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The world we have made as a result of the level of thinking we have done this far creates problems that cannot be solved at the same level at which we created them - Albert Einstein

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this research is the analysis of the perceptions of the stakeholders on the strengths, weaknesses and reform of the European School system. Reform of educational systems is a recurrent phenomenon but over the last two decades the involvement of all stakeholders has been getting more attention. Traditionally the persons involved in education were vertically defined or involved in the financial decisions, while lately other, horizontal groups are also involved, such as parents and students. The reform of the European School system started by top-down decisions and affected parties were not very involved. This study focuses on all parties and tries to describe the perceptions they have of the reform. Since the reform touches all fields of the system, the context of the European Schools, their strengths and weaknesses and the stakeholders’ perceptions of these strengths and weaknesses are taken into account. By giving voice to all groups involved, ideas for change and improvements may result and awareness of the model of the European Schools may rise.

At the time the European Schools were created the mission was twofold:

---

1 In The New Quotable Einstein (2005), editor Alice Calaprice suggests that this quote may have been paraphrased from a quote in the article "Atomic Education Urged by
• To provide a solution for the children of the European official by offering mobility through teaching mother tongue thus assuring the child to be able to go back to National systems.
• To become laboratories for pedagogical experiments of mother tongue teaching, multilingualism, multicultural education, and harmonizing the European curriculum.

The aim of the schools was expressed in the words of Jean Monnet¹ in 1953:

Educated side by side, untroubled from infancy by divisive prejudices, acquainted with all that is great and good in the different cultures, it will be borne in upon them as they mature that they belong together. Without ceasing to look to their own lands with love and pride, they will become in mind Europeans, schooled and ready to complete and consolidate the work of their fathers before them, to bring into being a united and thriving Europe.

Authors about the European Schools (Beatens Beardsmore, 1993; Gray, 2003; Swan, 1996) stress the importance of the political values involved in their creation. Gray (2003) says this declaration is “unashamedly Eurocentric, arguably patriarchal (see the reference to ‘fathers’, for instance), and perhaps implicitly elitist” with its suggestion that European School students would be the builders of the ‘united and thriving Europe’, and at the same time forward-looking and ‘visionary’: “Yet if the European Schools set out to be institutions of the future, they were also very much of their time- a time pregnant with historical possibilities” (p. 316).

¹ These words are sealed into the foundation stones of every European School. Most agree that these words are from Jean Monnet, the “Father of Europe” but Gray (2003) refers to these words as being from Marcel Decombis, who worked in Jean Monnet’s cabinet at the time of the founding of the first European School.
More than 50 years after the creation of the European School system, it is undergoing a major reform. Was the reform process an answer to the growing system, the result of a global trend, a response to the critics or was it necessary to fit the changing role of education? So far academic studies on the European Schools were mainly focused on the multilingual and multicultural aspect of the schools. With this research an attempt is made to add insight into the process of reform so far by involving stakeholders and their perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of the European School System, the impact of the reform on their life and work, their hopes, their knowledge and usage of autonomy elements, opening up and the reform of the European Baccalaureate.
CHAPTER I. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

1. Objectives and structure of the European Schools

The European Schools started in October 1953 in Luxembourg, at the initiative of officials of the European Coal and Steel Community, with the support of the Community's Institutions and the Government of Luxembourg. This experiment in education with children of different mother tongues and nationalities quickly took shape as the six different governments and Ministries of Education co-operated in matters of curricula, appointment of teachers, inspection and recognition of levels attained. In April 1957, the signing of the Protocol made the Luxembourg School the first official European School. The first European Baccalaureate was held there in July 1959 and the qualification was recognized as fulfilling basic entrance requirements by all the universities of the Member States\(^3\).

The European Schools try to offer a unique opportunity for pupils to stay connected with their mother tongue while being educated in a multilingual and multicultural environment in order to become open minded citizens. On the official website of the European Schools you can find the objectives and principles. The core objectives are: both developing high standards in the mother tongue and in foreign languages and developing mathematical and scientific skills throughout the whole period of schooling. Furthermore the European Schools seek to encourage creativity in music and the arts and an appreciation of all that is best developed in a common European artistic heritage; developing physical skills and instilling in pupils an appreciation of the need for healthy living through participation in

\(^3\) Source: Official website of the European Schools: www.eursc.eu.
sporting and recreational activities; and offering pupils professional guidance in their choice of subjects and in career/university decisions in the later years of the secondary school. The most interesting objectives refer to attitude or outlook on life: giving pupils confidence in their own cultural identity – the bedrock for their development as European citizens; providing a broad education of high quality, from nursery level to university-entrance; encouraging a European and global perspective overall and particularly in the study of the human sciences; to foster tolerance, co-operation, communication and concern for others throughout the school community and beyond; and cultivating pupils’ personal, social and academic development and preparing them for the next stage of education.

Concerning the principles, most are formulated to safeguard the mother tongue: basic instruction is given in the official languages of the European Union. This principle allows the primacy of the pupil’s mother tongue (L1) to be safeguarded. Consequently, each school comprises several language sections. Most remarkable are the reasons for the focus on foreign languages: to foster the unity of the school and encourage genuine multicultural education, there is a strong emphasis on the learning, the understanding and the use of foreign languages. This is developed in a variety of ways: the study of a first foreign language (English, French or German) is compulsory throughout the school, from the first year of primary education: all pupils must study a second foreign language, starting in the second year of secondary school. Pupils may choose to study a third foreign language from the fourth year of secondary school. Language classes are composed of mixed nationalities and are taught by native speakers; a weekly “European Hour” in the primary school brings together children from all sections for cultural, artistic and games activities; in the secondary school, classes in art, music and
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physical education are always composed of mixed nationalities; from the third class of secondary school, history and geography are studied in the pupil’s first foreign language, also called "the working language" (English, French or German). Economics, which may be taken as an option from the fourth class of the secondary school, is also studied in a working language. From the third class, therefore, all social science subjects are taught to groups of mixed nationalities; finally, everyday interaction in the playground, the corridors and the recreation rooms enhances the acquisition of other languages and the realisation that using them is not only vital but natural. (www.eursc.eu, 2011).

These objectives are hardly unique to the European Schools, but they include two that relate very directly to the underpinning values of the system. The first is that schools should ‘give pupils confidence in their own cultural identity – the bedrock for their development as European citizens’. The second is ‘to encourage a European and global perspective’ and ‘encourage genuine multicultural education’. (Gray, 2003).

Several experts (Beatens Beardsmore, 1993; Housen, 2008, 2002; Swan, 1996) stress that the European School system is quite unique and that the basis is pupils’ own cultural identity while a European and global perspective is added gradually. Swan (1996) adds the fact that it is a continuous education (from kindergarten through to primary and secondary, up to the university entrance), mostly together in one campus, and that the European Schools are considerably more complex than any international school because the European Schools must build their curricula based on equality of esteem amongst the Member States, meaning that all children, languages and cultures are to be treated equally. This leads to some principles that determine the nature of the programme in the schools. First of all, the child’s distinct national, cultural and linguistic identity must be maintained, underlining the significance of
instruction in the first language. Throughout schooling the child must build up competence in a second language through which he or she will be able to learn content matter and take examinations. The higher the child progresses in the school the more lessons are taught via the medium of a second or third language and harmonized curricula were put in place to allow children to mix across sections and to integrate (Beatens Beardsmore, 1993) and (Gray, 2003).

The schools provide nursery, primary and secondary education. They provide free education for children of personnel of the European Institutions. According to the “Facts and figures on the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year in the European Schools”: in 2010 72,93% of the pupils are considered to be of “category 1” (child of a European official). These pupils are exempt from school fees. Other children may be admitted depending on the availability of places and are subject to the payment of a yearly fee. In 2010 5,2% of the pupils were of the so-called “category 2” (company contract with European School). The fees for pupils of category 2 vary per school and were between 10.000 and 16.000 euros for the school year 2011-2012. Almost 22% Is considered “category 3” (pupils who do not belong to Category 1 or 2). Fees for category 3 for the school year 2011-2012 are 2.702,76 euro for nursery, 3.716,34 euro for primary, and 5.067,74 euro for secondary (Board of Governors, 2010a).

There are currently fourteen schools in seven countries with more than 22.000 pupils. There are five European Schools in Belgium (four in Brussels and one in Mol) and they are discussing building a fifth school in Brussels. The current fourteen schools are:

1. Luxemburg I (Kirchberg) (Luxemburg), founded in 1953
2. Brussels I (Uccle) (Belgium), founded in 1958
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3. Mol, (Belgium), founded in 1960
4. Varese (Italy), founded in 1960
5. Karlsruhe (Germany), founded in 1962
6. Bergen (Netherlands), founded in 1963
7. Brussels II (Woluwe) (Belgium), founded in 1974
8. Munich (Germany), founded in 1977
9. Culham (United Kingdom), founded in 1978
10. Brussels III (Ixelles) (Belgium), founded in 2000
11. Frankfurt-am-Main (Germany), founded in 2002
12. Alicante (Spain), founded in 2002
13. Brussels IV (Laeken), temporarily situated in Berkendael, opened in 2006
14. Luxembourg II (Bertrange/Mamer) (Luxembourg), to be opened in 2012.

The fourteen schools have a common curriculum that is centrally controlled by the Board of Inspectors and the Board of Governors. Supervision of the education provided by the schools is conducted by two Boards of Inspectors, one for the primary and nursery sections and one for the secondary section. One Inspector from each country sits on each Board. The Inspectors regularly visit classes, issue directives to heads and teaching staff, meet periodically for discussions and submit proposals concerning syllabi, teaching methods and evaluation to the Board of Governors. The Board of Inspectors also have the responsibility for staff recruitment. The majority of teachers in the European School system are appointed by their Member State and sent to the European Schools for a period of maximum 9 years.

The Board of Governors is the governing body of the European Schools and is composed of the Ministers of Education of each of the
Union countries, representatives of the EU Commission, of the European Patent Office, designated by the Staff Committee (from among the teaching staff) and representatives of the parents designated by the Parents’ Associations. The mandate of the Board of Governors covers educational, administrative and financial matters. When it is not in session, its powers are exercised by its officially appointed Secretary-General⁴.

The European Baccalaureate is a two year course and assesses at the end of secondary education the performance of students in the subjects taught. It is awarded only by fourteen European Schools (and Parma as well as soon more Type 2 schools) and should be distinguished from the International Baccalaureate (IB)⁵ and the baccalaureate of various national systems⁶. In final examinations all pupils are expected to take content-matter examinations, both written and oral, at least in their first and second language. Examination criteria are theoretically the same whether the pupil is taking an examination through the medium of the first or the second language. The European Baccalaureate requires students to take 11 subjects, all of which are weighted equally for the final mark (given as a percentage, where 60% is a pass).

The European Baccalaureate is administered and directly supervised by an external examining board appointed annually by the Board of Governors. The examining board consists of up to three representatives of each member state, who must satisfy the conditions governing the appointment of equivalent examining boards in their respective countries. It is presided over by a senior university educator.

⁴ Source: www.eursc.eu, the official website of the European Schools, where also the detailed curriculum can be found.
⁵ Founded in 1968, the International Baccalaureate foundation currently works with 3,417 schools in 141 countries to develop and offer programmes to over 1,025,000 students aged 3 to 19 years.
⁶ Details of this examination are set out in the Annex of the Statute of the European School and in the Regulations for the European Baccalaureate, available from the schools.
appointed by each member state in turn, assisted by a member of the Board of Inspectors of the schools.

2. Evolution of the European Schools

In this section the evolution of the European Schools and the adaptation to the context will be analysed. Because of the enlargement of Europe and the creation of more schools, the complexity of the European School system grew considerably. The following figures show the increase of countries in the European Unions, therefore increasing the languages taught at the European Schools and the increase of the number of European Schools.

Figure 1. Growth EU and languages in ES from 1953 to 1995.
As shown in figure 1, at the start of the first European School, there were only 6 countries in the European Union: Belgium, Netherlands, Luxemburg, France, Italy and West-Germany. It was not until 1973, when three more countries entered: Denmark, Ireland and United Kingdom. In 1981 Greece entered, in 1986 Spain and Portugal and in 1995 Austria, Finland and Sweden. From 1953 to 1995, the number of countries grew from six to fifteen. Following this development, the number of languages in the European Schools grew from five to eleven covering the mother tongues of these countries.

![Figure 2](imageurl)  
**Figure 2.** Growth EU and languages from 2004 to present.

---

7 In 1953 it was the European Coal & Steel Community that merged with the European Economic Community in 1967 to European Communities that was taken over by the European Union in 1993.

8 Numbers from the SWALS table on p.15-18 in Facts & Figures on the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year in the European Schools (Board of Governors, 2010a). Only 21 of 23 languages of the European Union are taught as mother tongue at the ES, no trace of Maltese and Irish.
As shown in figure 2, in 2004 ten more countries entered the European Union: Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Malta, and Cyprus, which added eight more mother tongues to the European Schools. In 2007 Bulgaria and Romania entered and added the last two languages so far. At present, the European Union contains 27 countries with 23 languages, which have resulted in 21 mother tongues taught in the European Schools, for which fifteen language sections have been created\(^9\).

To visualize the increased complexity of the European Schools, figure 3 and figure 4 were created.

\[\text{Figure 3. Number of languages taught in ES 1953 to present.}\]

\(^9\) There are a total of fifteen languages that have reached the necessary amount of pupils in one of the schools to create a Language Section. Each school has a different amount of Language Sections. For example Bergen has three language sections and Luxembourg I has twelve language sections. Pupils that have no Language Section are called SWALS (Students without a Language section). They will go into one of the existing Language Sections of the school and get mother tongue tuition.
Figure 3 shows the number of languages taught in the European Schools from the beginning to present, which has grown explosively especially in the last seven to fifteen years.

Figure 4 shows that the number of European Schools from start to present has grown constantly but there was always a steady period for many years, during eleven years from 1963 to 1974 there were six schools, and for 22 years, from 1978 to 2000, there were nine schools. In 2012 the fourteenth school will open.

![Figure 4. Number of European Schools from 1953 to 2012.](image)

It must be noted that with every new country that entered the European Union, not only languages and pupils were added to the European School system but also stakeholders. As the European Schools are governed by an intergovernmental body - the Board of Governors -
each time a new country enters, a new governor is added to the system. This resulted amongst others in a change in the number of representatives from each stakeholder group. For example in 2004, the Board of Governors had grown so much that, for practical reasons, instead of two parent representatives from each school, two persons in total, representing all associations of parents, were invited to the meetings.

2.1 Globalisation, Europeanization and multiculturalism

While the complexity increased inside the schools, the world around the schools also changed considerably in the last few decades. In the literature review arguments can be found that suggest that the effects of globalisation demanded a changing role of education that in turn seems to have initiated a widespread school reform.

2.1.1 Globalisation

Globalisation is mostly associated with economic globalisation; however the expansion of global linkages, organization of social life on a global scale, and growth of global consciousness has an enormous impact on people’s lives. Globalisation and technological advancements have sped up life as we know it and made it more complex. It has resulted in rapid and often unpredictable change for many organizations. (Beairsto, Klein, & Ruohotie, 2003). The impact on the organization of education is considerable. On the one hand there has been a clear trend towards marketization of education\(^{10}\) in countries around the world recently; on the other hand schools are becoming more business-like in their approach.

---

\(^{10}\) Marketization refers to the process that enables the state-owned enterprises to act like market-oriented firms.
(Codrington, 2004; MacDonald, 2006). In relation to globalisation, some say the world is shrinking. Even those who will never have the opportunity to travel to another country can experience other ways of living via television and the Internet. You could say that the notion of education serving to transmit only the national culture is no longer sufficient (Hill, 2006). Therefore demand for international education increased. Schools that were originally founded to educate the children of expatriates have come to offer an attractive alternative to local families. Parallel with this development, many International Schools have evolved from a school with a discernible national accent to one with a genuinely international attitude to staff recruitment, curriculum, ethos and mission. In times of borderless frontiers, international corporations and networks are taking over education services.

2.1.2 Europeanization

World-wide globalisation did not leave education in Europe indifferent. Antunes (2006), Lawn (2003) and Novoa (2002; 2010) argue for a European Educational Space. In this context, Europe, Europeification and Europeanization are terms that are used for a project, a space of meaning, to face common internal and external challenges. The value of common action and coordination is recognized. Global European references for education policies are being set up. In this perspective, the European Union and other intergovernmental platforms, such as the Bologna process\textsuperscript{11} constitute settings for mediation that can create, filter and convey the globalisation process. By working together globalisation

\textsuperscript{11} The Bologna Declaration is a pledge by 29 countries to reform the structures of their higher education systems in a convergent way.
does not just happen to education, but the European Union can have an active role in the process.

Without education, there can be no Europe. Andres Hingel (2001), head of the education policy unit at the European Commission says:

What is presently happening in co-operation in the field of education tells us, that not only is a European Space of Education in its making, common principles of education are being agreed upon between Member States, leading logically to a European Model of Education

Core to the Europeanization process, according to the abovementioned authors (amongst others Lawn, 2003), the following three elements are needed to construct the European educational space: Knowledge, Citizenship and Competence.

Concerning knowledge, in order to be able to take an active part in the current processes of change, the citizens of Europe will be able to develop their fund of knowledge on a continuous basis, thus continually expanding and renewing it.

The educational area of citizenship will facilitate an enhancement of citizenship through the sharing of common values, and the development of a sense of belonging to a common social and cultural area. It must encourage a broader-based understanding of citizenship, founded on active solidarity and on mutual understanding of the cultural diversities that constitute Europe’s originality and richness.

By competence is meant developing employability through the acquisition of competencies made necessary through changes in work and its organization. This means that it is necessary to promote, on a lifelong

\[12]\text{Marking in bold characters in original text.}\]
basis, creativity, flexibility, adaptability and abilities to learn and solve problems\(^1\).

2.1.3 Multiculturalism

Multiculturalism is a perspective that promotes the institutionalisation of communities containing multiple cultures. It is used for a wide variety of meanings, ranging from the advocacy of equal respect to the various cultures in a society, to policies of promoting the maintenance of cultural diversity. A common aspect of many such policies is that they avoid presenting any specific ethnic, religious, or cultural community values as central.

Pupils of the European Schools learn in a multicultural environment, with an anchor in their mother tongue and culture, as they construct the meaning of the world together, in the context of pupils and teachers coming from all over Europe. The conceptual foundation for much current work in the field of context learning or situated learning was laid down long ago by theorists as Mead (1934), Piaget (1954), and Vygotsky (1978). As Piaget put it:

> The principal goal of education in the schools should be creating men and women who are capable of doing new things, not simply repeating what other generations have done (p.14).

Only recently researchers (Resnick & Teasley, 1991) have begun to take seriously the ideas of these important thinkers regarding socially shared cognition. Theorists propose that the biologically grounded process

\(^1\) From “Towards a Knowledge-Based Europe”, EC Commissioner for Education - Edith Cresson, 1997.
of interpretation and constraining structures will produce common ideas if individuals grow up in similar environments. Resnick & Teasley (1991) reason that not only theories but even ways of reasoning themselves are socially determined. Cognitive tools also include the forms of reasoning and argumentation that are accepted as normative in given cultures. Both Mead and Vygotsky proposed that mechanisms of thought are best conceived as internalizations of ways of behaving first engaged in externally, in interaction with others. Mead called thought “conversation with the generalized other”, implying that as we think individually we attempt to respond to the imagined responses of others to our ideas and arguments. Each individual’s cultural patrimony is language, which mediates all thought. The phenomenon of code-switching shows that people can belong to multiple discourse communities, each enabling and constraining thought in different ways. Chaiklin and Lave (1996) argue similarly:

The idea of learning as cognitive acquisition whether of facts, knowledge, problem-solving strategies, or metacognitive skills - seems to dissolve when learning is conceived of as the construction of present versions of past experience for several persons acting together (p. 8).

In their theoretical treatise (Lave & Wenger, 1991), Jean Lave, anthropologist, and Etienne Wenger, computer scientist, push forward the notion of situated learning - that learning is fundamentally a social process and not solely a process in the learner's head. The authors maintain that learning viewed as situated activity has as its central defining characteristic a process they call legitimate peripheral participation. Learners participate in communities of practitioners, moving toward full participation in the sociocultural practices of a community. Legitimate peripheral participation (as in a school environment) provides a way to
speak about crucial relations and about their activities, identities, artefacts, knowledge and practice.

Also the teachers of the European Schools learn in context. Ladson-Billings (1999) quotes one of his student’s lectures:

In order to help the child learn, the teacher himself must discover the reference points from which the child starts...In every so-called “lesson”, the pupil always has something to tell the teacher; he may tell her what he has already learned that either aids or obstructs the new learning the teacher seeks to instigate. The slum pupil, to cite a case, cannot learn the teacher’s culture well until his teacher learns enough about the slum culture to understand what the pupil’s words and learning-acts mean (p. 216).

Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999) distinguish three conceptions of teacher learning: knowledge-for-practice, knowledge-in-practice and knowledge-of-practice. Knowledge-for-practice assumes that university researchers generate content and pedagogical knowledge for teachers to use. Teaching is applying received knowledge in a classroom situation. "Teachers are knowledge users, not generators". Knowledge-in-practice assumes that practical teaching knowledge comes through experience. Thus "teaching is a wise action in the midst of uncertain and changing situations". Knowledge-of-practice assumes that teachers play a central role in generating knowledge of practice by "making their classrooms and schools sites for inquiry, connecting their work in schools to larger issues, and taking a critical perspective on the theory and research of others". This way teachers’ knowledge can provide an analytic framework for how knowledge and practice are related and how teachers and pupils learn within communities. Teachers of the European Schools could add valuable contribution to research in this field, since the European Schools have
several communities with plural languages and cultures within the school community.

In their glossary, Martínez Ruiz and Sauleda Parés (2007) define diversity in two ways: equity in access and equity in background. They say education should be:

Un laboratorio para el pluralismo. Esta pluralidad se caracteriza por la diversidad de teorías y métodos de investigación, la internacionalización de profesores y estudiantes y una diversidad lingüística y cultural (p. 53).

Conflicts around the globe represent physical clashes between cultures. The root of the problem is the lack of understanding of each other’s culture. This is why education for intercultural awareness and understanding is so important. Hill (2006) defines five overlapping features that contribute to an effective school programme of international education, and therefore of international understanding: exposure to cultural diversity within the school; teachers as role models of international mindedness; a balanced, formal curriculum with an international perspective and open, critical approach; management practice that is value consistent with institutional international philosophy; and finally exposure to cultural diversity outside the school.

From the above we can summarize that the multicultural aspect of the school is related to notions like context learning, situated learning, diversity and intercultural awareness. A child constructs meaning in relation to others. If, in the case of the European Schools, the context is diverse, the child will be enabled to learn in several different languages and cultures within one learning community. Similarly, teachers learn in context and the teachers of the European Schools are in the unique
position to learn knowledge-in-practice and contribute to knowledge-of-practice of how teachers and pupils learn in a very diverse learning community. Lastly, the multicultural aspect of the schools adds to intercultural awareness which leads, as is argued, to international understanding.

2.2 Changing role of education and democratisation

Karsten (2006) and Carneiro & Draxler (2008) argue that the role of education has changed in the last few decades. While conflicts between countries diminished in the second half of the 20th century compared to the proceeding hundred years, conflict within countries increased markedly in the latter decades. The expansion of education opportunity did not reach, or not adequately, the poorest segments of society. Education’s role in providing steps up on the economic ladder weakened. People are less and less satisfied with the quality of the public educational system. Still education is seen as the solution to many social problems. Stakeholders (society, parents, government and politics) expect education to provide a workforce that is prepared to face the challenges societies have dealt with. Many ideological, economic and policy changes in the approach to the role of education in society emerged in the last few decades.

As an answer to the changing need of the role of education, attempts to establish a closer relationship between education and social harmony were made, one of them coming from the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). In 1993 they established a Commission on Education for the twenty-first Century, chaired by Jacques Delors. In 1996 they published: ‘Learning: the Treasure Within’, built on four pillars: learning to know, learning to do,
learning to be, and learning to live together. Especially Learning to live together was to induce people to implement common projects or to manage the inevitable conflicts in an intelligent and peaceful way, by developing an understanding of others and their history, traditions and spiritual values and, on this basis, creating a new spirit which was guided by recognition of our growing independence and a common analysis of the risks and challenges of the future.

Dewey says in 1916: “[O]ne cannot share in intercourse with others without learning—without getting a broader point of view and perceiving things of which one would otherwise be ignorant. There is perhaps no better definition of culture than that it is the capacity for constantly expanding in range and accuracy one’s perception of meanings” (p.145). According to Dewey what characterises a democratically constituted society is shared common interest as a factor in social control and change in social habit, through continuous readjustment meeting new situations produced by varied intercourse. The democratic community should be more interested in education than any other community because of the continuous progress.

Dewey might have been right as an article in the New York Times (2009) provides statistical proof for “there are basically no countries with very low levels of education that have managed to be democratic over the long term, and almost every country with a high level of education has remained a stable democracy”.

According to De Winter (2011) famous philosophers and educators, such as Kant, Dewey, Montessori and Freire, put a direct link between the social and political abuses of their time and the way children were raised. On that analysis, they derived the ambition to use educational reforms to improve the world. De Winter, Schillemans and Janssens (2006) argue that “against the background of declining confidence in democratic
institutions, increasing radicalization and reduced tolerance, the significance of education for a democratic society is more important than ever. " It is important to understand and internalize democratic citizenship, humanity and freedom. What does it mean to live in a democratic society in which you're entitled to your own identity, but in which you must allow others the same right? How do you offer resistance to the seductive “us-them” thinking that gives, on the one hand, a secure feeling of connectedness, but on the other side, the risk of exclusion and dehumanisation?

