offer demonstrable value for money; endorses the view that the annual projected budget allocation for each school should take account of the size and needs of the individual

schools and of evidence of efforts to spend the budget allocation as effectively as possible;

8. Underlines, however, that the nature of the Communities' contribution to the schools' budgets is set out clearly in Article 25.2 of the Convention defining the Statute of the European Schools; rejects, therefore, the imposition by the Commission of a ceiling on the Communities' contribution to the European Schools budget before the Board of Governors has presented its estimate of the revenue and expenditure of the Schools for the following financial year;
9. Considers that the current arrangement, whereby Member States' contributions are directly linked to the number of teachers they second to the European Schools and to the premises they provide for the European Schools, is not equitable and that alternative systems of financing should be explored;
10. Believes nevertheless that the present system, whereby teachers are appointed and paid their national salaries by Member States, ensures access for the European Schools to the teaching expertise of these States and is the means by which the financial contribution of the Member States is secured;
11. Notes that the level of fees payable by the parents of Category III pupils has risen substantially in real terms since 2002 and that this has resulted in increased revenue for the Schools and a smaller increase in the contribution from the Communities' budget than would otherwise have been the case; further notes that such fees do not meet the full cost of educating these pupils; believes, however, that the parents of existing Category III pupils should not face excessive fee increases during the remainder of their education in the European Schools system;
12. Calls on the Commission, through its representative on the Board of Governors, to press for the adoption and publication of clear, detailed, and publicly available criteria for the admission of Category III pupils; urges the Administrative Board of each school admitting Category III pupils to report on the application of such criteria in its annual report;
13. Reiterates its call for the Board of Governors to revise the criteria it has adopted for establishing, maintaining and closing individual language sections in individual schools so as to rule out any discrimination against an official language of the European Union;
14. Calls upon the Commission to publish, as soon as practicable, the external study commissioned by it into the long-term future of the four schools in Bergen, Culham, Karlsruhe and Mol);

#### ***Better governance and administration***

15. Believes that, given the growth in the number of European Schools and in the number of pupils they teach, the tasks of the Board of Governors should essentially be those of

setting strategic goals, of oversight and of review; believes that detailed management questions specific to individual schools should, in the first instance, be addressed by the Administrative Boards of the individual schools, and that each school should be considered an autonomous entity as regards operational and financial matters;

16. Believes that, given the above, the Administrative Boards of the individual schools should be given control over the financial and operational aspects of the individual schools within the strategic goals laid down by the Board of Governors;
17. Notes that the Community currently pays a balancing contribution equivalent to some 57% of the annual cost of the European Schools system, whereas the Member States contribute 22%; believes, therefore, that the European Commission, as representative of the Communities, should have voting rights on the Board of Governors more in line with the Communities' contribution to the budget, and that the Commission must report to the European Parliament following each meeting of the Board of Governors;
18. Calls on the Commission to press the Board of Governors to draw up a Code of Good Administrative Conduct and to clarify the remit of the Complaints Board;
19. Notes the Commission's suggestion that two new bodies might be established, one 'to administer the financial and operational aspects of all the Schools', the other to superintend the curriculum, the examination system and the assessment of teachers; believes that a single governing body, with the authority to take decisions affecting the Schools system as a whole and willing to accept responsibility for balancing sometimes conflicting financial and educational imperatives, must be maintained;
20. Calls for adequate representation of parents and other stakeholders, for example staff and pupils, on both the Board of Governors and the Administrative Boards of individual schools;

### ***Curriculum and educational issues***

#### *(a) Class sizes*

21. Believes that nursery, primary and secondary school classes, taught by a single qualified teacher, should not be larger than 30 pupil equivalents; believes also that from 2008 there should be a progressive introduction of a maximum class size in nursery and primary classes of no more than 25 pupil equivalents; calls on the Board of Governors to endorse this principle;
22. Calls on the Commission to encourage the development of coefficients in respect of children with certified special educational needs and of pupils whose mother tongue is different from the language in which they receive most of their instruction (Language I), and to ensure that these coefficients are applied when class sizes are calculated;
23. Urges the Commission, working together with the Member States concerned, to find solutions as a matter of urgency in order to deal with the excessively high pupil numbers

at some Schools, which are undermining teaching standards; urges the Board of Governors to take action without delay to combat the overcrowding of the schools in Brussels and Luxembourg; points to the need for proper planning at the right time to develop the infrastructure and facilities required in order for the European Schools to operate;

