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Continuous professional development of Educational Advisers/Evaluation of Educational Advisers

Since the school year 2011-2012 the Joint Board of Inspectors (JBI) has been developing two complementary pillars of a **common human resources policy**: evaluation and continuous professional development of teachers (CPD).

Meanwhile common **teaching standards** have been adopted, regulations and tools **for teachers’ evaluation** have been introduced and a new **concept of continuous professional development for teachers** is now in a pilot phase.

In 2016-2017 the CPD/Evaluation Working Group would like to complete its work for another pedagogical function: **Educational Adviser**. During the preparatory work the CPD/Evaluation Working Group came to the conclusion that the current roles, responsibilities and tasks of the Educational Adviser are not clearly set and differ quite often within one school and from school to school. The current profile and working standards might then need **further clarification**. Such clarification would be needed to set up a **policy of continuous professional development of Educational Advisers.**

In its discussions the CPD/Evaluation Working Group included some signals from schools that they might have **different needs** regarding this function and considered the **shift in the original role/tasks** of the Educational Adviser, mainly due to the **digitalisation of administrative tasks** and **evolution of the System.** Those administrative tasks (e.g. collecting and registration of absences) were quite time- consuming and have **considerably evolved**. The use of the digital platforms and other digital tools as well as e-mail and short message texts for **communication** require **other tasks** and **different competences** than before to be performed.

During this last discussion the CPD/Evaluation Working Group decided to ask the **Joint Board of Inspectors** (JBI) if it would be advisable to reconsider the function of Educational Adviser. This reconsideration could be integrated, in a separate process, into a future discussion about the **definition of pedagogical reinforcement of the school’s management.** Should the JBI agree, the **CPD/Evaluation Working Group** would propose to **postpone** its mandate to provide a common evaluation and continuous professional development policy for the function of Educational Adviser until the function of Educational Adviser has been reconsidered.

In late September, the CPD/Evaluation Working Group launched a **questionnaire** to collect the **necessary information** about the current tasks of the Educational Advisers and info on the time spent on each of them. Depending on the decision of the JBI, this information will be used by the current CPD/Evaluation Working Group or will be added as background information to the request to be put to the Board of Governors (December 2016).

**OPINION OF THE BOARD OF INSPECTORS (SECONDARY)**

The Board of Inspectors (Secondary) expressed a favourable opinion regarding the following proposals:

* Request, to be put to the Board of Governors, for a mandate to define a project to be carried out by a new working group.
* The project should reconsider the function of Educational Adviser and Principal Educational Adviser in relation to possible changes in the future organisation of the schools.

The Board of Inspectors (Secondary) also emphasised the need to strengthen leadership in the European Schools, with particular reference to the management of pedagogical questions.

**OPINION OF THE JOINT BOARD OF INSPECTORS**

Like the Board of Inspectors (Secondary), the Joint Board of Inspectors expressed a favourable opinion regarding the proposals set out above.

It nevertheless recommended that in deciding on the composition of the future working group which will take on this project, the Board of Governors should draw on the experience of the members of the ‘Continuous Professional Development’ (CPD) Working Group.

With the result of this project the CPD/Evaluation Working Group would be able to develop an appropriate evaluation and CPD policy for these revised or renewed pedagogical functions as has been done for teachers.

**OPINION OF THE JOINT TEACHING COMMITTEE**

Although the Joint Teaching Committee had only been informed on the subject, it wished to express an opinion regarding the questions which had been put to it.

Consequently, the Joint Teaching Committee expressed a favourable opinion regarding:

1) The request for a mandate, to be put to the Board of Governors, to appoint a new Working Group, whose remit would be definition of the profile of the function of Educational Adviser and Principal Educational Adviser. That definition should clarify the duties and the profile of Educational Advisers.

2) The JTC requested that in producing the profile, there should be reflection on the possibility that the future function of Educational Adviser might also meet the needs of the nursery and primary cycles.

3) Whilst taking account of the experience of the members of the ‘Continuous Professional Development ‘ Working Group, the JTC requested the Board of Governors also to take account, in deciding on the new working group’s composition, of the interest in participating of the following representatives:

- The Directors

- The Deputy Directors for the nursery and primary cycle

- The Deputy Directors for the secondary cycle

- The Staff Committee

- Interparents

- The Directors of the Accredited Schools (at their expense).

**PROPOSALS TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS**

In accordance with the opinions of the various Boards and Committees expressed above, it is recommended that the Board of Governors should:

1) Give a mandate to a new working group, whose remit would be a project to define the profile of the function of Educational Adviser and Principal Educational Adviser, taking account of possible changes to the future organisation of the schools.

 2) Clearly define the project’s limits, namely:

* Analysis based on the survey conducted by the ‘CPD’ Working Group, revision and clear definition of the profiles of Educational Adviser and Principal Educational Adviser.
* This definition should clarify the duties and the profile of (Principal) Educational Advisers and, if necessary, adapt them to match the requirements.
* Engaging in reflection on the possibility that the future function of Educational Adviser might also meet the needs of the nursery and primary cycles.

3) Define the composition of this new working group based on the proposals made by the Joint Board of Inspectors and the Joint Teaching Committee, namely:

* Take account of the experience of the members of the ‘Continuous Professional Development’ Working Group.
* The wish to participate of representatives of the following members:
* The Directors
* The Deputy Directors for the nursery and primary cycle
* The Deputy Directors for the secondary cycle
* The Staff Committee
* Interparents
* The Directors of the Accredited Schools (at their expense).

Leave to the working group the decision as to whether or not it is advisable to invite an Educational Adviser also to participate in its work.

4) Set an agenda for the start and finalisation of this new working group’s work.