In Preparing Teachers for a Changing World Darling-Hammond & Bransford (2005) argue for teaching as a profession that serves democratic purposes. What teaching has in common with a range of other professions is that the work serves others and, because of its social importance, must do so responsibly. Moreover, according to them, recent research demonstrates how important teaching is to children’s learning and life chance.

2.3 Governance: accountability, autonomy and leadership

Besides the multicultural character, another important aspect of the European Schools is its intergovernmental governance structure. In the following paragraph will be explored what the literature revealed concerning governance and the reforms thereof that are going on in response to the changing contexts of schools. In this context, accountability, autonomy and leadership are discussed.
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2.3.1 Accountability

Hirsch and Thomson (1999) distinguish between government and governance; where government deals with the institutions of the state that control and regulate life in a community, governance is the control of an activity by such means that a range of desired outcomes are achieved. Besides, in governance, control can be performed by a wide variety of public and private, state and non-state, national and international, institutions and practices.

Educational reform today can be seen as a shift from government to governance, from bureaucratic control to a set of governance relationships. Such a shift in governing implies changes in school management and steering. This includes greater use of private sector management practices, explicit and measurable standards of performance and so forth. Keywords that are used are new managerialism, leadership, professionalism, accountability and evaluation, as well as consumer choice (Chubb & Moe, 1988; Cribb & Gewirtz, 1997; Lindblad, Johannesson, & Simola, 2002; Karsten, Roeleveld, Ledoux, Felix & Elshof, 2002). There is external governance and internal governance, external governance deals with relationships and networks outside the school, such as local and central government, agencies and authorities. Internal governance is focused on building relationships with stakeholders within a school, namely staff, students and parents (see Clarke, 2009, p. 14). Some refer to governance as the withdrawal of government from a particular arena, although the need to provide a framework for operation of that arena must still be provided: what Glatter describes as ‘governing without government’ (Glatter, 2004).

Karsten et al. (2006) explain that in 2005 the Minister of Education of the Netherlands launched a ‘governance letter’ that proposed a new
management philosophy. Central in this philosophy is the idea that educational institutions are responsible for their own quality and processes of quality improvement. To achieve this, a culture is needed in which continuous reflection and feedback is natural. Incentives for improving and innovation should come from within. They have to be fed by the wishes and opinions of the stakeholders: pupils, parents, supplying and receiving education and agencies of the local community, youth care and relevant players of the local labour market. Of the educational institutions it is expected that they want to justify themselves towards these stakeholders. As a supplement to traditional, vertical accountability, important improvement is sought in horizontal accountability14. Three major aspects of horizontal accountability can be defined: performance-information (an actor simply explains to the forum what he/she did), quality charters and performance contracts (formalized expectations of operations), and participative or consultative fora (stakeholder dialogue).

An important difference with the traditional, vertical forms of accountability is that there are normally no formal sanction possibilities (the Director cannot be fired), but Karsten et al. (2006) define other possibilities of sanction: Exit and Voice15. Exit is also referred to as “voting with the feet”. This mechanism has it limits, especially in the case of the European Schools, for example in some areas the European School is the only real option for parents, like MacKenzie says: “Less clear is the degree to which expatriates in a foreign country on a fixed-term assignment can be said to have ‘chosen’ an international school, especially when there exists only one such school in their location” (MacKenzie, 2010, p. 108). Voice includes all forms of formal and informal

14 Translated from (Karsten, de Jong, Ledoux, & Sligte, 2006, p. 3).
consultation. If neither of these possibilities is used, it can be referred to as “silence”.

The idea of moving decisions “close to the customer” originated in research on effective corporations in the 1980s and the Effective Schools movement of the same era reflects that research. An example of the link between decentralisation and accountability is the plan of the mayor of Los Angeles (United States of America), discussed by Kerchner (2007). The plan displays an increasingly sophisticated understanding of what is necessary to decentralize school operations effectively. Earlier systemic reform plans failed to link decentralization and accountability for results. "...provide additional compensation for those teachers that take on substantial additional responsibility and deliver results at schools." By linking decentralization to accountability for outcomes, the mayor reinserted teachers into the reform process. "If decisions about employment, budget, and program move to schools, as the mayor advocates, this threatens everything else in the school bureaucracy, too.... Autonomy is linked to accountability and support mechanisms" (Kerchner, 2007, p. 1). Direct involvement in governance means that school leaders are increasingly involved in legal issues and devising means of demonstrating transparency and accountability (Clarke, 2009, p. 14). Decentralisation, moving decisions closer to the customer, and accountability are all notions related to the reform of governance where more autonomy for schools is seen as the solution to optimise the organization of a school.

2.3.2 Autonomy

Ján Figel, Commissioner for Education, Training, Culture and Youth, says in 2007:
Schools are at the heart of all educational systems. More than this, schools lay the foundations for the societies of the future, because they play such a crucial role in forming the citizens of the future. They are also decisive for our future prosperity, which depends greatly on the skills – in the widest possible sense of the word - and knowledge which schools are imparting to their pupils now (Eurydice, 2007, p. 3).

He continues that despite this, the 2006 PISA\textsuperscript{16} study results showed that the scientific and reading abilities of 15 year-olds across the European Union had deteriorated. This was considered an unsustainable and unacceptable situation and every effort had to be made to reverse this trend. This is why the Commission, in its Strategic Report on the Lisbon Strategy adopted on 11 December 2007, called on Member States to make a determined effort to raise the basic skills of young people. The report states: “Many factors are involved here, but one of them is clearly the optimal organisation of the school system in order to maximize performance”.

Anyone who ever speaks about optimal organization of the school system in the last few decades speaks about decentralisation and autonomy for schools. What happened in the Member States concerning reform and school autonomy in the last twenty years? According to the report on School Autonomy in Europe (Eurydice, 2007), school autonomy is not a tradition in Europe. It is only since the 1980s that the movement towards school autonomy began to develop, usually in the form of a limited transfer of responsibilities. During the 1990s the policy of school autonomy became more or less widespread, and only some countries

\textsuperscript{16} The Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) is a worldwide study by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in member and non-member nations of 15-year-old school pupils’ scholastic performance on mathematics, science, and reading.
began to consider school autonomy early in the present decade. No approach from any Member State may be designated as ideal or as more effective in general, because the stories and contexts of our countries are very diverse. However, we can learn from the approaches and experiences of others. Schools all over Europe have been the subject of many discussions and have undergone numerous reforms, particularly in regard to autonomy. Emphasis was always on three key elements: management of public funds invested in education, participation of the stakeholders and especially in recent years, the quality of teaching. The approaches differ in the pace of reform, the scale of transfers of authority and areas that are applied, the actors who benefit from them and monitoring or accountability mechanisms (see Eurydice, 2007, pp. 9–10).

The Directors of the European Schools made a comparative study of the data in this report (Eurydice, 2007) and the reality of the European Schools. The most important elements of autonomy are use of funds (public and private) and human resources (school heads, teaching staff and non-teaching staff). In the European School system there is limited autonomy in the use of public funds, and limited (only for letting of school premises for out-of-hour activities and loans) to no autonomy in the use of private funds (no use of private funds to acquire immovables, movables, or to employ teaching staff or non-teaching staff). There is no autonomy in selection, dismissal, duties and responsibilities and disciplining the school heads, limited autonomy with respect to teaching staff, slightly more for locally recruited staff than for seconded teachers, and limited to full autonomy for non-teaching staff.

In relation to autonomy, Cribb & Gewirtz (2007) distinguish three dimensions. First of all: loci and modes of autonomy. Here we consider whose autonomy it is. To talk about autonomy presupposes the existence of agents but obviously these do not exist as an undifferentiated mass.
There is a range of individual, collective and institutional agents to consider in the educational arena. Examples of individual agents include individual parents, students and teachers (themselves differentiated of course by their location in relation to social axes of race, class and gender etc.). Collective agents include teachers acting in teams within schools or politically, e.g. through trade union activity or lobbying at a national policy level, and parent or student associations. Institutional agents include central government agencies, local authorities, professional bodies and schools. It is important to spell out these distinctions because it is often the case that increasing one agent’s autonomy decreases that of another.

A second dimension is: Domains of Autonomy-Control. Here we consider autonomy or control over what? It has to be taken into account that domains interconnect. A third dimension is: Loci and Modes of Control. The different kinds of individual, collective and institutional agents identified above, as well as being subject to control have the potential to exercise control and there are different styles of control. These can be more or less rigid, direct, closed or crude. Cribb & Gewirtz (2007) say we should not forget that autonomy is a process:

The extent and nature of the autonomy we have and the control we are subject to are not set in stone and nor are they the result of one-off policy decisions; rather they are constantly being made and remade, and negotiated and renegotiated in all of our daily interactions (p. 205).

Polder (2005) discusses the situation in the Netherlands, and says that since the Reform in 1994, education has decentralized. However, more than a decade later in public education the question rose whose autonomy had actually increased. There is a situation in which the autonomy of the Directors appears to be increasing, but the schools’
autonomy not. Decentralization can have a number of negative consequences for schools and staff. Lindblad _et al._ (2002) argue that during the last decades restructuring of educational systems has been going on all over the world and is often described in terms of decentralization and deregulation in combination with increased school autonomy and new ways to manage schools. They also argue that several authors point out that restructuring is often related to financial measures, mostly in terms of large cuts and alternative funding of education. In Sweden, for instance, the cuts were considerable during the 1990s in general, and especially for children outside the mainstream.

Autonomy cannot exist in a vacuum but is always exercised within systems of constraints and conventions which at the same time both circumscribe action and make it possible. This interplay between control and autonomy is inevitable and is neither simply bad nor good, neither destructive nor productive. Autonomy can be found at the same time eroding and empowering (Cribb & Gewirtz, 2007). These authors also argue in favour of autonomy for individual teachers, saying autonomy is a precondition for the exercise of teachers' professional expertise, and it can be a source of job satisfaction, health and well-being for teachers, a source of creativity, experimentation and variety and a source of effectiveness. What is good for teachers is good for learning. On the other hand, there are also plausible arguments for continuing control over teachers, like: protecting learners from harm, ensuring equal access, the personal costs of autonomy, and cohesion. Similarly, Poole (2008) concludes that there is little evidence that increased autonomy improves student outcomes; rather it is the package of changes that take place along with the change that could make the difference.

When schools account for their results, publish them and are not afraid of comparing themselves to improve their performance, autonomy
can lead to improved student performance. The OECD publishes on the 20th of October 2011:

School autonomy and accountability: Are they related to student performance? In countries where schools have greater autonomy over what is taught and how students are assessed, students tend to perform better; In countries where schools account for their results by posting achievement data publicly, schools that enjoy greater autonomy in resource allocation tend to show better student performance than those with less autonomy. In countries where there are no such accountability arrangements, schools with greater autonomy in resource allocation tend to perform worse (OECD, 2011).

Literature about autonomy points to involvement whole community and leadership: Successful school principals will be those who are able to foster relations with teachers, students and the community through shared decision making and promotion of professional interaction and those who will develop strong positive school cultures to reflect these.

2.3.3 Leadership

“It has become conventional wisdom that inspirational leadership is essential for success… It is argued that we ‘talk’ leadership, and we mean it, but while we try to figure out how to go about it we ‘walk’ management while we extinguish fires”. Beirsto, Klein & Ruohotie (2003) argue that management and leadership are in tension with each other. It is difficult to focus on tasks and people at the same time, to require compliance while inviting commitment, to exercise control while encouraging creativity. In trying to explain the two sides of the coin, Beirsto et al. (2003) say:
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The worldview that underlies management is mechanistic and reductionist, emphasizing analysis and characterized by masculine aspects of personality. The worldview that underlies leadership is organic and holistic, emphasizing synthesis and characterized by feminine aspects of personality. The two are virtually polar opposites, like yin and yang (p. 12).

Only by combining the two contrasting and contradictory perspectives one can obtain a true three-dimensional view of the role. MacDonald (2006) describes this as “two optical lenses, each lens must be correctly placed relative to the other and the viewer positioned at the proper angle. Looking through only one lens, changing the angle or placement of either lens, or changing the position of the viewer will immediately distort the image. It requires a careful alignment of both lenses – an educational and a business lens – to achieve a clear picture”.

A study of effective leadership conducted by a research team from the University of Nottingham (Harris, Day & Hadfield, 2003) revealed that effective school leaders were considered to be reflective, caring and highly principled people who emphasized the human dimension of the management enterprise. They were viewed as placing a high premium upon personal values with a concern for cultural rather than structural change. They were seen to have moved beyond a narrow rational, managerial view of their role to a more holistic, value-led approach guided by their own personal experience. It would also appear that where leadership is both learned and shared, there is more possibility of organizational development and change. Multiple partnerships, with variable leadership, offer a more appropriate set of structural norms for

17 MacDonald refers in his article to the international schools, that generate tuition revenue every year, but the role of a school head in balancing the educational and business pressures (whether public or private) is comparable.
school improvement. At the same time, they are also more likely to impact upon classrooms and student learning. Within the accounts of teachers in this study it was clear that they were both aware of and involved in the process of leadership. They were both contributors to and recipients of effective leadership practice.

Like Harris et al (2003), Beattie (2002) argues for holistic leadership. Holistic leadership and teaching grows out of a consciousness that acknowledges the connections between the personal and the professional, between the self and others, between practice and theory, between past experience and future goals, and between the way things are and the way they might be. It is a view of leadership that is inclusive, connected, and collaborative. It challenges the notion that leadership is the exclusive domains of one group of individuals in a school, and offers a view of a holistic leader. Suppose students are involved in all aspects of school, and share the governance: when they are not afraid of being ostracised, marginalized or silenced, they will name and describe the world as they know it, they will participate in activities which will enable them to develop a sensitivity to the feelings and agendas of others, and skills and competencies in dialogue, decision-making, and collaboration with others. If there is a profound respect for young people, everything comes from that: give it and get it back, and the school will be most successful.

If student achievement is failing, and the transformation of schools is the answer, can we wait for individual leaders to take this burden alone? Harris, Leithwood, Day, Sammons, & Hopkins (2007) say:

The hope of transforming schools through the actions of individual leaders is quickly fading. Strong leaders with exceptional vision and
action do exist but unfortunately they do not come in sufficient numbers
to meet the demands and challenges of today’s schools” (p. 345).

The abovementioned researchers from Nottingham propose an
alternative conceptualization where leadership is distributed and
understood in terms of shared activities and multiple interactions.
Distributed leadership is a potential contributor to positive change and
transformation in school systems.

Is there a link between distributed leadership and student
outcomes? Harris et al. (2007) find in empirical studies that distributing a
larger proportion of leadership activity to teachers has a positive influence
on teacher effectiveness and student engagement. Student outcomes are
more likely to improve when leadership sources are distributed throughout
the school community and when teachers are empowered in areas of
importance to them. Teacher and student morale improved where
teachers felt more included and involved in decision-making within the
school. Leadership is best understood as distributed practice, stretched
over the school’s social and situational contexts. Finally, the school rather
than the individual leader is the most appropriate unit for thinking about
the development of leadership expertise. They highlight two key conditions
necessary for successful leadership distribution. First, leadership needs to
be distributed to those who have, or can develop, the knowledge or
expertise required to carry out the leadership tasks expected of them.
Second, effective distributed leadership needs to be coordinated,
preferably in some planned way (Harris et al., 2007, p. 343).
Mancuso et al. (2010) argue that turnover of teachers in schools impacts student learning and correlate teacher turnover with the perception of a supportive head of school (director). “Characteristics that defined teachers’ perceptions of supportive leadership are closely linked with transformational and distributed leadership.” (Mancuso, Roberts, & White, 2010, p. 306).

When there is no supportive head of school, there is a lot of turnover and turnover impacts student learning. Therefore, it is interesting to look at studies done on teacher turnover, or at the opposite term that is often used, teacher retention. There is a lot of academic literature on teacher retention. The situation in the European Schools is special, since 1989 there is a rule that seconded teachers have to leave after a maximum of nine years. For some countries the contracts are even for five years. Existing research on teacher retention can still tell us something about teachers’ job satisfaction and maybe even on what effect the turnover has on student outcomes. According to existing research, teacher retention is considered desirable. Teacher turnover brings significant financial costs and has an impact on the effectiveness of the school overall, student development and attainment, and the morale of those who stay (Rinke, 2008).

Important predictors of teacher retention, commitment and satisfaction are: salary, working conditions, student discipline and motivation, perceptions of school leadership and culture, perceptions of autonomy and discretion, input into decision making, perceived efficacy –

---

18 Mancuso et al. refer to Teacher retention in international schools, the ES do not have the same problem because of the nine-year rule for seconded teachers, still there is a lot of turnover and we can learn from reasons for teacher satisfaction.

19 Teacher retention is generally considered as teachers remaining in their current teaching assignments within the same school.

20 Student learning outcomes are defined in terms of the knowledge, skills, and abilities that students have attained as a result of their involvement in a particular set of educational experiences.
feel like making a difference with students, and supportive school culture – feel successful – bridge gap between vision and reality (Rinke, 2008; Whitcomb, Borko, & Liston, 2009).

In recent years, a shift can be seen towards professional development in the learning community, which in turn can contribute to teacher’s satisfaction and commitment. A “new paradigm for professional development” is beginning to replace traditional in-service staff development workshops. The main features are: Professional development programs being situated in practice, focused on student learning, embedded in professional communities, sustainable and scalable, and supported and accompanied by carefully designed research. Recent theoretical and empirical work also has drawn attention to the social nature of learning. Many conceptual discussions of professional learning communities identify respect and trust as essential features of a productive learning community. Terms like “reciprocal peer coaching” and “transformative professional development” (self-knowledge) are mentioned (Whitcomb et al., 2009).

According to Darling-Hammond, Meyerson, LaPointe and Orr (2010) pre-service and in-service programs should be able to develop principals and teachers that engage successfully in many of the practices found to be associated with school success: cultivating a shared vision and practices, leading instructional improvement, developing organisational capacity and managing change. On the other hand, recruitment and selection are essential qualities of these programs, in other words, individuals who enter a program determine to great extend what the program can do, and what kind of leader can emerge (p.187).

In summary, inspirational leadership is essential for the success of a school. A holistic view (educational and business) and the human dimension are valued. Shared or distributed leadership that involves
teachers and students would increase teacher effectiveness and student engagement. To prepare schools for a changing world, effective training programs and autonomy in recruitment and selection are essential.
3. Beginning of the reform process of the European Schools

As an answer to the changing context the reform of the European Schools was started. The description of the reform process of the European School system is not easy, since the reform is still in progress. Existing academic literature from Swan (1996), Gray (2003) and Clarke (2009) as well as documents and reports published by the Secretary General, the Commission, Parliament and the Council were used. Further insights were gained from internal documents from one of the pilot schools. An overview of the developments of the past decade until October 2010, when the survey was launched, will be presented.

Swan (1996) describes the situation in 1996:

In the case of the European Schools, there are two main levels of accountability, the local one operating at the level of the Administrative Board of the individual School, and the central one, with the Board of Governors and the inspectors acting, as it were, in place of national government. There is a further level of accountability here, however: this one to the European Commission with its representative on the Board of Governors; it also represents on the Board of Governors the interest of the European Parliament. Some commentators hold the view that a clearer role for the European Parliament could further enhance democratic accountability at the European level, and make for the greater harmonisation of national policies and practices vis-à-vis the European Schools (Swan, 1996, pp. 80–81).

Already in 1996, Swan thinks it is disappointing that the European School system is still very central which is reflected in the new statutes of 1994. He describes recent trends and pleads for more autonomy as he argues that research on school effectiveness and improvement consistently support a relatively high degree of autonomy at school level.
This autonomy should be coupled with the requirement of developing its own school plan, and explicitly making its own objectives within an agreed framework.

Swan (1996) does not only plead for autonomy, he also argues for opening up by saying that the European School’s deployment of native speakers to teach foreign languages and the provision of a multilingual environment are strategies that could usefully be adopted by others.

Concerning opening up, Swan (1996) warns for the loss of pluralism:

> while it is important to work diligently towards closer links with the school systems of those countries where the Schools are located, too close an integration with them could easily lead to the creation of inequalities of esteem within any such European School, which would favour the pupils and teachers of the country of its location above the rest. If this were to happen, one of the unique achievements of these schools (viz. the cultivation of pluralism instead of assimilation) would immediately be forfeited (p. 123).

Gray (2003) also looks into the future and worries about the challenge of the enlargement:

> Finally, what of the future? Will the European School system be able to cope with the accession of Member States and the influx of the children new civil servants bring with them?....there may be as many as 22 language groups to cater for, and a final number of 28 has been mentioned. The challenge is clearly huge, and for the small schools, where the criteria for the formation of independent language sections are unlikely to be met, probably beyond solution. The simple integration of new students into existing sections would almost certainly undermine one of the Schools’ two key values – ‘the bedrock of national identity’. And in more ways than one, since parents’ voices are already being
raised at the ‘dilution’ of mother-tongue learning brought about by the presence of non-native speakers in mother-tongue classes (p. 324).

Whether the reform was the result of a global trend, the answer to the growing system, or a response to the critics of the system, in November 2002, an Austrian Member of the European Parliament (MEP), Herbert Bösch, submitted a Report on the financing of the European Schools, commenting the following facts and developments forcing the budgetary authority to look at the future financing of the European Schools: the opening of two new European Schools (Alicante and Frankfurt), the withdrawal, in 2000, of all the Commission’s permanent staff at the Joint European Torus (JET) in Culham, the widely differing situation as regards the number of pupils of different categories in different Member States and the costs per pupil at the various schools; the budgetary system of a balancing subsidy without the budgetary authority having any influence over costs of the European Schools, the creation of new European Union agencies and their location in various Member States and the approaching enlargement of the Union (Bösch, 2002, pp. 5–6).

In 2005, a further Report on options for developing the European Schools system was submitted, with Mary Honeyball, a British Member of the European Parliament (MEP) as rapporteur. In this report, Honeyball (2005), under the heading of Better governance and administration, says that the European Parliament believes that, given the growth of 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 and 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. Furthermore the report states 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. It is noted that the Community currently pays a balancing contribution equivalent to some 57% of the annual cost of the European School system, whereas the Member States contribute 22%. The European Parliament believes therefore that the European Commission, as a representative of the Communities, should have voting rights on the Board of Governors, to be 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. The European Parliament 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, 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’. The European Parliament also 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, and 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.

Clarke (2009) summarizes that both Bosch and Honeyball raised the following issues: the need for reform in governance of the European School system, particularly with the accession of ten new Member States
in 2004, concerns regarding the financing of the European Schools and cost-sharing by Member States, the possibility of introducing greater autonomy and independence of decision-making for individual schools, guarantees for the quality of teaching and particularly for the provision of Special Educational Needs (SEN) in the system, greater co-operation between the European Schools and national school systems and the possibility of broadening access to the European Baccalaureate beyond the population served by the existing schools.

In November 2005 the Dutch Minister Van der Hoeven, at the time acting president of the European Schools (ES), and Vice President Kallas, member of the European Commission in charge of the European Schools, sent a letter to their colleagues, the EU Education Ministers, in which they informed them about their initiative to call for a Conference, to be held in May 2006 in the Netherlands, to which representatives of all the MS of the Board of Governors were invited. The following outcomes of the High Level Group Conference held in Noordwijk 15-16 May were listed\(^{21}\): opening up, autonomy, and improvement to the current Type I schools.

Concerning the opening up, three types of schools were considered for the future: Type I: the existing classical European Schools, Type II: national or international schools which provide European education to the children of EU Staff where European Agencies or equivalents are about to be founded, and Type III: accredited schools entitled to offer the European Baccalaureate independently of the existence of an EU agency or institution, if a Member State decides to take such an initiative. For all types of schools, the general denominator is that the schools work towards one common diploma, the “European Baccalaureate”, based on a ‘common curriculum’, with widely integrated Mother Tongue Education

---

\(^{21}\) In the document: Point B. 3. of the agenda of the Board of Governors of the European Schools High Level Group– HLG document 34 (Board of Governors, 2006).
The concept should be in accordance with the requirements set by the European School system regarding pedagogical targets and the demands regarding exams and accreditation. These elements will be supervised by the Board of Inspectors. The costs of the ES Type II will be shared between the host country and the European Community according to the number of EU staff children. The costs of the Type III schools will be carried entirely by the schools or host country.

The second element on the list was more autonomy balanced by greater accountability. The future system should be based on greater autonomy for the schools which would be balanced by a greater accountability in pedagogical issues and, if relevant, in aspects of management/finance and governance. More autonomy and more accountability require a strengthened school management. This could be accommodated by the introduction of middle management. The sharing of costs between the European Community as a whole and the different Member States should continue as it is in the present system of the ES, though the allocation of the costs of the seconded teachers among the Member States needs to be fair.

The third element concerned improvements in the present Type I European Schools. The Conference stated that “the pedagogical quality of the present European Schools must be enhanced, administrative and financial procedures of the European System must be strengthened and Governance of the European Schools should be improved”. Concerning pedagogical improvements: Mother Tongue Education (MTE) should be a priority. It should be such that a request of parents to teach their child MTE should be granted whenever possible. The teaching of the first foreign language should start at an early age. There is a need for more collaboration between the language sections, so that more homogeneously tuned curricula are being developed. Improvements and
innovations at a national level should be incorporated faster in the different curricula and the European School system must have more European added value. A joint pedagogical content needs to be developed (in history and literature) with a European dimension which can be taught in different language sections. Other improvements proposed by the Conference were the European Schools should be better incorporated in their “surrounding”. Teachers and management need to be trained continuously and facilities for this should be made available. The examination system needs to be professionalized, so that there is a clear distinction between the persons that prepare the exam, the persons that examine the pupils, and the persons that study the results of the examination. There should be an assessment on a number of core subjects for all pupils attending the ES at the age of 16 because, at that moment, the school results are comparable. This moment of assessment could serve as a graduation moment, i.e. students could either leave the school or go up for the exam programme at the age of 18. Whenever possible, the exam programme from the age of 16 to the EB, must offer more specialization in teaching materials for the pupils. There should also be a reflection on how to deal with pupils who leave school before the end of a cycle. The quality assurance by the inspectors of the teaching and learning process in the schools should be based on a common inspection framework and a common approach. General and proportional inspections of schools should be the core business of the inspectorate. Joint inspections must be developed.