*(b) Special Educational Needs provision*

24. Calls on the Commission to produce reliable statistics about the extent of the requirements for special needs provision in all the European Schools and further urges the Board of Governors to carry out a survey of provision at each of the European Schools for pupils with special educational needs, including children with physical and/or intellectual disabilities; asks the Board of Governors to draw up a set of minimum standards relating to educational provision, to undertake an accessibility audit of the European Schools so as to ensure that the fabric and design of the buildings are accessible for children with physical disabilities and to take any other steps deemed necessary in order to support all pupils with special educational needs;
25. Calls on the Commission and the Board of Governors of the European Schools to enhance the allocation of resources in terms of finance, staff and expertise with a view to providing first-class education for children with special educational needs and to fully promote the concept of inclusive education, as is the case in other schools across Europe; further calls on the Board of Governors to examine constructive alternatives for those children who are unable to cope with integration in mainstream classes;
26. Believes that, if pupils with special educational needs (SEN) are to benefit from their education at the European Schools, specialist multidisciplinary teams (such as educational psychologists and speech and language therapists) must be set up in Schools to provide support and advice for the teachers, pupils and parents concerned;
27. Calls for one of the larger European Schools to launch a pilot project for an SEN resource centre, comprising qualified personnel with relevant experience and appropriate teaching materials (books, computer software), the role of which would be to provide expert advice and materials for teachers involved in the education of SEN children in the school; calls for financing to be set aside for this project in the 2006 budget;

*(c) The European Baccalaureate*

28. Calls on the Commission to do all in its power to ensure that the Board introduces, by the beginning of the school year 2007-2008, an alternative leaving certificate in parallel to the European Baccalaureate, for pupils who choose to follow a more vocational education;
29. Reiterates its conviction that the increasing exchange of students between European universities, the globalisation of the world economy and the high intrinsic value of the European Baccalaureate justify its wider spread and its full recognition without discrimination by universities in Member States and in third countries;



30. Therefore invites the responsible authorities in the Member States to consider the merits of making the European Baccalaureate more widely available as a school leaving certificate outside the European Schools, on the understanding, however, that the necessary guarantees would have to be in place so as to meet the quality standards on which the Baccalaureate is based;

•

• •

31. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council, the Commission, the Court of Auditors, the Court of Justice, the European Economic and Social Committee, the Committee of the Regions, the Board of Governors of the European Schools and the governments of the Member States.

## EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

### BACKGROUND

1. The Preamble to the Convention defining the Statute of the European Schools<sup>5</sup> - the international Treaty which governs the European Schools - records that 'for the education together of children of the staff of the European Communities in order to ensure the proper functioning of the European Institutions, establishments bearing the name "European School", have been set up from 1957 onwards.' The prime purpose of the European Schools is to provide an education in their mother tongue for the children of officials of the European institutions, thereby contributing to the recruitment and retention of suitably-qualified officials.

2. **The school curriculum:** In the school year 2003-2004, there were twelve European Schools: two more (a second school in Luxembourg and a fourth school in Brussels) will open by the end of the decade. Each pupil is enrolled in a specific language section, normally that of the child's mother-tongue. Each school comprises several language sections but the curricula and syllabuses are the same in all sections. There is a strong emphasis on learning and using foreign languages: all pupils study a first foreign language (English, French or German) from the first year of primary education and a second foreign language (any language taught in the school) from the second year of secondary school. The schools also provide a broad and balanced education in mathematics, science, religion (or ethics), art, music, and physical education. All programmes of study lead to the European Baccalaureate, which is recognised by all Member States and which is broadly comparable in esteem with the International Baccalaureate.

3. The European Communities, as a 'Contracting Party' to the Convention are represented by the Commission on the **Board of Governors**, the body that governs the European Schools. This body decides on educational matters as well as on the budget. All the Member States have one vote, as has the Commission and the European Patent Office.