In a press release of the Council of 14th of November 2006: “Vice-President Siim Kallas as European Commissioner in charge of European Schools and the 25 ministers of the Member States in charge of the same area met yesterday in the margins of the Education and Youth Council to discuss the European Schools reform process”. The next steps proposed are: For all European Schools established or to be established next to EU
agencies or equivalent bodies, costs should be mainly born by the host country, but the Commission should be required to pay a contribution out of the EU budget which would have to be proportional to the number of EU staff children attending such schools. On the issue of fairer cost-sharing among Member States, notably as far as the detachment of mother tongue teachers is concerned, discussion needs to be pursued. The launching in 2007 of a pilot project aimed to open up the European Schools educational model to schools all over the EU. The idea is to promote the spreading of the European Baccalaureate to any school which complies with the requirements set by the European Schooling system regarding pedagogical targets.

Because the number of pupils from EU funded agencies at the European School in the UK at Culham in Oxfordshire had fallen to 44 pupils (approximately 5% of the 900 places available), the European Schools’ Board of Governors agreed to close the school as a European School in April 2007, asking the UK delegation to explore the possibility of accepting the school into the UK national education system and to consider applying for the school to become a pilot Type III European School. In order to protect the curriculum and the educational continuity for students at the school in Culham, the Board of Governors has further agreed to phase the closure over a seven year period.

In an interview in June 2008 with Mr Pino, Director of the European School of Alicante at that moment, the following points of the reform are mentioned as the 3 pillars at each school. First of all there is a new Financial Regulation (Adopted in October 2006 and to be applied from 1 January 2007 or January 2008). The Commission proposes the school to be a more bureaucratic institution. An institution has to be

---

22 The first interview for this research was conducted with Mr Pino, founding director of the European School of Alicante.
closely regulated for good management: transparency, efficiency, cost control. You need an administrative body that is highly specialized and sophisticated. But you cannot compare a school with an office. A school is responsible for education, which is a complexity that is incomparable to an institution. Forming part of the internal market you need public tenders ('call for tenders'), contracts ('framework contracts') and so on. These are forms of specialised financial management. Not only staff needs training, but you also need more diverse staff. The Commission claims that we do not need more posts. Are we forgetting the purpose of the school? A school is not an administrative office. How to find the balance, with control, and without exaggeration. For the control of quality of administrative and financial management, the following bodies are involved: Financial Controller, Internal Audit Service and Court of Auditors. The second pillar of the reform is Autonomy. In the financial regulations there will be more autonomy regarding the available budget. It implies working with budget credits and involves a much greater responsibility. What are the conditions? The following plans and reports are foreseen: Multiannual school development plan, Annual school plan and Annual activity report. The third pillar of the reform would be Attainment Contracts. Mr. Pino highlights both the newly created local bodies and the documents: The Administrative Board will now be held twice instead of three times a year; a new advisory organ called SAC, School Advisory Committee, will have to propose a multiannual budget. Each school must now produce an activity report linked to the budget, in addition to (or instead of) the 'rapport de rentree' that each school produces after summer. The 'rapport d'activités' must be done to the 'cour des comptes' at the beginning of the year for the Board of April.

Three pilot projects were started: one in Bergen, one in Munich and one in Brussels I. Clarke (2009) says:
There was a general consensus that the pilot project in Brussels I was a potential model for all of the larger schools in the system. Mme Christmann said “while every School is different, the methodology and the approach set out in Brussels I could be adopted by the other Brussels Schools and the Luxembourg Schools” What had emerged in the unfolding of the pilot projects was that “the role of the Director and Deputy-directors in developing and implementing autonomy and their own systems of governance within the Schools is incredibly influential. Dr Kivinen’s experience of leading one of the pilot projects was generally positive. He commented “Dialogue is opening up, but there are difficulties: a lack of decision-making power at the level of educational counsellors (p. 36).

In Brussels I the first survey was launched in 2008 (which was repeated in 2010) and opened the dialogue between stakeholders on priorities to set objectives to get to Action Plans, Whole School Planning, Activity Report, Multiannual School Development Plan, and Annual School Development plans, which resulted in models for the other schools. In October 2008 an important external assessment done by Van Dijk Management Consultant was finished: Analysis of the Academic and Professional Careers of the European School’s Graduates. This report evaluates the European School system very positively.

In January 2009 the report of another important external assessment was published: External evaluation of the European Baccalaureate by the University of Cambridge, which gives clear recommendations on how to modernise the European Baccalaureate. A working group Reform was started and representatives from all stakeholders participated. In January 2009, based on the evaluation of the pilot projects and a report (Board of Governors, 2009c) as a result of the activities of the Working Group Reform, some proposals were made to the
Board of Governors. It focused on the following elements: Opening up of the system and the European Baccalaureate, autonomy of the European Schools (Type I), reform of governance; and cost sharing. Clarke (2009) explains how the idea of attainment contracts was dropped:

The Brussels I experience was also key in determining that one feature of the reform process was dropped. Dr Kivinen explained: “The School Development Plan has taken three years and whole school involvement to achieve. We did include an attempt at developing an attainment contract, but since it can’t be made legally binding under existing statutes governing the Schools, it has been dropped by the Board of Governors as a requirement of the reform process (p. 37).

Siim Kallas, the Commissioner responsible for administrative affairs, said at a public hearing in Brussels on 19 March 2009: “If not reformed, the system might soon collapse”, focusing on the following three areas: streamlining governance, cost-sharing and opening up. (Unreformed European school system “might collapse” | EurActiv, 2009). In the April 2009 meeting (Board of Governors, 2009d), the Board of Governors gave the Secretary-General mandates concerning the following three elements: Reform of the European Baccalaureate in the context of opening up of the system, Autonomy of European Schools (Type I) and Reform of governance. The European Parliament published an article on the 12th of May 2009 called “The European Schools re-invent themselves”. According to this article, Siim Kallas welcomed the positive outcome of the ambitious reform process, begun in 2005 on the initiative of the Commission and Parliament, and urged the Member States to disseminate the curriculum and the European Baccalaureate as widely as possible in their national schools. The cornerstone of the reform is the opening-up of the European School system. Other key aspects of the
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reform concern: improving governance of the European Schools, with a simpler decision-making process and more clearly defined responsibilities and tasks for the different actors and organs; greater autonomy for each school in return for increased responsibility; fairer cost-sharing among Member States, for example by allowing non-native speakers to teach in one of the procedural languages of the system (currently English, French and German) (European Parliament, 2009).

Clarke (2009) finds that important conflicts about the functioning, governance and funding of the European Schools remain unresolved even as reform initiatives are pushed through and implemented. She states that the imposition of reform in particular arouses suspicions that the process is intended ultimately to exert greater control over the schools, through increasing accountability and particularly through explicit linking of pedagogy and budgets. A continuing climate of uncertainty should not, however, inhibit the individual schools and their stakeholders from using the available mechanisms such as advisory committees and school councils from identifying key areas for school improvement. With commitment from management, teaching staff, students and parents, the European Schools have the opportunity to deploy the reform agenda and engage in a process of self-evaluation. Clarke (2009) furthermore comments that all four interviewees expressed concerns about the reform process: The primary concern is that the process has been initiated top-down by external forces: Autonomy is limited: lack of time for reflection, lack of acknowledgement of the role of teaching staff, lack of a forum, no guidelines or instructions, lack of communication, fear of change, no central vision, lack of middle-management. There is a contradiction at the heart of the current system; there is a drive to expand the system, broaden the availability of the European Baccalaureate, but at the same time, there is a contradictory impulse to phase out all but Category 1 students. It is the
fees from Category 2 and 3 students that give greater flexibility and autonomy to individual schools. There is a fear that even if the School Advisory Council and Administrative Board for the School come up with plans and resource allocation this will be blocked by the Budget Committee. There is a core conflict between national cultural identity and European identity. There is a fear that pushing for harmonization could lead to uniformity rather than a celebration of diversity. European Schools are lurching towards the establishment of a system which would greatly alter their culture just at the moment when the success of that culture has been acknowledged through PISA (OECD, 2007) and the Van Dijk (2008) report.

Experts on the European School system argue that this experience should not be lost, especially their significance for communication, convergence and harmonisation, as centres of excellence and the considerations the schools experience teaches us if transplanting to ES model to different contexts. According to Swan (1996) the European Schools’ experience is significant, mainly in three respects: firstly for communication, secondly for convergence in education, and thirdly for coexistence among the nations of Europe:

Dialogue on and in education must now take place across the barriers that separate these communities; there will not be a European community of education until we recognize and find ways of transcending these barriers. This of course is what the teachers in the European Schools are doing on a daily basis since these Schools are both sui generis and yet organically linked to each national system. They therefore daily become pioneers of communication across these linguistic and conceptual frontiers. As laboratories of innovation, then, and mediators of new ideas, the European Schools could play a powerful role in furthering discourse in education, especially by measure, despite initial barriers to understanding. Besides,
communication in and about education is of far more than academic or professional significance; it opens up genuine cultural understanding for the whole younger generation. Convergence. Meeting the educational needs of highly mobile expatriate families, overcoming cultural and language differences and working towards a multinational, in this case European, identity are achievements whose wider sharing would smooth the way for the convergence process. Their experience in the deployment of teachers (and inspectors) from many national systems could add to the European Schools’ contribution to convergence. The case for a common basic European curriculum. Pupils need to travel secure in the knowledge that their valid qualifications will be recognized, and that their children will receive a comparable education anywhere in the European Union. Europe is on the move and schools must move with it, the European Schools’ experience could become a catalyst for changing structures and processes of schooling in the Member States (p. 123–125).

According to Savvides (2008) the system is not very well known amongst her colleagues (teachers) in Britain:

The Schools’ anonymity seems curious, since they are, if one takes in to account PISA scores and the Van Dijk study into the academic and professional careers of graduates, centres of excellence which produce students who are highly motivated, academically competent, flexible and adaptable thanks to their multilingual educational experience. The Schools have a great deal to share with both international and national school systems in terms of pedagogical practice, particularly in teaching languages and could widen access not only to the qualification of the Baccalaureate but also through acting as centres of research and training (p. 23).

Housen (2002) warns that it would be “inappropriate to transplant the ES model to different contexts”. Nevertheless four points are selected
for consideration: Time and timing of L2 (second language) education, L2 Education should span primary and secondary and no more than 50% should be devoted to L2, integrating language and content. Furthermore, it is recommended that at least one general subject be taught through the medium of L2, with the need for independent self-sustained output. The third point refers to the use of target language as the medium of instruction needs to be complemented by communication-rich social contexts in class and elsewhere in the school that promote spontaneous continuous output, and lastly, apart from teaching through the medium of L2, there is a need for formal L2-subject teaching (p. 60-61).

In summary, although Swan already talks about the necessity for reform and pleads for more autonomy and opening up in 1996, it is not until 2002 the Bösch report on the financing of the European Schools and 2005 the Honeyball report, both initiated by the European Parliament, the need for reform of the governance of the European School system was raised, starting with financial reform and cost sharing, followed by more autonomy for the schools. Pilot projects were started for autonomy and a Working Group for Reform. The system started opening up and at last the reform of the European Baccalaureate was initiated. Although most feel that reform was necessary, experts on the European School system warn to safeguard the strengths and to be very careful when transplanting the model to different contexts.
CHAPTER II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Within the theoretical framework described in Chapter I, the following research methodology was developed: first of all the initial research questions were formulated and the initial tools were chosen, elaborated and used. With more insight, the specific research questions were formulated, and the variables of analysis constructed so that the survey could be prepared. The categories of analysis served for later evaluation of the results before concluding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial research questions:</th>
<th>Survey:</th>
<th>Descriptive Results:</th>
<th>Conclusions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Strengths</td>
<td>1. Sex</td>
<td>Analytical statistics and charts questions 1-19</td>
<td>Strengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Weaknesses</td>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reform</td>
<td>3. Years experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Tools:</th>
<th>Evaluative results:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Interviews</td>
<td>1. Globalisation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reform:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Open</td>
<td>2. Educational change</td>
<td></td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>3. Opening up</td>
<td></td>
<td>Opening up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Observation</td>
<td>4. EB</td>
<td></td>
<td>EB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Research questions:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Variables of analysis</th>
<th>Categories of analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Strengths</td>
<td></td>
<td>a. Autonomy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Weaknesses</td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Opening up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reform</td>
<td></td>
<td>c. EB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Research methodology.
4. Research questions

The European School system is currently reforming. Reviewing literature in the field, it can be noted that reform is going on in educational systems all over the world. A general dissatisfaction with the quality of education, globalization and the changing role of education asked for a reform that includes a more business-like approach and autonomy. Autonomy is seen as a process and more importance is given to stakeholder involvement.

Based on the theoretical framework the following initial research questions were constructed:

1. What are, according to the stakeholders, the strengths of the European School system?
2. What are, according to the stakeholders, the weaknesses of the European School system?
3. What effect does the process of reform have on point these strengths and weaknesses?

After having conducted semi-structured interviews, having launched an open questionnaire amongst parents and teachers, and an additional research day in Brussels I, one of the pilot schools, the research questions concerning the reform process were reformulated which resulted in the following specific research questions:

1. What are, according to the stakeholders, the strengths of the European School system?
2. What are, according to the stakeholders, the areas for improvement of the European School system?
3. Concerning the reform process:

3.1. What is the impact of the reform process on the stakeholders?

3.2. What would the stakeholders hope for in the reform process?

3.3. How much are the stakeholders aware and did they notice specific areas of the reform process (autonomy, opening up of the system, reform of the European Baccalaureate)?
5. Stakeholders

The European School system has many stakeholders, amongst others the Office of the Secretary General, the Commission, Member States – specifically representatives from the Ministries of Education and Inspectors - Directors, Deputy-directors, Teachers, Pupils, Administrative Staff, Parents, Institutions, local communities and the Parliament. Involved parties are represented on a local and central level in the following stakeholder map:

Figure 6. Stakeholder map of the European School system.

The Office of the Secretary-General of the European Schools is in charge of: representing the Board of Governors, managing the European School system, chairing the Administrative Boards of the European Schools, ensuring the effective preparation and organization of and follow-
up on the meetings of the Boards of Governors, the Boards of Inspectors, the Budgetary Committee, the Directors and other groups, coordinating and supervising the administrative, financial and general management of the Schools and of the Central Office, managing preparations for the Baccalaureate sessions and ensuring the organization, setting and layout of the examination questions to a high standard, arbitrating, where necessary, in disagreements between members of the school community giving rise to complaints or appeals, and producing an annual report on the Schools’ development. The Office of the Secretary-General currently has a staff complement of 45.23

Board of Governors (BoG): The BoG is the governing body of the European School system. Takes all important decisions at central level. Contains representatives from the national governments of all Member States, Directors, parents, teachers, students, European Patent Office, and the Commission. The BoG meets twice per year (instead of three times before the reform).

Budget Committee (BC): the BC is a preparatory committee for the BoG on financial decisions. They meet twice a year.

Joint Teaching Committees (JTC). The JTC is a newly created organ in the reform. It replaces the old Teaching Committees for Primary, Secondary and Mixed Teaching Committees. It is a preparatory committee for the BoG. They give pedagogical advice. It combines primary and secondary. It contains inspectors from each member state, parents, teachers, students, Directors, Deputy-directors, European Patent Office (EPO), and the Commission vote. They meet twice per year.

Board of Inspectors. There are two Boards, one for Primary and one for Secondary. In the context of the European Schools, the responsibility for staff recruitment lies with the national inspectors. Every

23 Source: www.eursc.eu.
EU country has one inspector for the primary and one for the secondary school. They shall ensure the sound educational and administrative management of staff. Supervision of the education provided by the schools is also conducted by the Boards of Inspectors. The Inspectors regularly visit classes, issue directives to heads and teaching staff, meet periodically for discussions and submit proposals concerning syllabuses, teaching methods and evaluation to the Board of Governors.

Administrative Board (Admin Board). The Admin Boards takes all important decisions at local or school level. It is chaired by the Secretary General (or deputy) and the votes vary from school to school. In general: one for the Secretary-General; two for the Parents; two for the teachers; one for the Administrative Staff representative and one for the Commission. In some schools the local institution, e.g. in Munich the EPO, has a vote.

School Advisory Council (SAC)\textsuperscript{24} is a newly created body in the schools, as the forum for internal consultation. The SAC is chaired by the Director and composed of representatives of all the partners and stakeholders in the school community, taking into account the local situation.

Educational Committees. Most of the schools have kept their Nursery/Primary and Secondary Educational committees as they were before the reform. These Committees are useful inter-school discussion forums where the specific and practical pedagogical or school organization issues are discussed between the Director/Deputy-director and teachers, parents and students representatives of the level.

Parents. Parents’ Associations (PAs) play a specific role in the institutional arrangements. They are defending and promoting the interests of parents and pupils in the Admin Board of each School. Through an

\textsuperscript{24} Reform document definition. (2009-D-353-en-4).
umbrella association, INTERPARENTS, (which federates all PAs), they participate in the Board of Governors, the supreme body of the Institution. Furthermore, they participate in Working Groups, the Joint Teaching Committees (central level), the Education Committees (local level) and the newly created School Advisory Council (SAC). Most PAs also operate three services on behalf of the School Community: Transports (School bus), Canteen (School restaurant) and After-School Activities (Sports and cultural activities). In all PA’s together more than 40 full-time and 70 part-time persons are employed, not including the services being outsourced.

Parents are considered horizontal stakeholders. According to Swan (1996), the machinery of consultation between school authorities, parents and teachers, though slow, is on the whole good. However, both from submissions received and personal attendance at meetings of teachers and parents, Swan has found the parents of pupils divided on whether or not they were accorded a role in decision-making larger than is usual at school level in the national education systems:

> In the European Schools where parents of very diverse national backgrounds and experience bring a wide range of sometimes conflicting expectations to bear on their children’s schooling, it is to be expected that many issues, which would find unanimity in a national context, will become highly contentious here. Inevitably, therefore, the decisions reached will, in turn, leave some parents dissatisfied from time to time (p. 80).

Karsten et al. (2006) say the same: the more heterogenic the school population the more difficult for the school to satisfy the parents’ wishes. Karsten et al. (2006) also identify the tensions between the roles

---

of the professionals and the parents, so that parents’ input is not always taken seriously:

Schoolleiders en leerkrachten hechten veel waarde aan ouders die hun betrokkenheid jegens het onderwijs tonen, maar nemen in de praktijk de inbreng van ouders niet altijd serieus. Leerkrachten zien ouders niet als gelijkwaardige partners bij onderwerpen waarop zij menen zelf bij uitstek de expert te zijn\(^26\) (p. 42).

Still, Directors do seem to appreciate the input of parents, as Swan (1996) reports the Directors stating officially:

Much of the strength of the European School lies in the concern and energetic interest of the parent body. Elected parents already play a full part in the life of the European Schools as observers at the meetings of the Governing Body, as full voting partners on the administrative boards of individual schools, and on the Education Committees of the schools (p. 103).

Nevertheless, parents’ representatives’ responses to Swan’s enquiry of 1991 showed some ambivalence regarding consultation with them. It was reported to be better at the level of the Board of Governors and of Inspectors than at that of individual schools. Parents can play different roles\(^27\): Consumer, especially when choosing the school. As argued above, this can be limited in case of the ES. Constituent: participate in consultative and decisive educational organs or by active participation in school. This role is being played very actively by parents in the ES. However, it seems to be conceived better at central than at local

\(^{26}\) School leaders and teachers attach great value to parents who show their commitment towards education, but in practice the input of parents is not always taken serious. Teachers do not see parents as equal partners in matters they believe themselves to be the experts in.

\(^{27}\) Translated from Karsten et al., 2006, p. 89.
level. Client: having demands concerning execution of work of the professionals and use of complaints in case of dissatisfaction and deficiencies. The number of complaints and legal actions seems to have increased a lot over the past years (Karsten et al., 2006, p. 89).

Pupils. In total there are 22,778 pupils in the current 14 European Schools that are governed by the Board of Governors. 43.34% of the total amount of pupils can be found in Brussels and a further 19.39% in Luxemburg. CoSup stands for Conseil Supérieur des Elèves and represents all the Pupils Committees (PCs) of the European Schools at central level. At local level each European School has a Pupils Committee and at least one member represents its ideas in the CoSup meetings. CoSup is the sole representing body of the pupils in the central committees of the European School system. CoSup became officially recognized by the European Schools Board of Governors on the 31st of January 2006.

According to Hill (2006) the European School students are a special group of students, as the European Schools are an interesting hybrid: On the one hand, they can be seen as a subset of international schools since the focus of their mission is to promote European unity and European citizenship rather than international unity and world citizenship, although they would not deny the international dimension. An important additional feature is that they develop bilingualism (at least) since the use of a second vehicular language is mandatory. This distinguishes them from the many international schools which have only one language of instruction, usually English. On the other hand, European Schools provide children moving around Europe with reinforcement of their home country culture and language in a culturally diverse school in a host country environment. According to Hill (2006) the European School pupils are “Europeanly
mobile” students that are a subset of “internationally mobile” students. By definition they are neither nationals nor immigrants.

The Van Dijk analysis of the School’s graduate academic and professional careers revealed that an unusually high proportion of students came from families where at least one parent had a degree compared with general populations across Europe, which goes some way to explain the high academic standards expected of students, not only by the school system but also by the families whose children attend the school (Clarke, 2009, p. 21). As parents, pupils are also considered horizontal stakeholders. It is difficult to find sufficient participations of pupils in formal organs. Maybe alternative or informal ways of getting their involvement should be sought.

Teachers. There are two types of teachers in the system: Seconded teachers that are appointed by their national governments, after completing a selection procedure (full time) and locally recruited teachers that have a direct contract with the school (part time). 72% of the teachers are seconded teachers, 28% are locally recruited. Between 2007 and 2010 there was an 18.44% increase of locally recruited teachers in the system. (Board of Governors, 2010). Only the seconded teachers are officially represented in the governing bodies at central level. Each school has two official representatives (one for primary and one for secondary) in the Board of Governors.

As explained before, the responsibility for staff recruitment lies with the national inspectors. Every European Union country has one inspector for the secondary and one for the primary school. The diversity in culture and attitudes towards education existing in Europe could imply that a variety of recruitment and selection methods for European School staff exists. According to Van Gool (2009) roughly speaking two models of Human Resource Management (HRM) exist in Europe: the career-based
system and the position-based system. In career-based systems, teachers are usually civil servants and are generally expected to stay in the public system throughout their working life. Initial entry normally occurs at a young age and is based on a civil service entry exam, the so-called concoubrace. Entry criteria are demanding and the examination is on an academic nature (subject-based) with relatively little place for pedagogical, psychological or social issues. Once recruited, teachers are allocated to posts according to internal rules and normally cannot choose the school, town or area they will work in although they can express their preference. Position-based public services on the other hand, tend to focus on selecting the best-suited candidate for each position, whether by external recruitment or internal promotion. Such systems generally allow more open access at a wide range of ages, and entry from other careers is relatively common. Hence, staff is more representative of the population, bring in a greater variety of personal characteristics and experience. In the position-based system local managers play a critical role in personnel management. Staff management is more business-like and there is room for salary negotiations. The fact that teachers from some systems must resign from their teaching post at home in order to accept an appointment in a European School, and without a guarantee of employment on completing their contract, is seen as a disincentive by prospective applicants from those countries. In each case a contract of a seconded teacher at the European School does never exceed 9 years, after which they are supposed to go back to their national system.

As Housen (2002) says, “few European School teachers have received special training for teaching in multilingual schools. Some have a qualification to teach their own language as a second or foreign language, but most of the teachers learn how to teach multilingual groups of non-
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native pupils while on the job and in the in-service training programs organized by the schools” (p. 50).

Directors. The review of the literature on leadership shows the complexity of the role of a Director. According to Benson (2011):

Quantitative and qualitative data …suggests that the average tenure of an international school chief administrator is 3.7 years and that the main reason chief administrators leave international schools is related to school boards, although career consideration are also regarded as important. The two most common school board-related reasons given for leaving are regular changes in board composition and micro-management” (p. 87).

In the European Schools Directors do not leave the system very quickly. As will be shown later, the Directors and Deputy-directors that participated in this research, have 5-10 years’ experience in the European School system.

6. Collection of data

For the collection of data several tools were developed. After the initial research questions were formulated the initial tools were chosen: interviews, open questionnaires and observation. Based on the data collected with the initial tools, the specific research questions and the survey were constructed.
6.1 Initial tools

For the construction of the variables of analysis initial tools were used: interviews, open questionnaires, observation, and internal and official European School documents.

6.1.1 Interviews

A dozen interviews with relevant stakeholders were conducted over the past three years. These interviews were conducted one on one, on-site, visiting the interviewee in their offices, and they were recorded. All interviews were recorded with a Sony MP3 IC recorder and the files stored in MP3 sound files, which later were transferred to written Word documents.