4. In the school year 2003/2004, **19 267 pupils** were enrolled at the schools. The schools vary considerably in size: 3 802 pupils were enrolled at the Luxembourg school, 647 at Mol (Belgium). Pupils are divided into three categories:

- Category I: children of staff in the service of Community institutions and bodies
- Category II: pupils covered by individual agreements with public bodies or companies
- Category III: other pupils

The proportion of Category I pupils ranged from 81% at Brussels II to 1,6% at Culham (UK). In fact, in 2003-2004, in only four schools were more than one-third of pupils children of EU officials (the three schools in Brussels and that in Luxembourg): in all the others, more than two-thirds of pupils fell into Category II or III. Fees are charged to cover the full cost per Category II pupil: fees of up to EUR 3 657 per year (the level of fees depends on parental income) were charged for Category III pupils at secondary level (the fees for primary and

---

<sup>5</sup> OJ L 212, 17.08.1994, p.3

nursery pupils are lower). In 2005-2006, Category III fees will rise to EUR 4 500 but will still be less than half the average cost per pupil across the system.

5. The **budget** of the European Schools is governed by Articles 13.2 and 25.2 of the Convention. According to the latter, the contribution from the Communities is 'intended to cover the difference between the total amount of expenditure by the Schools and the total of other revenue' i.e. the Communities' contribution is a balancing contribution. Each school has its own budget, as does the Board of Governors: in 2003-2004, the total budget was EUR 222,4 million. About 57% of this - EUR 127 million - came from the European Communities' budget while some 22% was provided by the Member States. Teachers' salaries and allowances (which are based on those of Community officials) account for a large proportion of the schools' budgets. The average cost per pupil in 2003-2004 was EUR 10 361, but this figure varied from one school to another: it cost EUR 8 991 to educate a pupil at the Luxembourg I school, but EUR 15 966 at Mol (Belgium). Two points need to be stressed:

- average costs per pupil at the European Schools compare favourably with those at other schools serving the children of other expatriate officials
- there is a strong correlation between school size and cost per pupil, costs being lowest at the schools in Brussels and Luxembourg and highest at Mol, Bergen, and Culham.

6. A number of questions arising from the development of the European Schools system have led the European Commission to launch a debate about the future of the schools. The schools system - the number of schools, the number of pupils they teach, the number of languages in which instruction is given - has grown dramatically since the 1950s: is it as well-organised and governed as possible? In the past fifty years, there have been important changes in educational policy and practice in the Member States: has the European Schools system taken adequate account of these changes? Finally, as it has expanded, the schools system has become more expensive: does it offer value for money and should the current system for financing the schools be maintained?

7. Some of these questions were raised by the Parliament in its resolution of 17 December 2002 on Financing of the European Schools. In October 2003, the Commission representative on the Board of Governors stated that the Commission would oppose opening any new school, unless this was necessary to create places for the children of EU staff and occurred in locations with existing large schools (i.e. Brussels and Luxembourg): nor would the Commission oppose the transformation or phasing-out of the four schools whose continuation is most difficult to justify with reference to the need to provide mother-tongue education for the children of EU staff. At its meeting in March 2004, the Board of Governors took the decision to close some language sections in these four schools and to increase fees payable by the parents of Category III pupils.

## THE COMMISSION COMMUNICATION

8. **Governance and organisation.** The Communication suggests a number of changes to the current system:

- all the European institutions (not just the Commission but also the Parliament, the Council, the Economic and Social Committee, the Committee of the Regions, the Court of Auditors and the Court of Justice) should have a seat and voting rights on the Board of Governors (the Council should be added to this list)
- the role of the Board should be one of strategic review rather than involvement in detailed management issues: these might be more appropriately dealt with by the Administrative Boards of each of the schools
- an EU agency should be established to administer financial and operational aspects of the schools and to liaise with the EU institutions
- a Code of Good Administrative Conduct should be adopted, the system as a whole should be made more transparent, and the remit of the Complaints Board should be clarified
- the individual schools should be given the final say on the appointment of individual teachers and control over the longer-term planning of staff levels (at present, the Member States nominate seconded teachers; the Schools have full control over the appointment of only local, non-seconded, staff).

9. **Educational and curriculum issues.** Although they are open to the children of all EU officials, the European Schools have in practice been highly academic: in essence, the European Baccalaureate is a university matriculation qualification (a recent study carried out at the Parliament's request showed that about four-fifths of those passing the Baccalaureate go to university). The schools now make some provision for pupils with certified Special Educational Needs (i.e. learning difficulties or physical disabilities), but they make none for the much larger number of pupils who are unable to reach the academic standards required by the Baccalaureate. Class sizes (which may be as large as 32 pupils) are larger than would be permitted under the relevant legislation in a number of Member States: this is particularly regrettable because, since the most recent enlargement of the EU, many classes contain pupils whose mother-tongue is different from that of the language section in which they have been placed. For example, there is no Latvian, Lithuanian or Estonian language section in Brussels: all pupils with these languages as their mother tongue are being directed to the Brussels II school, where they will be taught in the English, French or German language sections.