The following open questions were used to guide the interviews:

1. What do you consider are the strengths of the European School system?
2. What do you consider are the weaknesses of the European School system?
3. What challenges have you encountered concerning these weaknesses?
4. What are your grounds for choosing this school system?
5. How do you value your influence on the governance of the European School system?

The following formal interviews were held in chronological order:

28/05/2008 Mr Pino, Director European School Alicante
Furthermore, interviews with many more stakeholders: Directors, Deputy-directors, Inspectors, teachers, parents and pupils were held with the objective to make the process of interpretation more sound and critical.

6.1.2 Open questionnaire

The open questionnaire was formulated and the target groups were parents and teachers. The questionnaire was launched by e-mail to Interparents and teacher representatives in January 2009 and March 2009.

The following subjects were questioned in the open questionnaire:

1. Demographics about type of stakeholder (parent/teacher/Deputy-director/Director), sex, age of children or cycle concerned, cat 1, 2 or 3 (in case of parents) or type of contract (seconded, locally recruited for teachers).

2. Advantages, satisfactions, strengths.
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Could you indicate what are, in your opinion, the advantages of the European School compared to other school systems? What are the strengths you are particularly satisfied with?

3. Disadvantages, dissatisfactions, weaknesses.
Could you indicate what weaknesses or disadvantages of the European School you are particularly dissatisfied with?

4. Necessities and other challenges derived from the weaknesses.
What challenges have you encountered concerning the weaknesses you have mentioned in question 3 and what have you been able to (or are planning to) do about it?

5. Grounds for choosing this school system for your child(ren).
Could you indicate your grounds for choosing this school system for your children over any other?

6. (In)formal participation locally and centrally.
How do you value the level of participation in your school and how do you value the influence you have on the governance of the European School system?

A total of 26 answers were received from parents, 6 from teachers and 6 from (Deputy)-directors. When the open questionnaire was launched to the Directors, a proposal from Mr Kivinen was received. In June 2010 a study day at Brussels I followed, where Mr Kivinen was Director at the moment.

6.1.3 Observation

Apart from the interviews and open questionnaires, observation was used as initial tool.
In the past ten years all schools were visited and the author of this research attended at all Interparents preparatory meetings for Joint Teaching Committees and Board of Governors in the past six years, from 2010 to 2012 as Secretary of Interparents. Furthermore, being official parent representative in the Joint Teaching Committees during 2010 and 2011, and staff committee representative of OHIM during a Study day on the Future of the European Schools and during the workshop on governance and autonomy on 14th of March 2011, led to further insights.

The fact is that the author of this research is a stakeholder of the European Schools; not really an inside researcher, i.e. an actor within the micro-political organizational process of the school (see Van Gool, 2009), but still a stakeholder of the system, which has on the one hand the advantage of facilitating access to data and stakeholders, but on the other hand makes objectivity challenging. For this reason, an approach is taken that predominantly relies on data obtained from the survey taking into account a variety of stakeholders, basing conclusions on the systematic analysis of the data obtained.

6.1.4 Documents on European Schools

For the preparation of Board of Governors and Joint Teaching Committees many documents were available, the tool used is DOCEE (DOCument distribution system used by the EuropEan schools: https://docee.eursc.org) as well as internal documents of European Schools, like the documents given access to by one of the pilot schools for autonomy, Brussels I. Furthermore, existing literature on the European Schools was consulted (a.o. Cambridge, 2009; Clarke, 2009; Housen, 2002a, 2002b, 2008, 2011; Swan, 1996; Van Dijk, 2008).
Academic researches so far have mainly focused on the multilingual aspect of the European Schools (see Beatens Beardsmore, 1993 and Housen, 2011, 2008, 2002). Swan (1996) gives an overview of 1984-1994, focusing on the pluralism aspect of the schools, Savvides (2008) focuses on European identity, and Gray (2003) has a more critical view on the European Schools. In the light of the reform two important studies have been carried out recently, one by Cambridge University (2009) on the European Baccalaureate and one by Bureau Van Dijk (2008) on the academic and professional careers of the European Schools’ graduates. There is a dissertation for the degree of MBA by Van Gool (2009) on the effectiveness of Recruitment, Induction and Development of European School Teachers and Educational Advisers. The only study in the field of the reform is Clarke’s MA dissertation on autonomy and altering governance of the European School System where she gives an overview of the on-going reforms until summer 2009 by interviewing four key players: two Directors, one Deputy-director and the Secretary-General.

6.2 Development of the survey

When the initial collection of data was reviewed, the specific research questions were formulated and the variables of analysis constructed: strengths, weaknesses, and reform. The survey was built in the following manner: the first ten questions are demographical, followed by questions on strengths, weaknesses and concerning the reform there are questions for hope and impact, autonomy, opening up and the reform of the European Baccalaureate. The survey ends with a general open question.
6.2.1 Question 1 to 10. Demographics

The first questions are identification questions to construct the demographics:

Question 1. Please specify your sex
Question 2. Please specify your age
Question 3. How many years have you been in the system?
Question 4. Please specify in which capacity you would be filling in this survey
   o Pupil
   o Parent
   o Teacher
   o Deputy Director
   o Director
   o Inspector
   o Commission
   o Institution
   o Office of the Secretary General
   o Other (specify).

These nine types of stakeholders have been constructed based on the stakeholder map of the European Schools.

In some cases “skip logic” is used: in this case only when “Teacher” is chosen, the following question is prompted:

Question 5. Are you Seconded or Locally recruited

When “Teacher”, “Deputy-director” or “Inspector” is chosen, the following question is prompted:

Question 6. Please specify: Nursery/Primary/Secondary
To identify which stakeholder is filling in the survey and whether this stakeholder participates in bodies at local and/or central level the following question is presented:

Please specify your participation in groups:

Question 7. Please specify if you form part of any of the following groups:

- Parents Association
- Interparents
- Staff Committee
- European School Staff Committee
- Pupils Committee
- Conseil Supérieur des Elèves (CoSup)
- Educational Committee
- Joint Teaching Committees
- School Advisory Council (SAC)
- Administrative Board
- Board of Governors
- Budgetary Committee (BC)
- Pilot School
- Working Group
- Other (specify)

When “Working Group” is chosen, the following questions are prompted:

Question 8. In which Working Group have you been participating?
Please enter the name of the Working Group in the free text box

Question 9. How long has this Working Group been working?

Question 10. Did the Working Group encounter any difficulties in successfully fulfilling its mandate?
Please indicate what have been the obstacles, if any.
6.2.2 Question 11. Strengths

Question 11 was developed concerning strengths. The fourteen priorities, from which 5 can be chosen, have been created amongst others based on findings by Housen (2002a, 2002b, 2008, 2011), MacKenzie (2010), Swan (1996), and Van Dijk (2008) complemented by answers given to the open questionnaire launched in the initial collection of data. In addition to the fourteen priorities the respondent can specify another priority in free text.

Question 11. What is, according to you, the European School system good at?
Please select 5 priorities from this list
- European oriented education (Swan)
- Mobility (Gray)
- Open mind for cultures; multicultural environment, tolerant (Swan, Van Dijk)
- Networking events like EUROSPORT and MEC
- Mother tongue teaching. Stay in touch with mother/father cultural identity (Van Dijk)
- Multilingual environment. Knowledge of many languages and familiarity with people speaking other languages (Housen, Swan)
- Teaching by native speakers (Housen, Swan)
- High Quality and professionalism of seconded teachers (Housen)
- High standard of science and math teaching (Van Dijk)
- High educational standard generally (Van Dijk)
- Extra-curricular activities like cultural evenings, musical productions, theatre
- Good preparation for higher education/work afterwards (Van Dijk, MacKenzie)
- Recognition of European Baccalaureate (EB) (Van Dijk, MacKenzie)
- Good reputation of EB alumni (Van Dijk, MacKenzie)
- Other (specify).
According to most researchers of the system mentioned so far and confirmed by recent important external assessments, like the reports of Van Dijk (2008), the University of Cambridge (2009), and OECD (2007) on PISA 2006, the European School system is especially successful at finding a balance between languages and sciences. Van Dijk Management Consultants (2008) say that besides language teaching the European Schools are also above average, compared to national systems, in the teaching of sciences (biology, chemistry and physics). Swan (1996) adds that the curriculum, “crowded though it now is”, does maintain a balance, since “even the most committed linguist must still take Natural Sciences and Mathematics as well as History and Geography”. (p. 55) Housen (2002), from combined information from internal assessments and external research, suggests that the high levels of the second language are comparable or higher than in any other system and “This is achieved at no apparent cost to the pupils’ L1\(^{28}\) or their academic development.” (p. 58). Housen (2002) concludes that the European School experience shows that “even in the most complex of situations the potentially conflicting demands of academic, cultural, and linguistic development in multilingual education can be reconciled” and at the same time it shows that “such reconciliation is by no means self-evident, requiring careful planning and considerable investment”. Additionally, success in multilingual education is ultimately determined by “a myriad of factors, curricular as well as extra-curricular, some of which may well be beyond the control of program designers” (p. 62).

Most observers point to the high success rate of the European School students on the final examinations leading to the European Baccalaureate and to the large proportion of European School pupils who progress to higher education. The Van Dijk report notes that the number of

\(^{28}\) L1 is mother tongue or first language.
graduates who choose tertiary education in these fields (sciences) is above the European average, especially so for girls: “..we notice the high percentage (20%) of sciences, which is about double the value for EU27 (11%); moreover, this percentage is nearly the same for boys as for girls, whereas for EU27, there are nearly two boys studying science for every girl” (Van Dijk Management Consultants, 2008, p. 34). In an inaugural speech, Mª Angeles Martínez Ruiz (2008) identifies the problem of the lack of women in science29, being the absence of role models that allow women to see themselves represented or imagine themselves as scientists:

Entre las causas de la desafección de las mujeres a la ciencia, el citado informe “Mujer y ciencia” señala la ausencia de modelos que permita a las mujeres verse representadas o imaginarse como científicas. (p. 6)

She continues by saying that institutions must make an accelerated effort to change their culture and their practice in matters of equal rights and gender related opportunities. The more girls that choose subjects that were traditionally not chosen by girls then the more role models there will be for the generations to come.

Housen (2002) discusses the aspects of the European School model of multilingual and multicultural education, with particular emphasis on its language component. In the past few decades, he says, research on bilingual and multilingual education has focused mainly on the Canadian immersion model. Other models have received far less attention. One such model is that of the European Schools (ES). The ES have been in operation for nearly 50 years in several Member States of the European

29 Although Van Dijk groups under sciences (science, biology, chemistry and physics) and mathematics. M. Martínez Ruiz is referring to all sciences, the gender equality of the European Schools system in this respect can be applauded.
Union (EU) and have gained a firm reputation as institutes of both linguistic and scholastic excellence. It seems that recent years have seen a growing interest in ES as a model for developing multilingual education and second language education elsewhere. (p. 45). Beatens Beardsmore (1993) says the reason is that the pupils of the European School perceive language acquisition as “immediately relevant to their everyday needs and not subordinated to either some long-term goal, as is the case with standard foreign language learning classes, or as an obstacle to be overcome in moving on to other interesting activities, as is the case when language learning is totally divorced from other learning processes”. (p. 149). Swan (1996) notices the difference with other international schools being that the role of the second language as a medium of instruction for other subjects gradually increases with transfer into secondary. Such features as these distinguish the European School from the typical international school. “In the latter, one, or at most two, cultural orientations will predominate, with the emphasis on assimilation, whereas here no one national culture or nationality is dominant, while the emphasis is on pluralism” (p. 12). Swan continues to state that each national group is a minority, enjoying in principle equal status with the rest as of right and, since they serve pupils both coming from and returning to their separate national systems, these Schools’ curricula seek as far as possible to synthesize and integrate with the school curricula of all. This remains true even where a national group, now called Students Without A Language Section (SWALS), does not have a dedicated language section of its own, and effort is needed in such cases to guard against the de facto assimilation of these with, say French, Germans or British. Swan states that this is clearly a very complex arrangement and that school policy dictates that only three of these languages (French, English and German) are used as langues véhiculaires or media of teaching certain other
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...subjects as well, and that this compromise does confer a greater prominence, with no doubt a certain status, on these languages. Housen (2002) also speaks of pluralism:

ES are distinctly multilingual and multicultural, not only in terms of their pupil population but also in their organization, ethos, and goals. These goals are manifold, involving both maintenance and enrichment – academic, linguistic, and cultural. The primary concern is with academic development...The second mission of the ES is to develop a pluralistic identity and to prepare pupils for life in linguistically and culturally heterogeneous societies. This implies additive multilingualism...The notion of cultural pluralism envisaged by the ES model entails two seemingly contradictory goals, namely the maintenance of the child's distinct home culture and national identity on the one hand and the development of a supra-national, "European" identity. Minimally, ethno-linguistic prejudices and overly nationalistic sentiments are to be prevented. A further tenet of the ES model is that all pupils (and teachers) are equal, and that no pupil, sub-section, or language be privileged, academically, linguistically, or otherwise" (pp. 47–48).

Since their inception, the European Schools have had the double aim of preserving pupils' national languages and identities as well as cultivating in them a sense of European identity (Beatens Beardsmore, 1993; Gray, 2003; Savvides, 2006a, 2006b). Hayden and Thompson's research in 1997 noted that the perceptions of European School students were broadly comparable with students from other international schools, but that they rated a number of the key features of the schools' organization and curriculum highly. These included having teachers from a number of different cultures, learning to speak more than one language, being in a school environment where a number of languages are spoken, and studying subjects through more than one language (Gray, 2003).
According to Housen (2002) European identity envisaged by the ES model is still somewhat negatively defined, that is, as the lack of a specific national identity, but pupils’ attitudes toward other nationalities, cultures, and languages are subtle and positive, and nationalistic antagonism and ethno-linguistic tensions across the various language sections are rare. According to Savvides (2008) exposure to pupils of diverse European national, cultural and linguistic backgrounds is one of the most European features of the European Schools. In her research she explores the perceptions of pupils and it reveals that many pupils felt that their experiences of interacting with each other outside of the classroom are even more important in terms of the European dimension of their education than what they learn in the classroom, as they learn to adapt to new cultures, languages, and environments in a natural way.

The most influential factor was seen to be the many opportunities offered by the schools for pupils of different European backgrounds to interact with one another in and out of the classroom. Through these interactions, pupils develop certain knowledge, skills and attitudes that enable them to learn to live together. In particular, they develop knowledge of other European cultures as they learn about each other, language skills, social skills, intercultural competence, and critical and open minds that can challenge stereotypes. While these particular pupils are developing such attributes in a European context, they are also an essential component of an international dimension in education, since in today’s globalised world it is important for young people to develop attitudes such as tolerance, adaptability and open-mindedness. Curricular subjects and teachers’ pedagogical approaches were also seen to contribute to the European dimension in education. Pupils learn up to four languages with native speaker teachers through both language and social science subjects. Through their classes and through switching languages when they talk...
with friends, pupils develop language awareness and learn to feel comfortable in the presence of people who speak a range of languages. The development of language skills in turn facilitates friendship formation and social interaction with pupils of various nationalities, thereby improving the pupil’s social and intercultural skills. In addition, mixed nationality classes such as history, geography and economics enable pupils to see the topics being studied through several different national perspectives as teachers take a European (i.e. multinational) perspective and draw on pupils’ knowledge and opinions of their own countries. Extra-curricular activities were viewed as having less of an impact in contributing a European dimension to education, although they do provide pupils of different European backgrounds with opportunities to mix together and learn about each other (Savvides, 2008). Housen (2002) confirms that while most primary school pupils still select friends from their own L1 section, friendship relationships become distinctly cross-linguistic during the course of secondary school.

Swan (1996) in his book on the European Schools “A singular pluralism” considers the European Schools unique in their multicultural, multilingual and multinational character and structure. “In particular, they are implementing a new kind of pluralism in schooling, and pioneering a new educational paradigm, matched to the emerging identity of tomorrow’s citizens of Europe” (Swan, 1996, p. 6). A past pupil stated the emergence of a particular European mentality among the pupils. He attributed this to “immensely enhanced opportunities afforded by the diversity of cultures, languages and meanings encountered within his school, and to its ‘original’ pedagogy of langues vehiculaires and European hours, which both precluded prejudice and intolerance, and rendered barriers, whether of territory or of language, absurd and obsolete” (Swan, 1996, p. 23). Outcomes of a questionnaire launched by Swan in 1991 report that:
“Teachers’ representatives specified the Schools’ European spirit; pupil representatives praised the tolerance towards other nationalities experienced, while the parents who were questioned identified the truly European and unprejudiced attitudes of the pupils”.

6.2.3 Question 12 and 13. Weaknesses

Two questions were constructed to study the perception the stakeholders have concerning the weaknesses of the European School system; question 12 in the area of governance and question 13 in the area of quality. The eight statements for question 12 on governance were mainly constructed based on findings in the initial collection of data; from the interviews and open questionnaires and the findings by Clarke (2009).

Which are the areas the European School system could improve?

Question 12. Governance. Please indicate how you rate the following statements

Ratings: Fully Agree/Partially Agree/No opinion/Partially Disagree/Totally Disagree.

- System is too complex
- Too much bureaucracy
- More autonomy for schools needed
- A coherent recruitment policy should be developed (Van Gool, 2009)
- 9-year rule is one of the mayor problems of the European School system
- School management should be involved in inspections
- An intergovernmental structure does not fit an education agency
- Fair cost sharing needed
- Please add any other statement you specifically agree with.

The six statements for question 13 on quality were constructed based on findings by Swan (1996), Gray (2003) and Van Dijk (2008),
complemented by statements from the interviews and to complete an open question was added.

Question 13. Quality. Please indicate how you rate the following statements.
Ratings: Fully Agree/Partially Agree/No opinion/Partially Disagree/Totally disagree.

- The system needs more quality assurance (Gray)
- More involvement stakeholders needed (Swan)
- Lack of alternative course to the European Baccalaureate (Swan, Van Dijk)
- Schools should be more integrated in local life (Swan)
- Overpopulation
- The system does not take care well enough of SWALS and SEN (Swan, Gray)
- Please add any other statement you specifically agree with.

The European School pupils have a high success rate in the final examinations, but, more critical observers have pointed to the fact that ES pupils are held back in secondary school if their overall attainment does not meet the educational goals set for the grade. Experts highlight the fact that pupils have to repeat classes if the level of education is too high, and even have to leave the school after having repeated twice. This practice, plus the fact that less academically inclined pupils may leave the program on their own accord, has to be taken into account when interpreting the reported high levels of academic success in the ES. (Gray, 2003; Housen, 2002; Van Dijk, 2008). Van Dijk analysed the measures taken in favour of pupils who have learning difficulties. They list Students Without a

---

30 As Mr. Galvin commented, Overpopulation is not necessarily a Quality issue, the way the European Schools are organized, overpopulation is the result of the governance of the system.

31 It is almost impossible to provide reliable statistics on drop-out and yearly failure rates, because they are anyway confused by the presence of a sizeable nomadic population.
Language Section (SWALS) measures, Learning Support (LS) measures for various learning difficulties, and also measures to integrate pupils with special educational needs (SEN). Despite these measures the level of doubling classes is a bit higher than the European average and concerns about one out of every four boys and one out of every seven girls.

The Cambridge report (2009) also finds some weaknesses. They mention the relatively restricted range of subjects. Business-related and applied subjects, non-European languages, drama and media studies are all subjects of increasing popularity, both in schools and universities. Furthermore, the outcome reveals a very mixed picture across the different European Baccalaureate subjects – there is no common relationship, with differences linked principally to variations in purpose and commitments. The rank order of different national idioms or underlying traditions of education, as expressed in examination results, showed a rather close correspondence between the national school systems and the (most nearly) corresponding language sections in the European Schools”.

Very consistent differences in culture of grading pupils can be seen throughout the whole school career. French teachers for example rate lower than their fellow European teachers (see Swan, 1996).

The European School system has always received many praises, but has always been receiving criticisms as well. According to Swan (1996) one of these criticisms say that the European Schools contradict both the EC’s general policy for the education of migrants’ children and the principle of equality of educational opportunity. Swan counter-argues that perhaps this argument would have more validity if the EC as such did in fact have full responsibility for the education of all its immigrants or again if it were ever to be accorded a determining voice in formulating education policy as a whole for the Member States. But neither is the case to date.
Legally the EU is not involved in policy-making for, and has no direct role in, education in the Member States, although it has an indirect one. Other points of criticism have always been: elitism (the schools are accessible to a limited group of pupils), overcrowding in the Brussels schools (already mentioned by Swan in 1996), the Board of Governors as ‘an uncontrollable institution’ and expensive (compared to public national schools).

Gray (2003) speaks about a “hidden curriculum” stating that apart from the obvious multilingual curriculum other values are less obvious. He comes up with three assumptions. First of all, the original EEC members all had the example of their own school-leaving certificate to guide them. The *Baccalauréat*, the *Abitur* and the *Maturità*, for example, all worked on the same ‘encyclopaedic’ principle – that students should study as much as possible at a as high as possible standard and for a as long as possible period. Thus the system values a broad and demanding syllabus. Secondly, from 1957 to present, learning in the European Schools has focused on a French-inspired model of the curriculum. As a consequence the European Schools have stayed with the idea that subject areas are separate, each with their own content and each with their own particular fields of methodology and skills. A third assumption Gray speaks about is educational elitism. Only one type of curriculum is allowed and it does not encompass any form of vocational training or offer a less academic track. The curriculum – as might be expected from something shaped in 1957 – values knowledge rather than skills” (p. 319).

The French inspiration behind the schools is also evident in areas as diverse as the pastoral curriculum and staff salaries and regulations. Pastoral work is divided between class teachers and education counselors who attend to disciplinary and administrative details. Similarly, the administrative structure of the school resembles that of France. Each
The European School system in the eyes of its stakeholders

School has a Director (rather like a French *proviseur* or *principal*) aided by two Deputy-directors, one for secondary and one for primary. There is no line management and no official middle management structure: teachers teach and administrators administer with constant reference to the regulations devised by the central authority.”(Gray, 2003, p. 320).

Swan (1996) argues that “the rank order of different national idioms or underlying traditions of education, as expressed in examination results, showed a rather close correspondence between the national school systems and the corresponding language sections in the European Schools”. Very consistent differences in culture of grading pupils can be seen throughout the whole school career. French teachers for example rate lower than their fellow European teachers.

Selection and recruitment in the European School system is currently done by the inspectorates. Van Gool (2009) shows that each country has a different approach; there is a lack of coordination, which creates variation and inconsistency. This is not good for the future with a view to the type of education the European Schools wish to provide and it is not conductive to sustained change. Concerning induction, data from Van Gool’s research show that currently it is a mere survival kit for the novice. He proposes mentoring and networking. Quality induction can act as a catalyst for changing school and system culture, improving staff skills, whilst, at the same time, allowing for an introspection of the system. The mentors should be able to be trained in coaching techniques. Staff development, according to his research, is erratic, incoherent and, especially where the pedagogical days are concerned, unsatisfactory and ineffective. It would help to have clear, concise statements of what teachers are expected to know: the profile of teacher competencies needs to be derived from the objectives of student learning and provide European School system-wide standards and shared understanding of
what counts as accomplished teaching or counselling. Policy directions and actions to be taken are proposed, amongst which: All staff members should be stimulated to attend professional courses, a more pyramidal management structure is proposed, the native tongue principle should be reconsidered and posts not linked to one nationality only. This would be truly European rather than “island” thinking. Identical selection procedures in all countries would be needed and selection should be coordinated to allow team building. Also a possibility for career evolution within the system should be created. Teachers or Pedagogical Advisers wishing to stay on beyond the nine years should be given this possibility, provided they completed a qualification for “European Teacher”. All this would allow to get to an integrated Human Resource Management system that puts quality at the centre of its preoccupations and that is incorporated in the school’s development strategies. For this, Van Gool proposes greater school autonomy and involvement of other stakeholders such as staff and parents.

According to Clarke (2009) reform of the European School system has arisen in response to critics of the system who consider the schools to be elitist and exclusive. While acknowledging their academic excellence, critics point out that there are limitations on enrolment, that the academic focus excludes less academic students and that the European Schools, funded by tax payers, are costly without sharing their benefits with a wider population.
6.2.4 Question 14. Impact and hopes

Question 14 has been constructed concerning the impact and hopes stakeholders have in the process of reform. The 26 categories in this question have been elaborated from the initial collection of data (interviews) and from literature review on autonomy and reform, amongst others by Chubb & Moe (1988), Clarke (2009), Eurydice (2007), Cribb & Gewirtz (2007), Lindblad, Johannesson, & Simola (2002), Karsten, Roeleveld, Ledoux, Felix & Elshof (2002), Kerchner (2007), Polder (2005), and Poole (2008).

What are your perceptions so far and what do you expect from the reform process?

Question 14. Please fill in what the reform process has given you so far and what you hope to get from the reform process.

Ratings: so far more/so far less/so far same and hope to get more/hope to get less/hope to get same

- Freedom
- Bureaucracy
- Workload
- Rules (Lindblad et al)
- Involvement stakeholders (Karsten)
- Quality of life (Cribb & Gewirtz)
- Quality of education (Eurydice)
- Career possibilities
- Efficiency (Kerchner)
- Cost effectiveness (Eurydice)
- Decision Power (Cribb & Gewirtz)
- Vote
- Time in meetings
- Responsibilities (Karsten)
- Accountability (Karsten, Kerchner, Clarke)
6.2.5 Question 15. Autonomy

Question 15 was elaborated concerning autonomy. The twelve concepts that are proposed have mainly been elaborated from official documents of Board of Governors and internal documents.

One of the pillars of the reform process is autonomy. Some new concepts come along with autonomy.

Question 15. Do you know the following concepts, have you noticed them in your school and have you been able to use them?

Ratings: Concept is unknown to me/Concept is known to me/I have noticed this in my school/I have used this in my school

- Annual School Plan
- Multi Annual School Development Plan
- Action Plan
- Rapport d'Activités
- School Advisory Council
- Freedom in budget lines
- Pedagogical autonomy
- More decision power in Admin Board

Other, please specify below.
6.2.7 Question 16. Opening up

The following question was formulated for the question on opening up:

Question 16. Please specify how you rate the following statements about the opening up of the system
Rating: Fully Agree/Partially Agree/No opinion/Partially Disagree/Disagree
- The opening up of the system is quite successful
- It creates more mobility
- It creates more options for pupils, parents and teachers
- It is cheaper
- It is more realistic
- It fits the needs of an evolving Europe
- Type 1 schools should be laboratories for type 2 and
- 3 schools
- The quality of the BAC must be guaranteed
- Category 1, 2 and 3 should not exist
- Other (Please specify Other).

Opening up is part of the reform process. Since the decision in the reform was taken to open up the system, several schools have already started and several are on their way. The following schools are already open:

1. Scuola per l'Europa Parma: http://www.scuolaperleuropa.eu/
2. Ecole Européenne de Strasbourg:  
   http://www.ee-strasbourg.eu/
4. European Schooling Dunshaughlin:  
   http://home.meathvec.ie:8080/schools/CES/Pages/Default.aspx
5. Ecole internationale de Manosque: http://www.ecole-internationale.ac-aix-marseille.fr/
6. School of European Education Heraklion:  

   The following schools will open soon:
   • The Hague, to open in September 2012:  
     http://www.europeanschoolthehague.nl/
   • Bad Vilbel, that will probably be the first Type III school
   • Copenhagen in 2013
   • Tallinn in 2013
   • Initially the European School Culham was going to be transformed to the English national system as an academy, a pilot for the Type III schools, but in 2010 this initiative was stopped for liability reasons. At this moment solutions are still being investigated.

6.2.8 Question 17 and 18. European Baccalaureate

The office of the Secretary General of the European Schools published a report in June 2009 called Reform of the European Baccalaureate. Question 17 was created to study whether stakeholders are aware of the ideas for reforming the European Baccalaureate.
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Question 17. Do you know the ideas for reforming the European Baccalaureate? No/Yes, which? Please specify which changes you know about.

Question 18 is created to study whether stakeholders have noticed any changes in the European Baccalaureate over the last year.

Question 18. Have you noticed any changes in the European Baccalaureate over the last year? No/Yes, which? Please specify which changes you noticed.

6.2.9 Question 19. Comments. Open question

The last question is an open question:

Thank you for writing any further comments on particular issues you might have. Question 19. Please add any further comments here.
7. Statistical tools

In the following section the different phases of the methodological process will be described. Dytham (2003) indicates eight steps to successful data analysis. Theus and Urbanek (2009) similarly speak about eight steps in Exploratory Data Analysis (EDA). First of all the researcher has to decide what he/she is interested in, formulate a hypothesis or some hypotheses, design the experiment, collect dummy data, make up appropriate values based on what he/she expects, using the key to decide on the appropriate test and carry out the test(s) using the dummy data and if there are problems go back. If not, collect the real data and finally carry out the test(s) using the real data (Dytham, 2003, p. 7). In the course of this research this process was repeated several times. The online survey was constructed and tested with a panel. The survey was reformulated several times, translated into French and German, so that it could be launched in three languages.

The survey was launched in October 2010 to the members of the JTC. A reminder was sent by the SG in January 2011. All collectors were closed in March 2011. Once the responses were gathered, a lot of time was spent on data cleaning and preparation. The data were explored with analytical tools to visualize and carry out statistical tests for significance: testing the hypotheses, looking for outliers, missing factors, and residuals. For data mining, a relatively young and interdisciplinary field of computer science used for scientific discovery, used in business (CRM, surveys), science (medicine, education) and engineering, KNIME was used. Interactive graphical methods helped further insight, generating new questions and hypothesis. Interactive graphics for data analysis (Mondrian was used) are good for communicating qualitative information but fail to give exact quantities. Further queries needed to be done to get the exact
values. Bar charts are the type of graphics that were used mostly. The Survey was created in SurveyMonkey, www.surveymonkey.net, online survey tool, for which an unlimited Annual Account was used and sent by email with a link to the survey to the stakeholders. Data from SurveyMonkey were downloaded in an advanced spreadsheet format to Excel and then imported into KNIME and Mondrian.

While analysing the data several reflections came up concerning the limits of this research. In future research the following should be taken into account: when there is too much in one statement or the phrase is too long, the statements should be split up to get more detailed answers. In some of the five scale ratings it would have been better to have used “neutral” instead of “no opinion” which corresponds to the gradual intervals of Rohrmann.

Concerning Qualitative Analysis, the need to use AQUAD was discussed with Prof. Huber. He confirmed there was no need to use AQUAD in this case, the answers to the open questions in the survey form examples and are a gist for the quantitative data. They can be used as quotes to deepen the interpretation of the quantitative results.

The research is studying both the reform process that is constantly changing and the context that is also subject to change. The period from the first interview to the last interview covers a three year time scale which gives this research some character of time exposure, which allows to give an understanding of the dynamics of the European School system and its on-going reform (see Swan, 1996). In October 2010 an online survey was launched to all members of the Joint Teaching Committees. In January 2011, a reminder was sent to all Directors and Deputy-directors by the Secretary General’s office. The differences between the first launch and second launch were taken into account and analysed, especially since a
leadership training was organised for all Directors and Deputy-directors in this period.

8. Development of categories of analysis

To evaluate the collected information two categories of analysis have been developed: globalisation and the changing role of education.

How do the globalisation and the changing role of education affect the European School system? Are these changes reflected in the stakeholder’s perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses and is living up to these challenges the goals of the reform? How do globalisation and educational change affect the governance of the European School system and can we answer the question: how does the reform affect the strengths and weaknesses?

8.1 Views of participants on the characteristics

The following elements are constructed for the categories of analysis concerning the views of the participants on the characteristics.

8.1.1 Globalisation and the strengths

Globalisation has led to an increased demand for international education, a raised awareness for the need of citizenship: belonging to a common social and cultural area based on solidarity and mutual understanding of cultural diversities. Do the stakeholders perceive these elements of globalisation in the strengths of the European Schools?
8.1.2 Changing role of education and the strengths

Norms are constructed together and communities learn to think likewise. Language is thought and learning is social. In the European School teachers and pupils get to construct multiple norms, in multiple communities and multiple languages. According to the literature review the root for the current global conflicts and clashes of cultures is the lack of understanding. Do the stakeholders perceive these elements of the changing role of education in the strengths of the European Schools?

8.1.3 Globalisation and the weaknesses

Globalisation means increased speed of life. To be prepared for the future, knowledge and competences are necessary to promote creativity, flexibility, adaptability and capabilities to learn and solve problems. Are these elements of globalisation reflected in the views of the stakeholders on the weaknesses of the European Schools?

8.1.4 Changing role of education and the weaknesses

To get to social harmony, we want to create men and women that are capable of doing new things and feel comfortable in a world of continuous progress and change. To achieve this, teachers need to be role-models for international mindedness. Are these elements reflected in the views of the stakeholders on the weaknesses of the European School system?
8.2 Views of participants in relation to the reform

The following elements are constructed for the categories of analysis concerning the views of the participants on the reform of governance.

8.2.1 Globalisation and the reform

Globalisation means marketization of education, and international corporations taking over educational services. Schools become more business-like in their approach and need to be prepared for continuous change. Europeanization means to face common internal and external challenges. Are these elements reflected in the views of the stakeholders on the reform of the governance of the European School system?

8.2.2 Changing role of education and reform

In the literature review arguments can be found that suggest that the effects of globalisation demanded a changing role of education that in turn seems to have initiated a widespread school reform. Autonomy, involvement of the stakeholders, accountability, increased responsibility and increased awareness for leadership are an answer to the changing role of education. Are these elements reflected in the views stakeholders have of the reform of the governance of the European School system?
The European School system in the eyes of its stakeholders

9. Results

As can be found in the annexed survey form, the survey consisted of nineteen questions, five closed questions and fourteen having an open character or a comment field. The survey was launched in three languages: English, French and German.

The Joint Teaching Committees (JTC) was the selected group of participants, as it is the body that represents members from most stakeholders in the system. The JTC is composed of fourteen Directors, 28 Deputy-directors, four teachers, four parents, two pupils, one representative from the Commission, one for the institution (EPO), 54 inspectors (every Member State sends two inspectors), one president, one vice-president, and two members of the Secretary General’s office, with a total of 112. The survey was launched to 112 persons and in total 55 responses were received: 43 in English, eight in French and four in German. 55 respondents started the survey, 95% filled in at least one question and 81.8% filled in all the questions.

An online survey tool was chosen; the survey was created in SurveyMonkey, (www.surveymonkey.com), for which an unlimited annual account was used. The invitation to participate in the survey was sent by email with a link to the survey.

The respondents of the survey have been codified in the following manner. Respondent 1 = R011 to Respondent 55 = R553 (added the last digit 1 for English, 2 for French and 3 for German). Following these codes it can also be determined when the answers came in. This was interesting to see if there are differences in answers between the first and second launch of the survey, especially from the Deputy-directors and Directors before and after the leadership training they received in November 2010.
R011-R211 and R442-R482 came in before 15/11/10 and R221-R431, R492-R553 came in after 15/11/10.

9.1 Results questions 1 to 10. Demographics

The demographics results are presented in the order of the survey questions.

Table 1. Distribution of gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Please specify your sex</th>
<th>answered question</th>
<th>skipped question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7. Percentage of male/female respondents.
Concerning the representation of the sexes; 51% (26) of the respondents is female and 49% (25) is male, an equal representation of both sexes as shown in figure 7.

**Table 2. Respondent's age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Answered question</th>
<th>Skipped question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response Percent</td>
<td>Response Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;20</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;60</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concerning the age of the respondents, figure 8 shows the following pattern: The biggest group of respondents (40.4%, 21) are between 50-60 years of age, 32.7% (17) are between 40-50 years, 17.3% (9) over 60 years of age, 7.7% (4) between 30 and 40 years and one is less than 20 years of age (a pupil). Inspectors and Directors are slightly older than the Deputy-Directors and Teachers. This is logical since it follows the normal career path, often you become a director or inspectors after having been a teacher or deputy-director. Parents are all between 40-50 years of age.
Table 3. Number of years in the system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Answered Question Count</th>
<th>Skipped Question Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3 years</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;20 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9. Number of respondents per years in the system.
As figure 9 shows, most respondents have considerable experience in the system: The biggest group, 35% (17), has 5-10 years’ experience in the system, two equal group of 23,5% (12) have 0-3 years and 10-20 years’ experience, 13,7% (7) have 3-5 years in the system and two persons have been more than 20 years in the system.

Relating this question to the previous question, compares the number of years of experience to the age of the respondents, it shows that most respondents have considerable experience in the system, therefore are not the youngest parents or teachers. Since the system is quite complex, normally parents that are involved at central level have been in the system for quite some years.
Concerning sampling, Dytham (2003) explains that in almost all scientific studies it will be impossible to account for every individual in a population. Therefore it is necessary to examine a subgroup of the total population and extrapolate from this to the whole population. The process by which the subgroup of the population is selected is sampling. To examine whether the data collected from the Joint Teaching Committees
can be extrapolated depend on the sample they represent of the total amount of stakeholders of the European Schools. For this reason figure 10 is presented here.

Table 5. Percentage of representation per group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>JTC votes</th>
<th>respondents</th>
<th>total population</th>
<th>percentage answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>directors</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>71.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dep dir</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>64.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pupils</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22778</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspectors</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>22.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>president</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vice-pres</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>observer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the numbers in table 5, the results show that the answer from the Directors, Deputy-directors and the inspectors could be seen as representative for their group. The percentage of answers from Directors (71.43%) and deputy Directors (64.29%) is considerable and inspectors answer rate is 22.22%, which is still good. The other groups are not represented enough to draw conclusions, one could only use their answers as indicative, pointing into a possible direction for further investigation.
In the questions 5 and 6 “skip logic” was used: only when “Teacher” was chosen, the following question was prompted:

Table 6. Type of teacher’s contract.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answered</th>
<th>Skipped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since only one respondent answered this question, this question was not considered in the conclusions.

When “Parent”, “Teacher”, “Deputy-director” or “Inspector” was chosen, the following question was prompted:

Table 7. Corresponding cycles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Answered</th>
<th>Skipped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nursery</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter II: Research Methodology

Little can be said about the results in Table 7 as the categories overlap. One respondent can have answered one, two or even all three categories. For instance, a parent can have children in all three cycles.

Table 8. Participation in different groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Answered Question</th>
<th>Skipped Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents Association</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.8% 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interparents</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.8% 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.8% 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European School Staff Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0% 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0% 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conseil Supérieur des Elèves (CoSup)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0% 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.0% 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Teaching Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td>64.7% 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Advisory Council (SAC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>64.7% 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.9% 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Governors</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.7% 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgetary Committee (BC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.7% 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot School</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.7% 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.7% 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Show Responses
Figure 10. Number of participants per group.

Figure 10 shows that most respondents answer they form part of the JTC (that was the target group) and the SAC, both 64,7% (33), compared to 53,3% (24) that participate in the Administrative Board. This is remarkable, because the SAC is a very recent body, created in the reform. Furthermore, most respondents have participated in a Working Group, and are participating in the Administrative Board and Educational Committees in the school. The Administrative Board is the body at school level were most decisions are taken. Most participants in the JTC are involved in SAC, Admin Board and Educational Committees as well. Very few members (8) of the JTC do also participate in the Board of Governors or Budget Committee, which are also central organs of the European School system. Fewer responses were received in the local and central pupils committees and staff committees, since very few pupils and teachers participated in the survey.
Figure 11 shows that the SAC is the most balanced body, all stakeholders (except for the inspectors; they are not a body at school level) are represented. Parents at 75% (3 out of 4), and Teachers, Deputy-directors and Directors at 100%.

Another remark that can be made in this area is that, apart from the teachers (0 out of 2), most seem to be participating in Working Groups. Parents 25% (1 out of 4), Deputy-directors 83% (15), Directors 80% (8) and inspectors 58.3% (7). It seems Educational Committees are not as popular as JTC, SAC, WG or Admin Board. Their importance seems to be receding in favour of the SAC.
Although in question 7 up to 32 respondents (62.7%) answered they have formed part of a Working Group, only one respondent answered questions 8, 9 and 10, where more details about the Working Groups are requested. The answer can only be looked at as illustrative.

In the free text box the following names of Working Groups are specified:
Reform, SEN, BAC Reform (R021).

Table 10. Working Group’s duration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 6 months</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months - 1 year</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year - 2 years</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 2 years</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11. Working Group’s obstacles.

Table 11 shows the answers to question 10: Did the Working Group encounter any difficulties in successfully fulfilling its mandate? Please indicate what have been the obstacles, if any.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only answer received indicated some obstacles that Working Groups encounter:

Different traditions in different member states, general difficulty to find compromise in complex issues, the fear of change (R021).
9.2 Results questions 11 to 13. Strengths and weaknesses

In this section the results are described following the order of the questions in the survey. For each question first a table with the raw data is presented, followed by visualization in pie charts, diagrams, charts or other figures. Finally there is a short evaluation of the results based on the categories of analysis.
### 9.2.1 Strengths

**Table 12. Strengths**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>answered question</th>
<th>skipped question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. What is, according to you, the European School system good at? Please select 5 priorities from this list.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response Percent</td>
<td>Response Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European oriented education</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open mind for cultures; multicultural environment, tolerant</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking events like EUROSPORT and MEC</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother tongue teaching. Stay in touch with mother/father cultural identity</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilingual environment. Knowledge of many languages and familiarity with people speaking other languages</td>
<td><strong>96.1%</strong></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching by native speakers</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Quality and professionalism of seconded teachers</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High standard of science and math teaching</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High educational standard generally</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra curricular activities like cultural evenings, musical productions, theatre</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good preparation for higher education/work afterwards</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of European Baccalaureate (EB)</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good reputation of EB alumni.</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 shows the answers to question 11: What is, according to you, the European School system good at? Please select 5 priorities from the list.
Figure 12 shows the statements or priorities that received highest scores, ordered by number of respondents of the survey that chose them:

1. “Multilingual environment, knowledge of many languages and familiarity with people speaking other languages” is what was valued most (96.1% = 49 respondents).
2. “Open mind for cultures; multicultural environment, tolerant” (74.5% = 38).
3. “Mother tongue speaking, stay in touch with mother/father cultural identity” (68% = 35).
4. “European oriented education” (54.9% = 28).
5. “Teaching by native speakers” (52.9% = 27).
6. “Recognition of European Baccalaureate (EB)” (51% = 26).

The following statements received lowest scores:

1. “Networking events like EUROSPORT and MEC” (7.8% = 4).
2. “Good reputation of EB alumni” (9.8% = 5).
3. “High standard of science and math teaching” (15.7% = 8).

One text response was added in other strengths: “Use of ICT at schools” by R341.
Figure 12. Statements chosen as priorities all respondents.

Figure 13 shows the priorities of the different groups of stakeholders: parents value highest “Multilingual environment” (100% = 4), and “Teaching by native speakers” (100% = 4). Teachers value highest “Mother tongue teaching” (100% = 2), “Multilingual environment” (100% = 2) and “Teaching by native speakers” (100% = 2). Deputy-directors value highest “multilingual environment” (94.1% = 16) and “Open mind for cultures; multicultural environment, tolerant” (82.4% = 14). Directors value highest “Multilingual environment” (100% = 10) and “Mother tongue teaching” (100% = 10). Inspectors value highest “Open mind for cultures; multicultural environment, tolerant” (83.3% = 10) and “European oriented education” (75% = 9).
Directors (10% = 1) value lowest: “Extra-curricular activities like cultural evenings, musical productions, theatre”, “Networking events like EUROSPORT and MEC” and “Good reputation of EB alumni”. Inspectors value lowest: “Networking events like EUROSPORT and MEC” (0%), “High standard of science and math teaching” (0%), “Good reputation of EB alumni” (0%). They also value quite low (16.7% = 2 out of 12) the “High standard of professionalism of seconded teachers” which is worrying, do they see room for improvement?

Figure 13. Statements chosen by group of respondents.

After the presentation of the descriptive results, a short evaluation is given based on the categories of analysis: globalisation and changing role of education. One could say that the stakeholders do perceive elements of globalisation and the changing role of education in the strengths of the European Schools, as they value most: “Multilingual environment,
knowledge of many languages and familiarity with people speaking other languages” and “Open mind for cultures; multicultural environment, tolerant” which is in line with globalisation’s increased demand for international education, a raised awareness for the need of citizenship: belonging to a common social and cultural area based on solidarity and mutual understanding of cultural diversities. Multilingualism, multiculturalism and tolerance are highly valued.
9.2.2 Weaknesses

Table 13. Governance weaknesses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Fully Agree</th>
<th>Partially Agree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Partially Disagree</th>
<th>Totally Disagree</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System is too complex</td>
<td>28.6% (14)</td>
<td>44.9% (22)</td>
<td>10.2% (5)</td>
<td>12.2% (6)</td>
<td>4.1% (2)</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much bureaucracy</td>
<td>48.0% (24)</td>
<td>40.0% (20)</td>
<td>2.0% (1)</td>
<td>10.0% (5)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More autonomy for schools needed</td>
<td>53.1% (26)</td>
<td>32.7% (16)</td>
<td>8.2% (4)</td>
<td>2.0% (1)</td>
<td>4.1% (2)</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A coherent recruitment policy should be developed</td>
<td>43.8% (21)</td>
<td>35.4% (17)</td>
<td>12.5% (6)</td>
<td>6.3% (3)</td>
<td>2.1% (1)</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-year rule is one of the mayor problems of the European School System</td>
<td>28.0% (14)</td>
<td>26.0% (13)</td>
<td>12.0% (6)</td>
<td>20.0% (10)</td>
<td>14.0% (7)</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School management should be involved in inspections</td>
<td>33.3% (16)</td>
<td>47.9% (23)</td>
<td>10.4% (5)</td>
<td>2.1% (1)</td>
<td>6.3% (3)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An intergovernmental structure does not fit an education agency</td>
<td>21.3% (10)</td>
<td>25.5% (12)</td>
<td>27.7% (13)</td>
<td>17.0% (8)</td>
<td>8.5% (4)</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair cost sharing needed</td>
<td>38.0% (19)</td>
<td>30.0% (15)</td>
<td>28.0% (14)</td>
<td>4.0% (2)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 shows the answers to question 12: Improvement areas. Governance. Please indicate how you rate the following statements.

Figure 14 shows the improvement areas or weaknesses of the European School system concerning governance issues. The stakeholders agree\(^{32}\) with the following statements, ordered by score:

1. Too much bureaucracy (88% agree = 44 out of 50 answers).
2. More autonomy needed for schools (85.8% agree = 42).

\(^{32}\) In “agree” fully agree and partially agree are gathered.
3. School management should be involved in inspections (81.2% agree = 39).
4. A coherent recruitment policy should be developed (79.2% agree = 38).
5. System is too complex (73.5% agree = 36).
6. Fair cost-sharing needed (68% agree = 34).
7. 9-year rule is one of the major problems of the European School system (54% agree = 27; 12% no opinion = 6; 34% disagree\(^{33} = 17\)).
8. An intergovernmental structure does not fit an education agency (46.8% agree = 22; 27.7% has no opinion = 13; 25.5% disagree = 12).

\(^{33}\) In “disagree” fully disagree and partially disagree are gathered.
The European School system in the eyes of its stakeholders

Figure 14. Statements chosen by percentage and rating.

The strongest opinions are: “More autonomy needed for schools”: 53.1% of all respondents fully agree (26). Of Directors and Deputy-directors together 66.7% (18) fully agree. It shows furthermore that almost half of the respondents fully agree they have too much bureaucracy and that a coherent recruitment policy should be developed. To the statement that school management should be involved in inspections more than 40% partially agrees and the same amount of persons agree partially that the system is too complex. The biggest disagreement is shown with the statement that the 9-year rule is one of the mayor problems of the European School system and that an intergovernmental structure would not fit an education agency.

If you take into account the time scale, figure 16 shows the difference between October launch and January launch concerning the statement “More autonomy needed for schools”. Before 15/11: 33% (9 of 27) fully agrees, 37% (10) partially agrees, 22% (6) no opinion, 7% (2)
disagree. After 15/11: 61% fully agrees (17 of 28), 21% (6) partially agrees, 14% (4) no opinion, 4% (1) disagrees. In other words, in the second launch almost double the amount of respondents fully agrees, and fewer respondents (60%) partially agree, fewer have no opinion (66%) or disagree (half).

A tendency towards more clarity about “More autonomy needed for schools” is remarkable. The stakeholders are more convinced about the need for autonomy in January than in October 2010. In November 2010 training was organized for Directors and Deputy-directors, about change, autonomy, and leadership (Board of Governors, 2010b).

Furthermore, the text responses illustrate some very interesting areas, connecting the governance to the quality of teaching:

The internal management structure does not lend itself to constant monitoring of quality of teaching (R431).

There is no climate of continuing professional development (R301).

The following comments propose a solution for the change of legal status of the system:

ES cannot be part of the DGHR but must be under the responsibility of the Education structures of the EU (R291).

The European Schools are placed in the commission under the personal department. This is very wrong. They should be placed under Education, languages and culture (R081).

And a comment with four elements concerning clarification, transparency, a proposal for recruitment and a concern about the financial argument that should not prevail over pedagogical arguments:
1. There are contradictory guidelines in the regulations of the European schools that need to be clarified. 2. More transparency is needed in decisions taken and more input from all stakeholders. 3. Possibility to apply for a post in the European school system without being proposed by one's own government. Apply the same system as for all posts in the European Institutions e.g. EPSO. 4. Pedagogical arguments should come first before any financial. Decisions should always be in favour of our pupils' education. A more child centred system is needed at the decision making parties (R351).
Table 14. Quality weaknesses

13. Please indicate how you rate the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answered question</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>Skipped question</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The system needs more quality assurance</td>
<td>51.0% (25)</td>
<td>26.5% (13)</td>
<td>4.1% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More involvement stakeholders needed</td>
<td>14.3% (7)</td>
<td>36.7% (18)</td>
<td>14.3% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of alternative course to the European Baccalaureate</td>
<td>32.7% (16)</td>
<td>42.9% (21)</td>
<td>14.3% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools should be more integrated in local life</td>
<td>22.0% (11)</td>
<td>46.0% (23)</td>
<td>20.0% (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overpopulation</td>
<td>25.0% (12)</td>
<td>31.3% (15)</td>
<td>31.3% (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The system does not take care well enough of SWALS and SEN</td>
<td>8.0% (4)</td>
<td>20.0% (10)</td>
<td>4.0% (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please add any other statement you specifically agree with

Table 14 shows the answers to question 13: Improvement areas. Quality. Please indicate how you rate the following statements.

Figure 16 shows the distribution of the ratings in relation to the improvement areas or weaknesses in quality issues of the European
School system. The stakeholders agree with the following statements, ordered by score:

1. The system needs more quality assurance (77.5% agree).
2. Lack of alternative course to the European Baccalaureate (75.6% agree).
3. Schools should be more integrated in local life (68% agree).
4. More involvement stakeholders needed (51% agree, 14.3% has no opinion, 34.7% disagrees).
5. Overpopulation\(^3\) (56.3% agrees, 31.3% has no opinion, 12.5% disagrees).