10. The Communication acknowledges that responsibility for educational issues within the system lies primarily with the Member States (represented on the Board of Governors). But it underlines that it (and, by implication, the other EU institutions) have a legitimate interest in ensuring that the schools offer a broad, modern curriculum and examination system, since the quality of the education offered by the schools is important for the recruitment and retention of suitably-qualified staff. It suggests a number of changes:

- greater attention should be given to developing appropriate support for the education of pupils with learning difficulties and physical disabilities (Special Educational Needs)
- a study should be carried out of the feasibility of offering a leaving certificate other than the European Baccalaureate, specifically tailored for less academically able pupils

- consideration should be given to ways to reduce the maximum class size
- consideration should be given to the establishment of a European Schools' Education Council, with responsibility for setting of curricula, inspections and final examination of both the European Baccalureate and any alternative leaving certificate
- the option of offering the European Baccalaureate outside the current schools system should be considered.

11. **Future arrangements for financing the schools.** Inevitably, as the Commission acknowledges, the European Schools are more expensive than conventional state schools in the Member States. The educational model they follow is based on teaching in a number of languages by expatriate teachers; and, in many of the smaller language sections, class sizes are smaller than would be deemed economical in Member States. While defending the European Schools, the Commission nevertheless identifies several areas in which improvements could be made so as to ensure effective budgetary planning and control and demonstrate value for money:

- the Commission proposes to continue the practice it began in 2004 of announcing in advance a ceiling on its contribution to the budget of the system as a whole and will expect the European Schools' budget presented to take this fully into account
- it suggests that, in the longer term, the Member States and the European Community institutions might consider whether they wish to maintain the current division of responsibility for the financing of the schools.
- it proposes that transparent and publicly-available criteria governing the admission of Category III pupils and the level of fees they are to be charged should be drawn up
- it urges that the longer-term future of four of the smaller schools (in Bergen, Culham, Karlsruhe and Mol) should be considered in the light of an external evaluation currently being carried out at the Commission's request.

\* \* \*

15.6.2005

## OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON BUDGETS

for the Committee on Culture and Education

on options for developing the European Schools system  
(2004/2237(INI))

Draftsman: Herbert Bösch

### SUGGESTIONS

The Committee on Budgets calls on the Committee on Culture and Education, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following suggestions in its motion

. for a resolution:

Suggestion 1  
Citation 3 a (new)

- *having regard to the annual report of the Secretary General of the Board of Governors of the European Schools from 1-2 February 2005*<sup>6</sup>,

Suggestion 2  
Recital E

- E. whereas, while the European Community contributes well over half of the running costs of the European Schools, the European Commission is the only European institution represented on the Board of Governors of the European Schools ***and therefore the Budgetary authority of the Communities is not appropriately involved in the decision-making process;***

Suggestion 3  
Paragraph 1 a (new)

---

<sup>6</sup> document 1612-D-2004-en-1; [http://www.eursc.org/SE/htmlEn/IndexEn\\_home.html](http://www.eursc.org/SE/htmlEn/IndexEn_home.html)

***1a. Believes that a solution for all work places of de-centralized agencies has urgently to be found;***

Suggestion 4  
Paragraph 1 b (new)

***1b. Believes that Member States hosting one of the new de-centralized agencies have to take over more financial responsibility for the children of the staff and that appropriate solutions must be found for all the new working places;***

Suggestion 5  
Paragraph 1 c (new)

***1c. Regrets that such solution had not been found at the moment when the work places of these agencies were decided, with the exception of the European Food Security Authority (EFSA) in Parma;***

Suggestion 6  
Paragraph 1 d (new)

***1d. Believes that, in these cases, the cooperation of European Schools with regional or local schools on the spot that could provide a European baccalaureate is a viable option and should be aimed at quality of education, European integration, language diversity and even mobility of labour;***