Most stakeholders disagree with the following statement: “The system does not take care well enough of SWALS and SEN” (28% agrees, 4% has no opinion, 68% disagrees). Directors (70%) and inspectors (75%) disagree most with “The system does not take care well enough of SWALS and SEN”. Strongest opinions are to be found in parents: 100% “The system needs more quality assurance” and 100% “Lack of alternative course to the European Baccalaureate”.

\(^3\) As Mr. Galvin commented, Overpopulation is not necessarily a Quality issue, the way the European Schools are organized, overpopulation is the result of the governance of the system.
Figure 16. Statements chosen as weaknesses of quality issues.

Figure 16 shows that half of the respondents fully agree to the statement that the system needs more quality assurance. Almost half of the respondents partially agree that the schools should be more integrated in local life. A big group partially agrees that an important weakness is the lack of alternative course to the European Baccalaureate, that more involvement from the stakeholders is needed. A quarter of the respondents partially agree that overpopulation is a weakness of the system, while another quarter has no opinion on this subject. Notably is that almost half of the respondents partially disagrees with the statement that the system would not take care well enough of SWALS and SEN.

The text responses add some interesting opinions of SWALS and SEN pupils:
1. Quality assurance at the schools’ level, with self-evaluation as a basis. 2. A distinction should be made between SWALS and SEN; then my answer would have been: SWALS: better care needed, SEN: the limits have to be faced (R391).

The system takes too much care of the SEN and not enough of the SWALS. The mother tongue it is one of the bases of the system (R291).

After the descriptive results some evaluative results concerning the weaknesses are presented, based on the categories of analysis globalisation and changing role of education. Globalisation means increased speed of life. To be prepared for the future, knowledge and competences are necessary to promote creativity, flexibility, adaptability and abilities to learn and solve problems. The classical subjects: maths and sciences are not any longer valued very high by the stakeholders. Lack of an alternative for the traditional Baccalaureate is also very important for the stakeholders. To be prepared for the future, other competencies are important and one could move away from classical and traditional values. One could say stakeholders agree with the elements of globalisation and find the European Schools are missing some of these elements.

Regarding the changed role of education, to get social harmony, we want to create men and women that are capable of doing new things and feel comfortable in a world of continuous progress and change. To achieve this, teachers need to be role-models for international mindedness. Teachers in the European School system are not specially prepared for an international environment. Inspectors value the “High quality and professionalism of seconded teachers” very low. One could say stakeholders agree with the elements of the changing role of
education and find the European Schools are missing some of these elements.

9.3 Results questions 14 to 19. Reform of the governance

The following questions concern the reform of the governance of the European School system. For each question first a table with the raw data is presented, followed by visualization in pie charts, diagrams, charts or other figures. Finally there is a short evaluation of the results based on the categories of analysis.
## 9.3.1 Impact and hopes

### Table 15. Impact and hopes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>So far more</th>
<th>So far less</th>
<th>So far same</th>
<th>Hope to get more</th>
<th>Hope to get less</th>
<th>Hope to get same</th>
<th>Answered question</th>
<th>Skipped question</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>2.5% (1)</td>
<td>27.5% (11)</td>
<td>50.0% (20)</td>
<td>45.0% (18)</td>
<td>5.0% (2)</td>
<td>10.0% (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
<td>53.8% (21)</td>
<td>2.6% (1)</td>
<td>30.8% (12)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>41.0% (16)</td>
<td>5.1% (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>43.6% (17)</td>
<td>2.6% (1)</td>
<td>46.2% (18)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>30.8% (12)</td>
<td>15.4% (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>42.1% (16)</td>
<td>5.3% (2)</td>
<td>44.7% (17)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>34.2% (13)</td>
<td>13.2% (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement stakeholders</td>
<td>23.1% (9)</td>
<td>12.8% (5)</td>
<td>48.7% (19)</td>
<td>23.1% (9)</td>
<td>2.6% (1)</td>
<td>23.1% (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of life</td>
<td>5.3% (2)</td>
<td>15.8% (6)</td>
<td>63.2% (24)</td>
<td>34.2% (13)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>15.8% (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of education</td>
<td>10.5% (4)</td>
<td>10.5% (4)</td>
<td>60.5% (23)</td>
<td>44.7% (17)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>10.5% (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career possibilities</td>
<td>2.8% (1)</td>
<td>13.9% (5)</td>
<td>69.4% (25)</td>
<td>33.3% (12)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>16.7% (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>18.9% (7)</td>
<td>21.6% (8)</td>
<td>37.8% (14)</td>
<td>45.9% (17)</td>
<td>2.7% (1)</td>
<td>8.1% (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost effectiveness</td>
<td>24.3% (9)</td>
<td>8.1% (3)</td>
<td>40.5% (15)</td>
<td>35.1% (13)</td>
<td>2.7% (1)</td>
<td>21.6% (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Power</td>
<td>18.4% (7)</td>
<td>21.3% (8)</td>
<td>39.5% (15)</td>
<td>44.7% (17)</td>
<td>5.3% (2)</td>
<td>7.9% (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>8.8% (3)</td>
<td>20.6% (7)</td>
<td>52.9% (18)</td>
<td>29.4% (10)</td>
<td>5.9% (2)</td>
<td>17.6% (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in meetings</td>
<td>41.0% (16)</td>
<td>23.1% (9)</td>
<td>25.6% (10)</td>
<td>15.4% (6)</td>
<td>17.9% (7)</td>
<td>12.8% (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td>41.0% (16)</td>
<td>5.1% (2)</td>
<td>46.2% (18)</td>
<td>17.9% (7)</td>
<td>5.1% (2)</td>
<td>23.1% (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>25.6% (10)</td>
<td>10.3% (4)</td>
<td>48.7% (19)</td>
<td>28.2% (11)</td>
<td>5.1% (2)</td>
<td>17.9% (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>31.6% (12)</td>
<td>5.3% (2)</td>
<td>55.3% (21)</td>
<td>15.8% (6)</td>
<td>5.3% (2)</td>
<td>23.7% (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>10.5% (4)</td>
<td>23.7% (9)</td>
<td>44.7% (17)</td>
<td>44.7% (17)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>10.5% (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>10.3% (4)</td>
<td>20.5% (8)</td>
<td>51.3% (20)</td>
<td>43.6% (17)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>12.8% (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility for individual school</td>
<td>16.2% (6)</td>
<td>21.6% (8)</td>
<td>40.5% (15)</td>
<td>48.6% (18)</td>
<td>2.7% (1)</td>
<td>10.8% (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>13.5% (5)</td>
<td>23.6% (8)</td>
<td>45.9% (17)</td>
<td>35.1% (13)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>21.6% (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating money/budget</td>
<td>10.3% (4)</td>
<td>41.0% (16)</td>
<td>33.3% (13)</td>
<td>35.9% (14)</td>
<td>7.7% (3)</td>
<td>12.8% (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>45.0% (17)</td>
<td>5.0% (2)</td>
<td>37.5% (15)</td>
<td>2.5% (1)</td>
<td>45.0% (18)</td>
<td>7.5% (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication within school</td>
<td>30.0% (12)</td>
<td>7.5% (3)</td>
<td>40.0% (16)</td>
<td>42.5% (17)</td>
<td>2.5% (1)</td>
<td>12.5% (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for school planning</td>
<td>37.5% (15)</td>
<td>5.0% (2)</td>
<td>37.5% (15)</td>
<td>35.0% (14)</td>
<td>2.5% (1)</td>
<td>20.0% (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for reflection, evaluation</td>
<td>29.3% (12)</td>
<td>14.6% (6)</td>
<td>34.1% (14)</td>
<td>39.0% (16)</td>
<td>4.9% (2)</td>
<td>14.6% (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for improvement</td>
<td>26.8% (11)</td>
<td>14.6% (6)</td>
<td>39.0% (16)</td>
<td>43.9% (18)</td>
<td>4.9% (2)</td>
<td>7.3% (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify below</td>
<td>20.0% (1)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>100.0% (5)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>20.0% (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 shows the answers to question 14: Please fill in what the reform process has given you so far and what you hope to get from the reform process.
Figure 17 shows that concerning the impact of the reform, the highest scores are:

- So far more: Bureaucracy (21 of 43 respondents);
- So far less: Operating money/budget (16);
- So far same: Career possibilities (25); Quality of life (24); Quality of Education (23); Control (21); Independence (20); and Freedom (20).
Figure 18. Number of respondents per area of hope.

Figure 18 shows that concerning the hopes the respondents have in the reform process, the following areas score highest:

Hope to get more: Freedom (18 out of 24 respondents); Flexibility for individual school (18); Opportunities for improvement (18); Quality of education (17); Efficiency (17); Decision power (17); Autonomy (17); Independency (17); and Communication within school (17).

Hope to get less: Complexity (18); and Bureaucracy (16).
Chapter II: Research Methodology

Figure 17 and 18 show that many of the variables are valued to have “so far same” impact, and “hope to get more”, which could be an indication that the stakeholders have high hopes of the reform process, but have not seen much impact of the reform process so far.

In freedom, most say to have the same, but hope to get more. In relation to bureaucracy, respondents say they have more now, but hope to get less. In workload and rules, most respondents say they have same and hope to get less, but almost the same group states they have more now. In involvement stakeholders, quality of life, quality of education and career possibilities most respondents state they have so far same and hope to get more. Efficiency, Cost effectiveness, decision power and vote are mostly rated to be so far the same, but the stakeholder hope to have more in future.

Respondents say they spend more time in meetings and hope to spend less in the future. Concerning responsibilities and control the biggest group says they have the same amount of responsibilities and they hope to keep the same. About accountability the respondents say there is so far the same, and they hope to get more. Accountability is often referred to as vertical, or that the system or the school has to be more accountable.

In reference to autonomy, independence, flexibility for individual school and participation a big majority say they see same so far and hope to get more. In operating money, most say they have less now, and hope to get more.

For communication and opportunities for school planning, reflection, evaluation and improvement a lot of participants see same or more and hope to get even more.
9.3.2 Autonomy

Table 16. Awareness and usage autonomy elements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Answered Question</th>
<th>Skipped Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual School Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept is unknown to me</td>
<td>7.1% (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept is known to me</td>
<td>28.6% (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have noticed this in my school</td>
<td>11.9% (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have used this in my school</td>
<td>52.4% (22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Count</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Average</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Annual School Development Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept is unknown to me</td>
<td>9.8% (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept is known to me</td>
<td>31.7% (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have noticed this in my school</td>
<td>7.3% (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have used this in my school</td>
<td>51.2% (21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Count</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Average</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept is unknown to me</td>
<td>14.6% (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept is known to me</td>
<td>29.3% (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have noticed this in my school</td>
<td>7.3% (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have used this in my school</td>
<td>48.8% (20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Count</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Average</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport d'Activités</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept is unknown to me</td>
<td>17.1% (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept is known to me</td>
<td>26.8% (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have noticed this in my school</td>
<td>9.8% (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have used this in my school</td>
<td>46.3% (19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Count</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Average</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Advisory Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept is unknown to me</td>
<td>12.5% (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept is known to me</td>
<td>15.0% (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have noticed this in my school</td>
<td>12.5% (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have used this in my school</td>
<td>60.0% (24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Count</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Average</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom in budget lines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept is unknown to me</td>
<td>36.8% (14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept is known to me</td>
<td>23.7% (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have noticed this in my school</td>
<td>18.4% (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have used this in my school</td>
<td>21.1% (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Count</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Average</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept is unknown to me</td>
<td>17.9% (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept is known to me</td>
<td>38.5% (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have noticed this in my school</td>
<td>12.8% (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have used this in my school</td>
<td>30.8% (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Count</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Average</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More decision power in Admin Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept is unknown to me</td>
<td>25.0% (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept is known to me</td>
<td>40.0% (16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have noticed this in my school</td>
<td>20.0% (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have used this in my school</td>
<td>15.0% (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Count</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Average</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability for directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept is unknown to me</td>
<td>18.4% (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept is known to me</td>
<td>31.6% (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have noticed this in my school</td>
<td>21.1% (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have used this in my school</td>
<td>28.9% (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Count</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Average</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations from pilot schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept is unknown to me</td>
<td>28.2% (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept is known to me</td>
<td>35.9% (14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have noticed this in my school</td>
<td>7.7% (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have used this in my school</td>
<td>28.2% (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Count</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Average</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Templates for new reports and plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept is unknown to me</td>
<td>27.5% (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept is known to me</td>
<td>37.5% (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have noticed this in my school</td>
<td>12.5% (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have used this in my school</td>
<td>22.5% (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Count</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Average</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept is unknown to me</td>
<td>25.6% (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept is known to me</td>
<td>33.3% (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have noticed this in my school</td>
<td>10.3% (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have used this in my school</td>
<td>30.8% (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Count</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Average</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept is unknown to me</td>
<td>50.0% (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept is known to me</td>
<td>50.0% (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have noticed this in my school</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have used this in my school</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Count</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Average</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please specify Other

Show Responses
Figure 19 shows the answers to the question “Do you know the following concepts, have you noticed them in your school and have you been able to use them?” by number of respondent per concept of autonomy.

The variables are concepts related to Autonomy. The categories increase in terms of knowlegde of the concept, having noticed it at local level and having been able to actively use it. Highest scores (respondents say they have been able to use):

1. School Advisory Council 60% (24 of 42 respondents) say they have been able to use this in their school.
2. Annual School Plan 52.4% (22).
5. Rapport d’Activités 46.3% (19).

In figure 20 you see the answers split by type of stakeholder (4 = have been able to use, 3 = have noticed in my school, 2 = concept is known to me and 1= concept is unknown).

Figure 20. Level of knowledge and use of autonomy.

Figure 20 makes evident that: Directors have been able to use Annual school plan, multiannual school development plan, Action Plan, Rapport d’Activités, Freedom in budget lines. Directors have noticed or have been able to use: Accountability for directors, templates for new
reports and plans, recommendations pilot schools, and have noticed more decision power in Admin Board.

Deputy-directors have been able to use School Advisory Council. Deputy-directors have noticed in their school or have been able to use: Annual School Plan, MASDP, Action Plan, Rapport d’Activités, Pedagogical autonomy, Accountability for Directors. Deputy-Directors know the following concepts, but have not noticed them in their school: Freedom in budget lines, more decision power in Admin Board, and templates for new reports and plans.

Parents have noticed or have been able to use: School Advisory Council. Parents have noticed in their school: Annual School Plan, Multiannual School Development Plan and Accountability for Directors. Most parents have never heard of: Key indicators and templates for new reports and plans.

Teachers know the following concepts: More decision power in Admin Board, Accountability for Directors and School Advisory Council. Teachers have never heard of: Rapport d’Activités, Freedom in budget lines and Key indicators.

Inspectors know the concepts of: Annual School Plan, pedagogical autonomy, Multiannual School Development Plan, Rapport d’activités and most have never heard of Freedom in budget lines and recommendations from pilot schools. The fact that the inspectors did not respond any “noticed” or “have been able to use at school level” is logical, they are not involved in SAC, Admin Board etc.

Remarkable text responses:

I don't recognize that the new reform gives more autonomy (R291).
Autonomie is nicht vorhanden; Buerokratie is viel mehr geworden und Kontrolle ebenso; es wird an Bildung und Erziehung gespart\textsuperscript{35} (R543).

Real autonomy is killed by the arrogance of the delegation from the EU commission (R081).

\textsuperscript{35} Autonomy is not available; there is more bureaucracy and more control as well, and training and education are being economized.
9.3.3 Opening up

Table 17. Opening up.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stated Statement</th>
<th>Fully Agree</th>
<th>Partially Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Partially Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System opening up</td>
<td>9.3% (4)</td>
<td>46.5% (20)</td>
<td>18.6% (8)</td>
<td>16.3% (7)</td>
<td>9.3% (4)</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System mobility</td>
<td>19.0% (8)</td>
<td>28.6% (12)</td>
<td>38.1% (16)</td>
<td>4.8% (2)</td>
<td>9.5% (4)</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options for pupils and teachers</td>
<td>16.7% (7)</td>
<td>33.3% (14)</td>
<td>33.3% (14)</td>
<td>9.5% (4)</td>
<td>7.1% (3)</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System cheaper</td>
<td>24.4% (10)</td>
<td>24.4% (10)</td>
<td>39.0% (16)</td>
<td>7.3% (3)</td>
<td>4.9% (2)</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System realistic</td>
<td>18.6% (8)</td>
<td>32.6% (14)</td>
<td>23.3% (10)</td>
<td>9.3% (4)</td>
<td>16.3% (7)</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System evolving</td>
<td>34.9% (15)</td>
<td>37.2% (16)</td>
<td>16.3% (7)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>11.6% (5)</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 1 schools</td>
<td>23.3% (10)</td>
<td>30.2% (13)</td>
<td>20.9% (9)</td>
<td>7.0% (3)</td>
<td>18.6% (8)</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAC quality</td>
<td>95.3% (41)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>2.3% (1)</td>
<td>2.3% (1)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 1, 2 and 3</td>
<td>39.5% (17)</td>
<td>7.0% (3)</td>
<td>16.3% (7)</td>
<td>14.0% (6)</td>
<td>23.3% (10)</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 shows the answers to question 16: Please specify how you rate the following statements about the opening up of the system.

Concerning the statements about the opening up of the system, figure 22 shows the highest scores:

1. The quality of the BAC must be guaranteed: 95.3% fully agrees = 41 of 43 respondents.
2. It fits the needs of an evolving Europe: 72.1% agrees = 31 respondents.
3. The opening up is quite successful: 55.8% agrees = 24 respondents.
4. Type I schools should be laboratories for Type II and III schools: 53.5% agrees = 23 respondents.
5. It is more realistic: 51.2% agrees = 22 respondents.
6. It creates more options for pupils, parents and teachers: 50% agrees = 21 of 42 respondents; 33.3% has no opinion = 14; 16.6% disagrees = 7.
7. Category 1, 2 and 3 should not exist: 46.5% agrees = 20; 16.3% has no opinion = 7; 37.3% disagrees = 16.

If you split “Category 1, 2, and 3 should not exist” according to type of stakeholder, it shows that Directors (62.5% fully agrees, 37.5% disagrees) have a stronger opinion than the Deputy-directors (46.7% agrees, 26.7 no opinion, 26.7% disagrees).
When reflecting on the opening up of the system, the quality of the BAC is the biggest concern of the stakeholders. Almost all respondent fully agree with the statement that the quality of the BAC must be guaranteed. Whether the opening up is cheaper, creates more mobility and more options for pupils, parents and teachers, about half of the respondents agree, and half has no opinion. Very few disagree.

A big group of respondents partially agrees that the opening up of the system is quite successful. More than half of the respondents think it is successful, more realistic, it fits the needs of an evolving Europe and that type 1 schools should be laboratories for type 2 and 3 schools.
9.3.4 Reform of the European Baccalaureate

Table 18. Awareness ideas reform of EB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, which?</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 shows the answers to question 17: Do you know the ideas for reforming the European Baccalaureate?

Figure 22 shows that 72.7% (32 of 44) of the respondents say they do know the ideas for reforming the European Baccalaureate (EB).
Figure 23 shows the answer to the question: “Do you know the ideas for reforming the European Baccalaureate?” Most convinced are the Directors (100% claims to know the ideas for reforming the European Baccalaureate), then Parents, then Inspectors. Deputy-directors and teachers are not much convinced they know the ideas for reforming, (nearly half of the Deputy-directors and half of the teachers claim they do not know these ideas). Half of the Inspectors are of course primary inspectors and are less impacted.

![Graph showing percentage of stakeholders knowing the ideas for reforming the EB](image)

Figure 23. Ideas for reforming the EB by stakeholder.

The open answers to the question “What are the ideas for reforming the EB?” give a qualitative indication of the awareness amongst the stakeholders of the ideas for reforming the European Baccalaureate. Analysing these text answers, most respondents refer to the reduction of
the number of oral exams (14 out of 23 answers), distance marking (10 out of 23), cost reduction or cost effectiveness (10 out of 23 answers), pedagogical issues like the multidisciplinary project (8 out of 23), quality assurance (8 out of 23), opening up (8 out of 23). One person specifically mentions autonomy.

The following answer combines cost, quality assurance and opening up:

Kosteneinsparung bei gleichzeitiger Qualitätssicherung und Qualitätsverbesserung mit dem Blick auf Erweiterung des Systems36 (R553).

The following text answer involves cost saving, written-oral exams, marking system, multidisciplinary project, and opening up:

Cost saving through change of numbers of written-oral examinations, marking system. Introduction of multidisciplinary task in S6. Opening up of EB to other schools (R502).

The following response involves number of oral exams, local management of written exams, distance marking, and abolition of deliberations:

[n]ombre d'examens oraux, la gestion locale des examens écrits, la correction à distance, l'abolition de la deliberations etcétera37 (R462).

---

36 Cost savings while improving quality assurance and quality with a view to expanding the system.
37 Number of oral examinations, local management of written examinations, remote corrections, abolition of the deliberations etc.
The following response speaks about adaptation to modern teaching, autonomy, modernization, transparency and opening up:

Quality Assurance by changing and adapting the assessment criteria to the objectives of modern teaching, giving the written and oral part a different weight (number of exams), more autonomy by making schools exam centres, modernizing the means: ICT in exams (maths), corrections at distance, more transparency like minutes in orals, make it ready for sale to type II and III schools (R341).

**Table 19. Awareness changes EB.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answered</th>
<th>Skipped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. Have you noticed any changes in the European Baccalaureate over the last year?</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, which?</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 shows the answers to question 18: Have you noticed any changes in the European Baccalaureate over the last year?

Figure 25 shows that about half of the respondents have noticed any changes in the European Baccalaureate over the last year.
Analysing the open answers to the question “Which changes in the European Baccalaureate have you noticed over the last year?”, it is noted that most respondents have noticed distance marking (7 out of 16 open answers), pedagogical issues like improvements in the content of Dutch and Music exams (5 out of 16), illustrated by the following text answer:

Improvements in the content of the written exams for Dutch and Music and other subjects as well, a better second correction according to clear marking schemes and assessment criteria, a better cooperation between the 1st and 2nd examiner during the orals, a better use of assessment criteria during the orals (R391).

Other respondents noted organizational issues (4 out of 16) and schools becoming exam centres (3), as the following text answer illustrates:

Schools became exam centres with growing responsibilities, corrections at distance, many more SEN cases which pushed the school's capacity to its limits (R341).
The other text answers involved quality improvements (3), 2 comments on SEN and 1 about opening up. The following text answer clarifies a shift in responsibilities:

Headmasters responsible in the schools instead of inspectors (R081).

9.3.5 Comments

Table 20. Further comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Please add any further comments here</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 shows the answer to question 19: Please add further comments here.

Finalizing the survey, there was one open question, asking for further comments or particular issues. Eleven respondents gave a free text comment. Mostly, these open answers indicate that stakeholders have concerns regarding the reform. Three comments refer to the costs savings, one expressing a concern regarding quality and one regarding bureaucracy, and one regarding autonomy:

Wenn die Reform zu mehr Autonomie und nicht nur zu Kosteneinsparungen fuhrt, traegt sie jeder gerne mit (R543).
Two comments refer to globalisation, making special reference to the original mission of the European School and how they should be beneficial, according to the needs of society. Also is remarked that the European School system can play a leading role in education throughout Europe, and the need for innovation.

One comment is more political:

The system is close to collapse. Main reason is the political false involvement from the personal department of the commission (R081).

After the descriptive results of the questions on the reform of the governance of the European School system, some evaluation is presented in relation to the categories of analysis: globalisation and changing role of education.

Globalisation means marketization of education, and international corporations taking over educational services. Schools become more business-like in their approach and need to be prepared for continuous change. One could argue that these elements are reflected in the views of the stakeholders on the reform of the governance of the European School system. The stakeholders feel most strongly about bureaucracy. They feel they have more bureaucracy now and they hope to get less.

In the literature review arguments can be found that suggest that the effects of globalisation demanded a changing role of education that in turn seems to have initiated a widespread school reform.

Autonomy is the world-wide answer to globalisation. Stakeholders are quite aware of the need of autonomy. More autonomy, independency and decision power are valued high by the stakeholders.
Chapter II: Research Methodology

Opening up is an answer to the demand for international education where mutual understanding of each other’s language and culture promote social harmony and European citizenship.

The reform of the European Baccalaureate is an answer to the global professionalization and marketization of education as well as the need to simplify because of the opening up of the system. Stakeholders agree that opening up fits the need of an evolving Europe and they think is successful. They are also quite aware of the need for simplification of the European Baccalaureate.

10. Conclusions

The conclusions are presented in the order of the research questions. First of all, the views of the stakeholders on the strengths and weaknesses of the European School system are presented. Secondly, the views they have on the reform of the governance of the European School system and its specific areas, such as autonomy, opening up and the reform of the European Baccalaureate. In third place, a comparison between these research questions is made and an attempt to answer the question, what is the effect of the reform on the strengths and weaknesses of the European Schools and is the reform successful in the eyes of its stakeholders? Lastly, policy recommendations are made.

10.1 Research question 1 and 2

The first two research questions were:

1. What are, according to the stakeholders, the strengths of the European School system?
2. What are, according to the stakeholders, the areas for improvement of the European School system?

10.1.1 Strengths in the eyes of the stakeholders

This research finds that the stakeholders value most the multilingual and multicultural aspect of the European School system. These two strengths coincide with the findings of authors of earlier studies on the European School system, like Beatens Beardsmore (1993), Housen (2011) and Swan (1996). Furthermore, in this research multilingual and multicultural skills are valued above the science and math teaching, which is in line with the views that many stakeholders in the wider educational arena display when they propose education that prepares pupils for the future.

The use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) at schools is considered one of the strengths of the European Schools. This is confirmed by views of the authors in Panorama (2010), edition 234 on “ICT in the European Schools” and the results of the surveys launched in Brussels I, in 2008 and 2010, in which an increasing majority of the respondents chose “Modern teaching” (including ICT) as a priority.

Globalisation increased the demand for international education, and raised awareness for the need of citizenship: belonging to a common social and cultural area based on solidarity and mutual understanding of cultural diversities. The European Schools provide an international education (multilingualism) and promote equal respect of cultures and diversity (multiculturalism). It allows you to create your own identity and allows others the same right. The European schools answer the need for education for the intercultural awareness and expose teachers and pupils to cultural diversity.
10.1.2 Weaknesses in the eyes of the stakeholders

Concerning improvement areas stakeholders of the European School system indicate that the system needs more quality assurance and more involvement of the stakeholders including the local community. The respondents involved in this research agree with the authors of earlier studies that overpopulation and lack of an alternative course to the European Baccalaureate are important weaknesses of the system. Furthermore they feel that there is too much bureaucracy and that more autonomy is needed for schools.

Globalisation means increased speed of life. To be prepared for the future, competences are necessary to promote creativity, flexibility, adaptability and abilities to learn and solve problems. The classical subjects: maths and sciences are valued low in this research and an alternative for the traditional Baccalaureate has become very important for the stakeholders. To be prepared for the future, new competencies are important and classical subjects and traditional knowledge seem less important.

Regarding the changed role of education, to get social harmony, we want to create men and women that are capable of doing new things and feel comfortable in a world of continuous progress and change. To achieve this, teachers need to be role-models for international mindedness. Seconded teachers in the European School system are selected and recruited by the national systems and are not specially prepared for an international environment, and when they are trained and exposed to this cultural diversity for a few years they have to leave (9-year rule). Most worrying is that the inspectors do not value very highly the quality and professionalism of seconded teachers.
10.2 Research question 3

The third specific research question was concerning the reform process:

3.1 What is the impact of the reform process on the stakeholders?
3.2 What would the stakeholders hope for in the reform process?
3.3 How much are the stakeholders aware and did they notice specific areas of the reform process (autonomy, opening up of the system, reform of the European Baccalaureate)?

10.2.1 Impact and hopes of the stakeholders

Concerning the impact of the reform on stakeholder’s life and work, stakeholders claim to have more bureaucracy. Educational institutions all over the world complain they spend more and more time on administrative and legal matters than on educational matters. Stakeholders also perceive less operating money. Operating money has actually been lowered by the Commission restricting the overall and individual budgets. In the literature can be found that reform processes and economic measures often go hand in hand. Stakeholders are concerned that the cuts in the budget result in cuts in the heart of the European School system.

In the reform process stakeholders' hopes are high; they especially hope to get more freedom, flexibility for individual schools, opportunities for improvement, quality of education, efficiency, decision power, autonomy, independency and communication within school. That is a long wish-list, but actually this is what is generally expected from a reform process, and especially autonomy. Stakeholders hope to get less complexity and bureaucracy. Less complexity is not very likely as the
world is getting more complex, but clear information might help to understand the complexity. Less bureaucracy is also not very likely, but once the new tools are in place and the old tools and organs are disappearing, one might expect to waste less time and do useful things.

Globalisation means marketization of education, and international corporations taking over educational services. Schools become more business-like in their approach and need to be prepared for continuous change. One could argue that these elements are reflected in the views of the stakeholders on the reform of the governance of the European School system. The stakeholders feel most strongly about bureaucracy. They feel they have more bureaucracy now and they hope to get less. If bureaucracy is typically a trait of public administration, a more business-like approach would be welcomed, just like they value most: freedom, flexibility, opportunities for improvement, and efficiency, which seems to indicate they are ready for continuous change as in modern organisations.

10.2.2 Autonomy, opening up and the reform of the EB

Stakeholders are quite aware of autonomy, opening up and the reform of the European Baccalaureate. Concerning autonomy the most successful is the newly created advisory organ SAC that gives voice inside the school to all stakeholders. There is room for increasing awareness amongst Deputy-directors and teachers of the notions and tools of the reform, as the findings show that a leadership training organized for Directors and Deputy-directors had a considerable impact on their understanding of the reform and therewith the necessity for autonomy. Research confirms that training programs can be highly effective in times of change.
Stakeholders value highly “School management should be involved in inspections” and “a coherent recruitment policy should be developed”. Several stakeholders remarked that this is already the case, although according to Van Gool (2009) greater school autonomy in HRM is needed and there is a lack of coordination in recruitment, which creates variation and inconsistency. Research confirms that autonomy in recruitment and selection are essential to successfully prepare the schools for the future.

Concerning opening up most stakeholders agree that opening up fits the needs of an evolving Europe but almost all stakeholders strongly agree that the quality of the BAC must be guaranteed. Concerning the reform of the Baccalaureate, the majority of the stakeholders are aware of the changes and about half noticed some already.

The effects of globalisation demanded a changing role of education that in turn seems to have initiated a widespread school reform. Autonomy is the world-wide answer to globalisation. Stakeholders are quite aware of the need of autonomy. More autonomy, independency and decision power are valued high by the stakeholders. One of the elements of autonomy is involvement of the stakeholders, and stakeholders hope to get more communication in schools. The success of the School Advisory Council (SAC) is another indication that this element of autonomy is highly appreciated, since the SAC is a new and the only body at school level that seeks to involve most stakeholders.

Opening up is an answer to the demand for international education where mutual understanding of each other’s language and culture promote social harmony and European citizenship. The reform of the European Baccalaureate is an answer to the global professionalization and marketization of education as well as the need to simplify because of the opening up of the system. Stakeholders agree that opening up fits the
need of an evolving Europe and they think is successful. They are also quite aware of the need for simplification of the European Baccalaureate.

10.3 Comparison of research question 1 and 2 with 3

In the following section an attempt is made to compare the first two research questions with the third, or more specifically the initial third research question: What effect does the process of reform have on the strengths and weaknesses of the European School system?

In general, stakeholders worry that the effects of the reform will cut out the heart of the European School system, like the multilingual and multicultural environment.

Concerning opening up and the simplification of the European Baccalaureate, most respondents are worried about the quality of the BAC, which must be guaranteed.

Financial measures often go hand in hand with reform, but the world-wide economic crisis has made the Commission's attitude towards budgets cuts more severe and some stakeholders perceive that this holds back or slows down the autonomy process.

Since the reform process has not finished yet, it is hard to say what the final effect of the reform process on the strengths and weaknesses of the European Schools will be. Stakeholders are worried and should remain involved in these changes.

10.4 Is the reform successful in the eyes of its stakeholders?

If the reform was the answer to globalisation and changing role of education, is the reform living up to these challenges or more specifically:
The European School system in the eyes of its stakeholders is the reform successful in the eyes of its stakeholders? To answer this question we need to recollect what was reform set out to do.

The reform started with a proposal for financial reform with a new financial regulation, and a need for cost sharing (including looking for alternative ways of financing). This has not been very successful as the new Financial Regulation has brought a lot of bureaucracy in the eyes of the stakeholders, the system is still looking for alternative ways of financing and cost sharing is an unresolved issue.

The second element of the reform was autonomy and improvements in governance: simpler decision making processes, more clearly defined responsibilities and tasks for different actors and organs, and self-evaluation. Some elements are quite successful like the newly created bodies School Advisory Council, Joint Teaching Committees and the increase of powers of the Admin Board. Although some elements of autonomy are successful, in the European Schools there is limited autonomy in the use of public funds, and limited to no autonomy in the use of private funds. There is no autonomy in selection, dismissal, duties and responsibilities and disciplining the school heads, and limited autonomy with respect to teaching staff, slightly more for locally recruited staff than for seconded teachers. The success of autonomy will remain questionable if inspirational leaders cannot be chosen and these leaders in their turn cannot choose their own teachers. Self-evaluation also has to be addressed further.

The third element of the reform was opening up and the reform of the European Baccalaureate (EB). The opening up has been successful (6 new Type 2 schools have already opened) and the EB has implemented some simplifications already. Hopefully the involvement of the National Systems in Type 2 schools will bring greater cooperation between
European Schools and National systems, because in the eyes of the stakeholders the commitment of Member States is fading.

The fourth element of the reform was quality of teaching and pedagogical improvements: Mother Tongue teaching, collaboration between language sections, more homogeneous curriculum, joint pedagogical content, integration in local environment, teachers and management training, assessment at 16 years, do something at school leavers, joint inspections. Some elements have started, like joint inspections are now a fact, but mostly the pedagogical improvements still have to start.

10.5 Recommendations

Below are some policy recommendations that might help to improve the system further:

• Concerning the stakeholders: Give more voice to pupils, and involve the ex-pupils, they are the best defenders of the system. Give voice to locally recruited staff, their numbers are increasing, and they stay longer than 9 years. Increase Member State involvement through collaboration with type 2 schools, they can be considered a platform to create true spirited European Schooling throughout Europe, and good ideas can be exchanged. Involve teachers and Deputy-directors in leadership for commitment and improvement.

• Concerning governance: move towards a Quality Management System (like ISO 9001). This will help focus on quality, stakeholders, benchmarking, self-evaluation, involving experts and continual improvement. Description of the workflows will help teachers and middle management to have more insight; it will facilitate knowledge transfer (nine year rule) and analysis of the impact of proposed
changes. Set up an academic research network to develop a fund of knowledge and continually expanding and renewing it.

11. Recent developments

In this section recent developments are discussed, which in this case means a window of one year: developments that incurred after the launch of the survey in October 2010 until the Joint Teaching Committees of October 2011.

In a study day on the future of the European Schools in March 2011, one of the most remarkable outcomes was that stakeholders in the system are worried about the lack of interest, awareness and commitment of Member States. In the different bodies of the European Schools the Member States are represented by different persons, for example in the JTC it is the inspectors and in the BoG it is other representatives of the national governments. Therefore, for the stakeholders of the Member States it is more difficult to be aware of all issues concerning the European Schools. The Member States are much more involved in the Type 2 European Schools and therefore would be more aware, committed and interested in European Schooling, if they were given the information, contacts, and platform to create true spirited European Schools.

On the 4th of June 2011 an article was published on a Eurosceptic blog, called: “Elite European Schools: how the eurocrats' kids get the gravy and you pay for it” There was an avalanche of comments from ex-pupils, defending “their” system. This has incentivized two ex-pupils to start a new alumni association: Alumni Europaea.

Recent developments show that there are more and more SWALS in the system and they will keep on growing as Europe grows but the number of language sections created in the European Schools will not.
According to the stakeholders these pupils have always had very good results. It would be interesting to research if this is true and if so, why they do in order to be able to make sure they will continue to do so.

If we look at European public institutions and International Baccalaureate Schools we notice that the trend is continuing to move to obtaining an ISO 9001 certification or getting any other Quality Management System in place. This helps to focus on stakeholders, feedback and continual improvement. A good description of work flows could help schools greatly.

There are more and more locally recruited teachers (28% are locally recruited). Between 2007 and 2010 there was an 18.44% increase of locally recruited teachers in the system. (Board of Governors, 2010). Should they not have a voice in the system?

Already six Type 2 schools have been created and two more are planned. The academic literature on context learning indicates in the direction that the European School pupils “live” to become Europeans because of their multilingual and multicultural context (peers and teachers) and “teaching” Europe in a homogeneous context would not have the same effect. Housen (2002) warns that it would be “inappropriate to transplant the ES model to different contexts”. When we continue to open up the system, some considerations should be taken into account:

Time and timing of L2 education. L2 education should span Primary and Secondary and no more than 50% should be devoted to L2; Integrating language and content. It is recommended that at least one general subject be taught through the medium of L2; Need for independent self-sustained output. The use of target language as the medium of instruction needs to be complemented by communication-rich social contexts in class and elsewhere in the school that promote
spontaneous continuous output; Apart from teaching through the medium of L2, there is a need for (formal) L2-subject teaching. (p. 60-61)

According to the literature salary has an effect on job satisfaction or stability at school level. With the reduction of salary in the new statutes, this should be carefully watched. At the same time, limited faculty involvement can be a source of dissatisfaction with teaching. More teacher involvement, more job satisfaction. If a teacher is more informed and involved in the system, he/she is more committed. Also in leadership literature, all participate to the success of the school.

In September 2011 the European Parliament published a resolution on European Schools, prepared by Mr Cavada, which summarises facts and suggestions on organization and spread of the European School system, budgetary aspects and educational aspects. First of all it acknowledges the multilingual and multicultural aspects of the schools and that the schools are entirely different from international schools. According to the resolution the system needs a legal basis to simplify the governance. It is a unique system with 50 years of experience and should open up. For that it needs a change in legal status. The educational model should be promoted in the Member States because they have added value. Effort should be made to bring students together with different cultural and linguistic backgrounds. The financial crisis that made the Commission rationalise the costs should not penalise children with Special Educational Needs (SEN), mother tongue and the growing number of SWALS. Amongst the suggestions on organization and spread, the European Schools are acknowledged to be an excellent educational showcase, tried and tested that should be spread in the Member States, with collective effort to cooperate, to share best schooling practices and examples. Students and teachers could be exchanged and awareness of
the European Schools risen. The schools need more autonomy and because they are considered to be in “legal limbo”, their legal situation should be improved and they should be brought under the umbrella of the Union. Concerning budgetary aspects, alternative ways for funding should be sought that are fair, while at the same time it is acknowledged that the proposed cuts in the budget constitute a serious threat to the quality of education and the proper functioning of the European Schools. Concerning educational aspects the parliament proposes an external evaluation of the European School syllabi, locally recruited staff meeting the same excellence criteria as seconded staff, improving induction training for teachers, examining the educational and financial causes of the failure rate and disparity in results, especially in the French language section and assessing the impact of a school leaving certificate other than the EB (European Parliament resolution on the European School system, 2011).

A vast majority agrees that fair cost-sharing is needed. In a document for the Board of Governors of December 2011 about cost sharing it is clear that the foreseen solution to share costs by having other Member States sending teachers that could teach a subject in English was not very successful. Only 18 teachers were sent, while there are 150 English teachers too many in the system. It was decided to start WG for cost sharing. In February 2012 they had their first meeting, and they met again in March 2012. In the BoG of April 2012 no final decision was taken although stakeholders agree that disproportionate situation cannot continue. The question is what system to use to share costs more fairly. Everyone wants new resources and fundamental change to funding of system; however these would involve changes to the Convention which is a long term process as it needs unanimity. As for medium term solution,
no commitments other than promises again to send more non-native teachers. A Working Group will be set up to do further work.

One of the latest developments in the system is about the raise of school fees for category III. The Commission wants to raise the fees, since the real costs for a pupil are more than double than the category III fee. Stakeholders are very worried.
12. Summary/Resumen en español

The European School system in the eyes of its stakeholders

El sistema de las Escuelas Europeas desde la perspectiva de sus grupos de interés

12.1 Objetivos y la evolución de las Escuelas Europeas

Cuando las Escuelas Europeas se crearon, su misión era doble. Por un lado, se quería ofrecer una solución para los hijos de los funcionarios europeos proporcionando movilidad y enseñanza en la lengua materna, asegurando así que el niño pudiera volver a los sistemas nacionales. Por otro lado, se quería crear laboratorios de experimentación pedagógica para el multilingüismo, la educación multicultural, y un programa europeo de armonización.

Las Escuelas Europeas existen desde hace 55 años. En la actualidad, hay catorce escuelas en 7 países, con unos 23.000 alumnos, con edades comprendidas entre en los 4 a 18 años.

Debido a la ampliación de Europa, el número de idiomas que se ofrecen en las Escuelas Europeas aumentó de 5, en 1957, a 21, en 2011.

Fueron creadas más escuelas y la complejidad del sistema de las Escuelas Europeas creció considerablemente. Simultáneamente, contexto de las escuelas también ha cambiado, de forma considerable, en las últimas décadas. Un descontento general con la calidad de la educación, la globalización y el rol cambiante de la educación exige una reforma (Karsten, De Jong, Ledoux y Sligte, 2006).

No solo las Escuelas Europeas, sino todas las escuelas en Europa
han sido objeto de discusiones y numerosas reformas, especialmente en lo que se refiere a la autonomía. El énfasis de este proceso de autonomía estuvo siempre en 3 elementos claves: la gestión de los fondos públicos invertidos en la educación, la participación de las partes interesadas y, especialmente en los últimos años y la calidad de la enseñanza (Eurydice, 2007). En la mayoría de los casos, los procesos de autonomía coinciden con las medidas financieras.

Para el éxito de una escuela, es esencial el liderazgo de su director. Este debe de ser un líder inspirador, con una visión holística y una dimensión humana. Además, el liderazgo compartido o distribuido, donde toda la comunidad escolar participe, promete una mayor eficacia de profesores y estudiantes.

A pesar de que Swan (1996) ya habló de la necesidad de la reforma y abogó por una mayor autonomía y apertura del sistema, no fue hasta la publicación de 2 informes iniciados por el Parlamento Europeo, el informe Bösch (2002) sobre la financiación de las Escuelas Europeas y el informe Honeyball (2005), que se planteó la necesidad de una reforma de la gobernanza del sistema de Escuelas Europeas. El proceso empezó con una reforma financiera y la búsqueda de una participación en los costos más equitativa entre los países miembros, seguido por un proceso hacia mayor autonomía para las escuelas.

Se iniciaron 3 proyectos piloto para la autonomía y un grupo de trabajo para la reforma. El sistema comenzó a abrirse en el sentido que la apertura permite que escuelas de otro tipo ofrezcan el Bachillerato Europeo. Por ello, era necesario la simplificación y la reforma del bachillerato europeo. Aunque la mayoría cree que la reforma era necesaria, los autores sobre el sistema de las Escuelas Europeas advierten que hay que asegurarse de no perder de vista los puntos fuertes y de ser muy cuidadosos a la hora de trasplantar el modelo a diferentes
12.2 Cuestiones de la investigación

A partir del marco teórico, se plantearon las siguientes cuestiones iniciales de investigación:
1. ¿Cuáles son, según las partes interesadas, los puntos fuertes del sistema de Escuelas Europeas?
2. ¿Cuáles son, según las partes interesadas, las debilidades del sistema de Escuelas Europeas?
3. ¿Qué efecto tiene el proceso de reforma en las fortalezas y debilidades?

Después de la recogida de datos con las herramientas iniciales, fueron formuladas las siguientes cuestiones de investigación específicas de este trabajo:
1. ¿Cuáles son, según las partes interesadas, los puntos fuertes del sistema de Escuelas Europeas?
2. ¿Cuáles son, según las partes interesadas, las áreas de mejora del sistema de Escuelas Europeas?
3. En cuanto al proceso de reforma:
   3.1 ¿Cuál es el impacto del proceso de reforma en los grupos de interés?
   3.2 ¿Cuáles son las esperanzas de las partes interesadas en el proceso de reforma?
   3.3 ¿Cuál es el nivel de conciencia de los grupos de interés de las áreas específicas del proceso de reforma (la autonomía, la apertura del sistema y la reforma del bachillerato europeo)?
12.3 Los grupos de interés

El sistema educativo europeo tiene muchas partes interesadas o grupos de interés, entre ellas la Oficina del Secretario General, la Comisión Europea, los Estados Miembros – en particular los representantes de los Ministerios de Educación e inspectores–, directores, directores adjuntos, profesores, alumnos, personal administrativo, padres, las instituciones, las comunidades locales y el Parlamento.

En cuanto al acceso de los alumnos, las escuelas fueron creadas para los hijos de los funcionarios europeos. En este momento, alrededor de 2/3 de los alumnos pertenecen a este grupo. Estos alumnos están exentos de las cuotas escolares. Otros niños pueden ser admitidos en función de la disponibilidad de plazas y están sujetos al pago de una cuota anual. Una cantidad de alumnos muy pequeña es admitida en el sistema por un contrato entre la compañía de sus padres y la escuela pagando una cuota de los costos reales anuales de un alumno, que puede variar según la escuela y que oscila entre 10.000 y 16.000 euros, para el año escolar 2011-2012. Los alumnos que no pertenecen a las 2 categorías antes mencionadas pagan una cuota de 2.702,76 euros para la guardería, 3.716,34 euros para primaria y 5.067,74 euros para secundaria, por año escolar 2011-2012 (Board of Governors, 2010).

En cuanto al reclutamiento de profesores, la responsabilidad de la contratación de personal corresponde a los inspectores nacionales. Cada país de la Unión Europea cuenta con un inspector para primaria y otro para secundaria. La diversidad de culturas y actitudes que existen en Europa en el entorno educativo implican que hay una variedad de métodos de reclutamiento y selección de personal para la Escuela Europea. A grandes rasgos existen 2 modelos de gestión de recursos humanos en Europa: el sistema basado en la carrera y el sistema de
posicionamiento.

El hecho de que los profesores de algunos sistemas deben renunciar a su puesto de enseñanza, en su lugar de origen, con el fin de poder aceptar un trabajo en la escuela europea, y sin garantía de empleo al finalizar su contrato, constituye una desincentivo a los posibles solicitantes de esos países. En todo caso, el contrato de un profesor de la escuela europea no será superior a un periodo de 9 años, después del cual se supone que debe volver a su sistema nacional. Antes de llegar a las Escuelas Europeas, los profesores no reciben ninguna formación específica para enseñar en escuelas plurilingües. Algunos tienen un título para enseñar su propio idioma como segunda lengua o lengua extranjera, pero la mayoría de los profesores aprenden a enseñar a grupos de alumnos multilingües no nativos durante el desempeño del mismo trabajo y por mediación de los programas de formación organizados por las escuelas.

12.4 Las variables de análisis y las herramientas

Las variables de análisis se construyeron mediante las herramientas iniciales: entrevistas, cuestionarios abiertos, observación y documentos oficiales e internos de la escuela europea. Se llevaron a cabo una docena de entrevistas, con directores, directores adjuntos y con el Secretario General. Se redactó un cuestionario abierto destinado a los padres y profesores.

Cuando ya teníamos 25 respuestas de los padres, 6 respuestas de los profesores y 6 respuestas de directores (adjuntos), recibimos una propuesta para un estudio más específico y decidimos construir la herramienta final: la encuesta en línea. Además de las entrevistas y cuestionarios abiertos, se utilizó la observación como herramienta inicial.
Asimismo, en los últimos 10 años todas las escuelas fueron visitadas y la autora de esta investigación participó, en los últimos 6 años, en todas las reuniones de Interparents preparatorias del Comité Pedagógico Mixto y del Consejo Superior de las Escuelas Europeas, del 2010 al 2012, además como secretario de Interparents. Por otra parte, adquirí un mejor conocimiento de las Escuelas Europeas como representante oficial de Interparents en el Comité Pedagógico Mixto en 2010 y 2011, y como representante del Comité del Personal de la OAMI, en una jornada de estudio sobre el futuro de las Escuelas Europeas y durante un taller sobre la gobernabilidad y la autonomía el 14 de marzo de 2011.

En este marco, para la construcción de las variables de análisis y el desarrollo de la encuesta, se estudiaron los documentos oficiales e internos de las Escuelas Europeas.

Cuando se revisó la recolección inicial de datos, se formularon las cuestiones específicas de investigación y se construyeron las preguntas relativas a las fortalezas, a las debilidades y a la reforma para la encuesta en línea. Esta se construyó de la siguiente manera: las primeras diez preguntas son demográficas, seguidas por preguntas sobre las fortalezas y debilidades. En cuanto a la reforma, hay preguntas para descubrir lo que se espera y el impacto, la autonomía, la apertura y la reforma del bachillerato europeo. La encuesta termina con una pregunta general y abierta.

Sobre la base de las herramientas iniciales, las preguntas para las fuerzas tenían que incluir las siguientes variables: la educación europea, la movilidad, la apertura de mente para que las culturas, el ambiente multicultural y tolerante, los eventos entre las Escuelas Europeas, la enseñanza de la lengua madre, el mantenerse en contacto con la identidad o cultura de la madre / padre, el ambiente multilingüe, el conocimiento de varios idiomas y la familiaridad con las personas que
hablan otros idiomas, la enseñanza de profesores nativos, la alta calidad y el profesionalismo de los profesores, la alta calidad de enseñanza de las ciencias y las matemáticas, el alto nivel educativo en general, las actividades extra-curriculares como las veladas culturales, producciones musicales, obras de teatro, la buena preparación para la educación superior y trabajo posterior, el reconocimiento del bachillerato europeo, y la buena reputación de ex-alumnos.

Para las debilidades, las variables se dividían en dos grupos: las debilidades de gobernanza y las de calidad. La pregunta sobre debilidades de gobernanza incluía: la complejidad del sistema, el exceso de burocracia, la necesidad de más autonomía para las escuelas, la necesidad de desarrollar una política de contratación coherente, la duración máxima de 9 años de contratación de profesores y directores (adjuntos) como uno de los mayores problemas del sistema de Escuelas Europeas, la necesidad de la participación en la gestión de las escuelas en las inspecciones, una estructura intergubernamental que no se ajusta a una agencia de educación y la necesidad de participación equitativa en los gastos.

Los debilidades de calidad contenían las siguientes variables: la necesidad de más control de calidad para el sistema, la necesidad de más participación de los grupos de interés, la falta de alternativa al bachillerato europeo, la necesidad de mayor integración de las escuelas en la vida local, la sobreexplotación, el sistema no cuida suficientemente de los alumnos que no tienen sección lingüística propia, o que tienen necesidades educativas especiales.