Suggestion 7  
Paragraph 3

**3. Believes that the balancing contribution from the Communities must not develop into an open-ended commitment; *welcomes, therefore, the proposal by the Commission of a ceiling on the Communities' contribution to the European Schools budget before the Board of Governors has presented its estimate of the revenue and expenditure of the Schools for the following financial year, allowing incentives for better resource management, increases in income, and cost savings without reducing the quality of service provided;***

Suggestion 8  
Paragraph 4

**4. Underlines, however, that the nature of the Communities' contribution to the schools' budgets is set out clearly in Article 25.2 of the Convention defining the Statute of the European Schools; *deletion***

Suggestion 9  
Paragraph 5

5. Considers that the current arrangement, whereby Member States second teachers to the European Schools is not equitable since Member States providing teachers who teach in a widely-spoken language (for example, the United Kingdom, the Republic of Ireland *with 308* and *Germany and Austria with 239 out from 1.390 seconded teachers*<sup>7</sup>) bear a disproportionate financial burden; ***more autonomy for European Schools is requested also regarding the recruitment of teachers, which would increase the responsibility of the European Schools and lead to a more efficient system;***

Suggestion 10  
Paragraph 10

10. Calls upon the Commission to publish, as soon as practicable, the external study it has paid for examining the long-term future of the four schools (in Bergen, Culham, Karlsruhe and Mol) whose existence can no longer be justified by reference to the need to provide mother-tongue education for the children of officials of the European institutions; ***clear, detailed, and publicly available criteria for the creation and closure of linguistic sections or even European Schools must however be applied in order to allow long-term planning;***

Suggestion 11  
Paragraph 13

13. Notes that the Community currently pays a balancing contribution equivalent to some 57% of the annual cost of the European Schools system, ***whereas the Member States contribute with 22 %; believes, therefore, that the European Commission as representative of the Communities should bear an appropriate percentage of voting rights in the Board of Governors;***

Suggestion 12  
Paragraph 14

*deleted*

---

<sup>7</sup> source: document 1612-D-2004-en-1; [http://www.eursc.org/SE/htmlEn/IndexEn\\_home.html](http://www.eursc.org/SE/htmlEn/IndexEn_home.html), page 19



Suggestion 13  
Paragraph 17

17. *Notes that in September 2004 the Board of Governors adopted a series of new regulations having as an effect the reduction of the number of participants at Board of Governors meetings; calls for adequate representation of parents and other stakeholders, for example staff and pupils, on both the Board of Governors and on the Administrative Boards of individual schools, in order to make their decisions more transparent;*



## PROCEDURE

<b>Title</b>	Options for developing the European Schools system	
<b>Procedure number</b>	2004/2237(INI)	
<b>Legal basis</b>		
<b>Basis in Rules of Procedure</b>	Rule 45	
<b>Committee responsible</b>	CULT	
Date authorisation announced in plenary	16.12.2004	
<b>Committee(s) asked for opinion(s)</b>	BUDG	
Date announced in plenary	16.12.2004	
<b>Not delivering opinion(s)</b>		
Date of decision		
<b>Enhanced cooperation</b>		
Date announced in plenary		
<b>Motion(s) for resolution(s) included in report</b>		
<b>Rapporteur(s)</b>	Mary Honeyball	
Date appointed	22.9.2004	
<b>Previous rapporteur(s)</b>		
<b>Discussed in committee</b>	24.5.2005	
<b>Date adopted</b>	15.6.2005	
<b>Result of final vote</b>	for:	26
	against:	0
	abstentions:	1
<b>Members present for the final vote</b>	María Badía i Cutchet, Guy Bono, Marie-Hélène Descamps, Věra Flasarová, Milan Gašpar, Claire Gibault, Vasco Graça Moura, Erna Hennicot-Schoepges, Ruth Hieronymi, Bernat Joan i Marí, Marianne Mikko, Ljudmila Novak, Doris Pack, Zdzisław Zbigniew Podkański, Christa Prets, Karin Resetarits, Pál Schmitt, Nikolaos Sifunakis, Hannu Takkula, Helga Trüpel, Henri Weber, Thomas Wise	
<b>Substitutes present for the final vote</b>	Adamos Adamou, Gyula Hegyi, Mary Honeyball, Ignasi Guardans Cambó, Jaroslav Zvěřina	
<b>Substitutes under Rule 178(2) present for the final vote</b>		
<b>Date tabled – A6</b>	20.6.2005	A6-0200/2005
<b>Comments</b>	...	