Las pregunta sobre el impacto y las esperanzas, que tienen los encuestados en el proceso de reforma de las escuelas europeas incluía las siguientes variables de análisis: la libertad, la burocracia, la carga de trabajo, las reglas, la participación de los interesados, la calidad de vida,
la calidad de la educación, las posibilidades profesionales, la eficiencia, la rentabilidad, el poder de decisión, el voto, el tiempo en las reuniones, las responsabilidades, la rendición de cuentas, el control, la autonomía, la independencia, la flexibilidad, la participación, el presupuesto, la complejidad, la comunicación dentro de la escuela, las oportunidades para la planificación escolar, las oportunidades para reflexión, la evaluación y las oportunidades de mejora.

Para la pregunta sobre la autonomía, fueron incluidos los siguientes conceptos: el plan escolar anual, el plan de desarrollo multi-anual, el plan de acción, el informe de actividades, el Consejo Consultivo Escolar, la libertad en las partidas presupuestarias, la autonomía pedagógica, un mayor poder de decisión en el Consejo de Administración, la rendición de cuentas para los directores, las recomendaciones de las escuelas piloto, las plantillas para nuevos informes y planes, y los principales indicadores clave de rendimiento.

Con relación a la pregunta sobre la apertura del sistema, se incluyeron los siguientes elementos: la apertura del sistema es bastante acertado, se crea una mayor movilidad, se crean más opciones para los alumnos, padres y profesores, es más barato, es más realista, se adapta a las necesidades de una evolución de Europa, las Escuelas Europeas deben ser laboratorios para escuelas de otro tipo, la calidad del bachillerato europeo debe garantizarse, no deberían existir diferencias entre las distintas categorías de alumnos.

Las últimas 3 preguntas sobre la reforma del bachillerato europeo eran de tipo abierto.
12.5 Las categorías de análisis

Para evaluar la información recopilada, se desarrollaron 2 categorías de análisis: la globalización y el rol cambiante de la educación.

La globalización ha dado lugar a un aumento de la demanda internacional de la educación y la necesidad de una mayor conciencia de la ciudadanía europea: pertenencia a un espacio social y cultural común basado en la solidaridad y el entendimiento mutuo entre las diferentes culturas (Martínez y Sauleda, 2007).

Las normas se construyen en conjunto y las comunidades unifican criterios de pensamiento y de actuación. El lenguaje es la base del pensamiento y el aprendizaje es social. Los profesores y alumnos de la escuela, a través de sus múltiples idiomas y normas, llegan a construir diversas comunidades. Según la revisión de la literatura, la raíz de los conflictos mundiales actuales y los choques de las culturas se halla en la falta de comprensión.

La globalización también significa una mayor velocidad de vida. Para estar preparados para el futuro, son necesarios nuevos conocimientos y competencias para promover la creatividad, la flexibilidad, la adaptabilidad y la capacidad para aprender y resolver problemas. Para llegar a la armonía social, necesitamos formar hombres y mujeres capaces de hacer cosas nuevas y que se sientan cómodos en un mundo de progreso y cambio permanente.

Por otro lado, la educación se convierte cada vez más en un negocio, lo que conlleva que las corporaciones internacionales se quieran hacer cargo de los servicios educativos. Las escuelas actúan más como negocios, en su enfoque, y sienten la necesidad de estar preparados para el cambio continuo.

Los efectos de la globalización exigen una evolución del papel de la
la educación que a su vez parece haber iniciado una reforma educativa mundial. Autonomía, participación de los interesados, la rendición de cuentas, una mayor responsabilidad y una mayor conciencia de liderazgo son una respuesta a la evolución del papel de la educación. Ante esto, surge inevitablemente la siguiente interrogante: ¿Están estos elementos de globalización y del cambiante rol de educación reflejados en los puntos de vista de las partes interesadas en el sistema de las Escuelas Europeas?

12.5 Resultados de la encuesta

La encuesta constaba de 19 preguntas, 5 preguntas cerradas y 14 que tenían un carácter abierto o un campo de comentarios. Fue plantada en 3 idiomas: inglés, francés y alemán.

El Comité Pedagógico Mixto (CPM) era el grupo destinatario de la encuesta puesto que es el órgano que representa a los miembros de la mayoría de los actores del sistema.

El CPM se compone de 14 directores, 28 subdirectores, 4 profesores, 4 padres, 2 alumnos, un representante de la Comisión Europea, un representante de una institución (Oficina Europea de Patentes, OEP), 54 inspectores (cada Estado miembro envía a 2 inspectores), el presidente y un vicepresidente y 2 miembros de la Oficina del Secretario General, que hacen un total de 112 miembros. La encuesta fue construida con una herramienta de encuestas en línea y fue lanzada por correo electrónico. Se recibió un total de 55 respuestas: 43 en inglés, 8 en francés y 4 en alemán.

De los 55 encuestados, que cumplimentaron la encuesta, el 95% rellenó al menos una pregunta y un 81,8% completó todas las preguntas.
Se podría considerar que la respuesta de los directores, directores adjuntos y los inspectores son representativos para su grupo. Los otros grupos no están representados lo suficiente como para sacar conclusiones. Por ello, se utilizan sus respuestas de forma indicativa.

Respondiendo a la pregunta de si forman parte de alguno de los referidos grupos, la mayoría de los encuestados afirma que forman parte del Comité Pedagógico Mixto y el Consejo Consultativo Escolar. Esto es importante, porque el Consejo Consultativo Escolar es un organismo muy reciente, creado en la reforma. Además, el Consejo Consultativo Escolar es el órgano más equilibrado, ya que en él están representadas todas las partes interesadas.

Casi todas las partes interesadas están de acuerdo en que el "ambiente multilingüe, el conocimiento de varios idiomas y la familiaridad con las personas que hablan otros idiomas" son la fuerza más importante del sistema de las Escuelas Europeas. Las otras fuerzas importantes son "la mente abierta a las culturas y el medio ambiente multicultural y tolerante". El multilingüismo, el multiculturalismo y la tolerancia son muy valorados.

Según los interesados, las áreas de mejora o puntos débiles de la gobernanza de las Escuelas Europeas son "un exceso de burocracia" y "la necesidad de una mayor autonomía para las escuelas". Es notoria la tendencia hacia la necesidad de una mayor autonomía. En enero de 2011, los actores estaban más convencidos de la necesidad de la autonomía que en octubre de 2010, probablemente causado por el efecto de una jornada de formación sobre el cambio, el liderazgo y la autonomía organizada por la Oficina del Secretario General en noviembre de 2010.

Según los encuestados, las áreas de mejora más importantes en materia de calidad son las siguientes: "El sistema necesita una mayor garantía de calidad" y "La falta de una alternativa al bachillerato Europeo".
Esto está en consonancia con lo que señalaron otros autores sobre el sistema de la Escuela Europea.

Las materias clásicas, las matemáticas y las ciencias, han dejado de ser muy valoradas por las partes interesadas, e igualmente, ha subido la conciencia de que es necesario encontrar alternativas menos académicas. Otras competencias parecen importantes. Los inspectores valoran muy bajo “la alta calidad y la profesionalidad de los profesores.

Casi todas las partes interesadas están de acuerdo en que se necesita una mayor autonomía para las escuelas. Esta es una de las áreas de mejora más importantes según los encuestados. Las herramientas que se han introducido para facilitar la autonomía, como el nuevo Consejo Consultivo Escolar, parecen estar muy bien utilizadas.

En cuanto al impacto, los encuestados valoran que, hasta ahora, en el proceso de la reforma, ha habido más burocracia y menos presupuesto. A menudo, las medidas financieras van de la mano de la reforma, pero la crisis económica mundial ha hecho que la actitud de la Comisión Europea respecto a los recortes presupuestarios sea más severa, y algunas partes interesadas perciben que esto ralentiza el proceso de autonomía.

En cuanto a las expectativas, los encuestados esperan conseguir más libertad, flexibilidad, oportunidades de mejora, calidad educativa, eficiencia, poder de decisión, autonomía, independencia y comunicación dentro de la escuela. Asimismo, abogan por un sistema menos complejo y burocrático.

Con respecto a la reforma del bachillerato europeo, los interesados coinciden en que la apertura del sistema se ajusta a la necesidad de una evolución europea y valoran que es un éxito. También son muy conscientes de la necesidad de simplificar el bachillerato europeo.
12.6 Conclusiones y recomendaciones

Esta investigación concluye que los grupos de interés valoran, por encima de todo, el aspecto multilingüe y multicultural del sistema de las Escuelas Europeas. Estos 2 puntos fuertes coinciden con los hallazgos de los autores de estudios anteriores sobre el sistema de Escuelas Europeas, como Beatens Beardsmore (1993), Housen (2002a, 2002b, 2008, 2011) y Swan (1996). En general, los interesados temen que los efectos de la reforma puedan afectar a las fuerzas del sistema de las Escuelas Europeas, especialmente en el entorno multilingüe y multicultural. La globalización ha aumentado la demanda de una educación internacional, y ha aumentado, asimismo, la conciencia de la necesidad de la ciudadanía europea: la pertenencia a un espacio social y cultural común basada en la solidaridad y el entendimiento mutuo de las diversidades culturales.

Las Escuelas Europeas ofrecen una educación internacional (multilingúismo) y promueven el respeto por la igualdad de las culturas y la diversidad (multiculturalismo). Permiten crear una identidad propia y que los demás tengan ese mismo derecho. En síntesis, responden a la necesidad de una educación dirigida a la sensibilización intercultural y a la diversidad cultural.

En cuanto a las áreas de mejora, las partes interesadas del sistema de Escuelas Europeas señalan que el sistema necesita una mayor garantía de calidad y una mayor participación por parte de los actores, incluyendo a la comunidad local. En ese sentido, están de acuerdo con los autores de estudios anteriores en que la superpoblación y la falta de una alternativa al bachillerato europeo son importantes debilidades del sistema. Además, consideran que hay demasiada burocracia y que se necesita una mayor autonomía para las escuelas.
La globalización significa una mayor velocidad de vida. Para estar preparados para el futuro, son necesarias las competencias para promover la creatividad, la flexibilidad, la adaptabilidad y la capacidad para aprender y resolver problemas.

Las materias clásicas: las matemáticas y las ciencias tienen un valor bastante bajo y la alternativa del Bachillerato tradicional se ha vuelto muy importante para los interesados. Para estar preparados para el futuro, son importantes las nuevas competencias. Los conocimientos clásicos, hoy por hoy, parecen menos importantes.

En cuanto al nuevo papel de la educación, para conseguir la armonía social, es necesario crear hombres y mujeres sean capaces de hacer cosas nuevas y sentirse cómodos en un mundo de progreso y cambio permanente. Para lograr esto, los alumnos necesitan modelos a seguir. La mayoría de los profesores del sistema de las Escuelas Europeas son seleccionados y contratados por los sistemas nacionales y no están especialmente preparados para un entorno intercultural. No obstante, después de haber estado expuesto a la diversidad cultural durante unos años, los profesores se convierten en modelos de multiculturalidad y flexibilidad. El problema es que estos profesionales se tienen que ir de vuelta a su sistema nacional después de un máximo de 9 años, y en algunos casos, de 5 años. Lo más preocupante es que los inspectores no valoran muy positivamente la calidad y la profesionalidad de los profesores.

En cuanto al impacto de la reforma en la vida y el trabajo de los interesados, estos afirman que existe más burocracia. Las instituciones educativas de todo el mundo se quejan de dedicar más tiempo a las cuestiones administrativas y legales, que a la materia educativa.

Las partes interesadas también perciben menos dinero operativo. En realidad, el dinero dedicado al funcionamiento ha sido reducido por la
Comisión Europea, restringiéndose los presupuestos generales e individuales. En la literatura, se puede encontrar que los procesos de reforma y las medidas económicas van a menudo de la mano. Las partes interesadas están preocupadas por los recortes presupuestarios, y temen que estos puedan afectar significativamente al sistema de Escuelas Europeas.

Las esperanzas de los actores son altas en cuanto a la reforma del proceso, sobre todo la esperanza de conseguir más libertad y flexibilidad para las escuelas individuales, oportunidades de mejora, calidad de la educación, eficiencia, poder de decisión, autonomía, independencia y comunicación dentro de la escuela. Esta es una larga lista de preferencias, pero en realidad es lo que generalmente se espera de un proceso de reforma.

Las partes interesadas desean que el sistema se haga menos complejo y burocrático. Es poco probable que sea menos complejo, puesto que el mundo es cada vez más complejo, pero una información clara podría ayudar a entender esta complejidad. Tampoco es muy probable que exista menos burocracia, pero una vez que las nuevas herramientas se encuentren implementadas y las viejas herramientas y órganos desaparezcan, se podría esperar que se pierda menos tiempo y que se pueda dedicar más tiempo a hacer cosas útiles.

La globalización significa la mercantilización de la educación y, actualmente, un número mayor de corporaciones internacionales se están haciendo cargo de los servicios educativos. Además, las escuelas están gestionadas cada vez más como negocios, en su enfoque y en su necesidad de estar preparadas para el cambio continuo. Se podría argumentar que estos elementos se reflejan en las opiniones de los interesados en la reforma de la gobernanza del sistema de Escuelas Europeas. Las partes interesadas sienten que tienen más burocracia
ahora, y esperan tenerla menos, en el futuro. Por ello, un enfoque más empresarial sería positivo. Asimismo, el hecho de que valoren más la libertad, la flexibilidad, las oportunidades de mejora y la eficiencia, parece indicar que están listos para el cambio continuo como en las organizaciones modernas.

Las partes interesadas son muy conscientes de la autonomía, la apertura y la reforma del bachillerato europeo. Siempre se puede mejorar la conciencia de las nociones y herramientas de la reforma entre los delegados de los directores y profesores. Los hallazgos muestran que una formación sobre liderazgo, organizado por directores y directores adjuntos, ha tenido un impacto considerable en la comprensión de la reforma y con ello en la necesidad de la por la autonomía. Las investigaciones confirman que los programas de capacitación pueden ser muy eficaces en tiempos de cambio, y que la autonomía en el reclutamiento y selección de personal es esencial para preparar con éxito las escuelas para el futuro.

La apertura del sistema es una respuesta a la demanda por una educación internacional donde haya entendimiento mutuo de diferentes lenguas y culturas y para la promoción de armonía social y ciudadanía europea. La reforma del bachillerato europeo es una respuesta a la profesionalización global y la mercantilización de la educación, así como la necesidad de simplificar, debido a la apertura del sistema. Los interesados coinciden en que la apertura se ajusta a la necesidad de una evolución de Europa y piensan que puede ser un éxito. Son muy conscientes de la necesidad de simplificar el bachillerato europeo, pero insisten que hay que garantizar la calidad del Bachillerato. Desde la decisión de abrir el sistema, 6 escuelas de tipo 2 (Parma, Strasbourg, Helsinki, Dunshaughlin, Manosque and Heraklion) han abierto ya sus puertas y otros 6 están en proceso de apertura.
Si recapitulamos la reforma del Sistema de las Escuelas Europeas, podemos distinguir 4 elementos: la reforma financiera y la necesidad de compartir costos de manera más equitativa, la autonomía y la mejora de la gobernanza, la apertura y la reforma del Bachillerato y la calidad de la enseñanza o mejora pedagógica.

La reforma se inició con una propuesta de reforma financiera, con un nuevo reglamento financiero, y por la necesidad de compartir los costos, incluyendo la búsqueda de formas alternativas de financiamiento. Según los grupos de interés, esta parte de la reforma no ha sido muy exitosa porque el nuevo Reglamento Financiero ha traído consigo mucha burocracia.

El sistema todavía está buscando formas alternativas de financiación y participación en los costos. Por ello, el problema aún no está resuelto.

El segundo elemento de la reforma es la autonomía y la mejora de la gobernanza: simplificación en la toma de decisiones, las responsabilidades y las tareas de los diferentes actores y órganos más claramente definidos, así como la auto-evaluación.

Algunos elementos, como los órganos recién creados, son bastante exitosos: el Consejo Consultivo Escolar, el Comité Pedagógico Mixto y el aumento de competencias del Consejo de Administración. Aunque algunos elementos de la autonomía tienen éxito, en las Escuelas Europeas hay una autonomía limitada en cuanto al uso de fondos públicos, y hay poca autonomía en cuanto al uso de fondos privados. No existe autonomía por parte del sistema en la selección, despido, deberes y responsabilidades de los directores.

Asimismo, hay una escasa autonomía con respecto al personal docente. Existe un poco más de autonomía para los profesores de contrato local, que para los profesores que vienen contratados desde su Estado Miembro. El éxito de la autonomía seguirá siendo cuestionable si
no se puede elegir libremente a los directores y estos a su vez no pueden elegir a sus propios profesores. La auto-evaluación también tiene que ser más detallada.

El tercer elemento de la reforma fue la apertura y la reforma del bachillerato europeo. La apertura ha sido un éxito (ya se han abierto 6 nuevas escuelas del tipo 2) y el bachillerato europeo ya ha puesto en marcha ya algunas simplificaciones. Esperemos que la participación de los sistemas nacionales en las escuelas tipo 2 traiga una mayor cooperación entre las Escuelas Europeas y los sistemas nacionales, porque a los ojos de los interesados, el compromiso de los Estados Miembros se está desvaneciendo.

El cuarto elemento de la reforma fue la calidad de la enseñanza y la mejora pedagógica: enseñanza en lengua materna, colaboración entre las secciones lingüísticas, plan de estudios más homogéneo, de contenido pedagógico común, integración en el entorno local, profesores con formación en gestión, evaluación a los 16 años, hacer algo para evitar el abandono escolar e inspecciones conjuntas. Algunos elementos han sido iniciados, como las inspecciones conjuntas, pero la mayoría de las mejoras pedagógicas todavía tienen que desarrollarse más.

A continuación, señalamos algunas recomendaciones, que podrían ayudar a mejorar aún más el sistema:

En cuanto a los grupos de interés: involucrar más a los alumnos e ex-alumnos, que son los mejores defensores del sistema. Dar voz a los funcionarios de contratación local, ya que su número está en aumento, y se quedan más de 9 años. Aumentar la participación de los Estados Miembros mediante la colaboración con las escuelas del tipo 2, que pueden ser considerados una plataforma para crear espíritu europeo de escolarización en toda Europa, donde las buenas ideas pueden ser intercambiadas.
Involucrar a los docentes y directores adjuntos en el liderazgo para el compromiso y la mejora.

En cuanto a la gobernanza: avanzar hacia un Sistema de Gestión de la Calidad (como ISO 9001). Esto ayudará a centrarse en la calidad, las partes interesadas, la evaluación comparativa, la auto-evaluación, la participación de expertos y la mejora continua. La descripción de los flujos de trabajo ayudará a los profesores, coordinadores y directores (adjuntos) de tener una visión más clara, y facilitará la transferencia de conocimientos y el análisis del impacto de los cambios propuestos.

Establecer una red de investigación académica para desarrollar un fondo de conocimientos y en continua expansión y renovación.
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ANNEXES

Annex 1: the survey

Title: Survey on reform process

Page 1. Introduction
The European School system is undergoing a reform process. This survey tries to evaluate the perception of the stakeholders of this process. Therefore your feedback is very important. The results of this survey form part of a doctorate thesis that studies the reform process considering it to be an opportunity for reflection, evaluation and improvement of the European School system.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. This survey should only take 5-10 minutes of your time. Your answers will be completely anonymous and confidential. In order to progress through this survey, please use the following navigation links:
- Click the Next button to continue to the next page.
- Click the Prev button to return to the previous page.
- Click the Submit button to submit your survey.

If you have any questions, please contact me at caroline.hetterschijt@oami.europea.eu or call +34618126572.

Page 2. Identification
Question 1. Please specify your sex
- Male
- Female

Question 2. Please specify your age
- <20
- 20-30
- 30-40
- 40-50
- 50-60
- >60
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Question 3. How many years have you been in the system?
   - 0-3 years
   - 3-5 years
   - 5-10 years
   - 10-20 years
   - >20 years

Question 4. Please specify in which capacity you would be filling in this survey
   - Pupil
   - Parent
   - Teacher
   - Deputy Director
   - Director
   - Inspector
   - Commission
   - Institution
   - Office of the Secretary General
   - Other (specify).

Page 3. Seconded/Locally recruited
Question 5. Are you
   - Seconded
   - Locally recruited.

Page 4. Nursery/Primary/Secondary
Question 6: Please specify:
   - Nursery
   - Primary
   - Secondary.

Page 5. Participation
Please specify your participation in groups:
Question 7. Please specify if you form part of any of the following groups:
   - Parents Association
   - Interparents
Page 6. Working Group participation
Question 8. In which Working Group have you been participating?
Please enter the name of the Working Group in the free text box

Question 9. How long has this Working Group been working?
- Less than 6 months
- 6 months – 1 year
- 1 year – 2 years
- More than 2 years

Question 10. Did the Working Group encounter any difficulties in successfully fulfilling its mandate?
Please indicate what have been the obstacles, if any.

Page 7. Strengths, advantages, satisfactions

Question 11. What is, according to you, the European School system good at?
Please select 5 priorities from this list
- European oriented education
- Mobility
- Open mind for cultures; multicultural environment, tolerant
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- Networking events like EUROSPORT and MEC
- Mother tongue teaching. Stay in touch with mother/father cultural identity
- Multilingual environment. Knowledge of many languages and familiarity with people speaking other languages
- Teaching by native speakers
- High Quality and professionalism of seconded teachers
- High standard of science and math teaching
- High educational standard generally
- Extra-curricular activities like cultural evenings, musical productions, theatre
- Good preparation for higher education/work afterwards
- Recognition of European Baccalaureate (EB)
- Good reputation of EB alumni
- Other (specify).

Page 8. Improvement areas.

Which are the areas the European School system could improve?

Question 12. Governance. Please indicate how you rate the following statements

Ratings: Fully Agree/Partially Agree/No opinion/Partially Disagree/Totally Disagree.

- System is too complex
- Too much bureaucracy
- More autonomy for schools needed
- A coherent recruitment policy should be developed
- 9-year rule is one of the mayor problems of the European School system
- School management should be involved in inspections
- An intergovernmental structure does not fit an education agency
- Fair cost sharing needed
- Please add any other statement you specifically agree with.

Question 13. Please indicate how you rate the following statements.

Ratings: Fully Agree/Partially Agree/No opinion/Partially Disagree/Totally disagree.

- The system needs more quality assurance
- More involvement stakeholders needed
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- Lack of alternative course to the European Baccalaureate
- Schools should be more integrated in local life
- Overpopulation
- The system does not take care well enough of SWALS and SEN
- Please add any other statement you specifically agree with.

Page 9. Reform process

In 2002 a reform of the European School system was initiated by the Commission published in the Bösch report and the Resolution on the future financing of the European Schools. The Bösch report contained proposals for increased autonomy and broadening access to the European Baccalaureate. In June 2005 pilot projects on autonomy initiated in three European Schools, Brussels I, Bergen and Munich. The office of the Secretary General of the European Schools published a report in April 2009 called Reform of the European School System. This report presented altering administrative structures, objectives and timelines.

What are your perceptions so far and what do you expect from the reform process?

Question 14. Please fill in what the reform process has given you so far and what you hope to get from the reform process.

Ratings: so far more/so far less/so far same and hope to get more/hope to get less/hope to get same

- Freedom
- Bureaucracy
- Workload
- Rules
- Involvement stakeholders
- Quality of life
- Quality of education
- Career possibilities
- Efficiency
- Cost effectiveness
- Decision Power
- Vote
- Time in meetings
- Responsibilities
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- Accountability
- Control
- Autonomy
- Independence
- Flexibility for individual school
- Participation
- Operating money/budget
- Complexity
- Communication within school
- Opportunities for school planning
- Opportunities for reflection, evaluation
- Opportunities for improvement
- Other, please specify below.

Page 10. Autonomy

One of the pillars of the reform process is autonomy. Some new concepts come along with autonomy.

Question 15. Do you know the following concepts, have you noticed them in your school and have you been able to use them?

Ratings: Concept is unknown to me/Concept is known to me/I have noticed this in my school/I have used this in my school

- Annual School Plan
- Multi Annual School Development Plan
- Action Plan
- Rapport d'Activités
- School Advisory Council
- Freedom in budget lines
- Pedagogical autonomy
- More decision power in Admin Board
- Accountability for directors
- Recommendations from pilot schools
- Templates for new reports and plans
- Key indicators
- Other (please specify Other).
Page 11. Opening up of the system.
Opening up is part of the reform process. Several type 2 and type 3 schools have been created or are on the way.

Question 16. Please specify how you rate the following statements about the opening up of the system
Rating: Fully Agree/Partially Agree/No opinion/Partially Disagree/Disagree
  o The opening up of the system is quite successful
  o It creates more mobility
  o It creates more options for pupils, parents and teachers
  o It is cheaper
  o It is more realistic
  o It fits the needs of an evolving Europe
  o Type 1 schools should be laboratories for type 2 and 3 schools
  o The quality of the BAC must be guaranteed
  o Category 1, 2 and 3 should not exist
  o Other (Please specify Other).

Page 12. European Baccalaureate
The office of the Secretary General of the European Schools published a report in June 2009 called Reform of the European Baccalaureate.

Question 17. Do you know the ideas for reforming the European Baccalaureate?
  o No
  o Yes, which?
    Please specify which changes you know about.

Page 13. Changes in European Baccalaureate
Question 18. Have you noticed any changes in the European Baccalaureate over the last year?
  o No
  o Yes, which?
    Please specify which changes you noticed.
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Page 14. Further comments.
Thank you for writing any further comments on particular issues you might have
Question 19. Please add any further comments here.

Page 15. Thank you
Thank you very much for taking part in this survey. The results will be published
in a doctorate thesis. If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to
contact me: Caroline Hetterschijt, tel: +34-618126572,
caroline.hetterschijt@oami.europa.eu.