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1. Introduction

The European School Summit, held on 21 and 22 May 2018, addressed mainly the attractiveness of teaching positions in the European Schools, a fair repartition of costs in the system and the long term sustainability of the European Schools accreditation system.

With respect to the attractiveness of teaching positions, the Round Table on 22 May 2018 identified several measures which might help to attract and retain qualified teachers. These measures concerned the salary conditions, the job stability, but also other benefits like enhanced professional and personal development of the teaching staff, as well as support to their families.

The Enlarged Presidency Working Group discussed first proposals (see doc. 2018-08-D-13-en-1) at its meeting on 24 September 2018.

This document is based on document 2018-10-D-66-en-1 and reflects the discussion of the Budgetary Committee at its meeting on 6 and 7 November 2018 and the discussions of the latest meeting of the Enlarged Presidency Working Group on 15 November 2018 and takes also in consideration the discussions during the Working Dinner between Commissioner Oettinger and the Education Ministers of the European Union on 26 November 2018.

1. **Analysis of the current situation**
2. **Seconded teaching staff**

The number of seconded (teaching) staff has decreased over the last four school years from 1.441 seconded teachers in the 2014/15 school year to 1.351 in the 2017/18 school year, whilst the demand for teachers in a growing system like the European Schools continues to increase.

An analysis of the document “Creation and suppression of seconded posts in the nursery, primary and secondary cycles – 2018/2019 school year” (doc. 2017-10-D-14-en-6) demonstrates in particular the lack of seconded teachers native in English, French or German language or having language skills on the level C1, respectively C2, in these languages.

In total 120 posts requiring being native in English or requiring language skills on the level C1/C2 in English could not be filled by seconded teachers.

54 posts requiring being native in French or requiring language skills on the level C1/C2 in French could not be filled by seconded teachers.

In addition, 15 posts requiring being native in German or requiring language skills on the level C1/C2 in German could not be filled by seconded teachers.

Finally, 40 posts requiring a mixture of either English, French or German language skills could not be filled with seconded teachers.

Altogether, over 220 posts corresponding to these three languages widely used in the European Schools could not be filled in the 2018/2019 school year.

**The four main reasons for this development are:**

1. Some weaknesses in the cost sharing agreement adopted in December 2014,
2. the decision of some delegations to reduce their over-quota secondments starting as of 2012,
3. the salary decrease applied as of 1 September 2011,
4. the lack of duly qualified teachers in the different Member States.
5. **Cost sharing mechanism**

The cost sharing mechanism set up a quota for secondments for each Member State based on the ratio of pupils of the same nationality enrolled in the system of the European Schools. Moreover, a ‘correction coefficient’, linked to the number of language sections per language, was established.

The cost sharing mechanism entered into force in 2015 and is foreseen to be reviewed in 2020.

Its aim was to achieve a fair share of burden between the Member States, also eventually introducing a payment to compensate a lack of secondments.

The cost sharing mechanism was built on the assumption that Member States, who do not fulfill their quota, would reach step by step their quota, while Member States which are over fulfilling their quota would hopefully continue to do so.

Indeed, a positive aspect has been that Member States, who failed to fill their quota, have increased their secondments since the mechanism entered into force.

However, Member States which used to second beyond their quota, started to reduce their secondments. In total this led to an overall decrease of secondments.

The present cost sharing mechanism does not foresee a target for the overall number of secondments, for example linked to the full-time teaching needs in the schools. The quota (percentage) is calculated using the number of seconded teachers working in the system and is not linked to the number of full time posts needed to fulfil the teaching needs. This has led to an overall decrease of secondments, well below actual needs and this development will continue if nothing will be done: the less secondments will be received, the less will be required.

The financing of the system of the European Schools is – besides the revenues due to school fees and the contributions from Institutions which have signed an agreement – build on a share of burden between the EU COM and the Member States.

The Member States are supposed to contribute to the system by seconding teachers, so via the national salary paid to these teachers (with the exception of the ES Munich). The contribution via secondment amounts to around 30% of the total budget. The EU COM is financing around 62 % of the total budget.

When the number of secondments reduces, the teaching needs need to be compensated by locally recruited teachers, whose salaries (including social charges) are paid 100% from the budget of the schools. This leads to an increase of the EU COM contribution.

At the same time, the number of pupils, and consequently the teaching needs, have constantly increased over the last years.

Finally, the link of the target level of secondments for each Member State and the nationality of the pupils might become questionable in the light of BREXIT. UK will not be longer bound by the Convention of the European Schools as of 1 September 2021 in case of a Withdrawal agreement and as of 1 September 2020 in case of a ‘hard BREXIT’, without a Withdrawal Agreement. This means that the secondments by the UK will end by the end of the 2020/21, or already by the 2019/20 school year, while pupils with UK nationality have the right to continue their education in the system of the European Schools (see also chapter below).

1. **Decrease of UK secondments**

In 2013, long time before the BREXIT referendum, the UK government, which had a level of secondments well above its quota, decided to reduce its secondments so to come closer to its quota.

Due to this decision, the secondments from UK decreased from 143 seconded teachers in the 2014/15 school year to 43 seconded teachers in the 2018/19 school year.

The BREXIT draft withdrawal agreement foresees in Article 125 that UK would be bound by the Convention of the European Schools until the end of the 2020/21 school year (31 August 2021) and would have to continue its secondments until this date.

1. **Salary decrease as of 1 September 2011**

At its meeting in December 2010 the Board of Governors decided to decrease the salary of the Seconded Staff by around 10% for all new secondments as of 1 September 2011.

This decision was motivated by the financial crisis and the fact that also the European Institutions had decreased the salary of the EU Officials.

Moreover, the method of establishing the initial step was reviewed. Since 2011 the initial step is no longer linked to the age, but to the professional experience of the new staff member. This has led to a de facto decrease of the initial salary of another 10% on average.

As a result, the difference between salaries from Member States such as Luxembourg, Germany, Austria, Denmark, Ireland, Sweden, Finland, etc. and the ES salaries has been reduced to the extent that many teachers of these nationalities do not find it sufficient to justify the relocation.

1. **Lack of qualified teachers in the Member States**

During the European Schools Summit, several delegations clearly indicated that they are facing problems to fulfill even their national system request of duly qualified teachers. This is in particular true with respect to scientific subjects. Moreover, at least Germany is facing a general lack of teachers in the nursery and primary cycle (see for the details also doc. 2018-10-D-24).

This leads to some internal ‘resistance’ within the Member States to second qualified teachers for some specific subjects to the European Schools.

1. **Locally Recruited Teachers**

The number of full time equivalent locally recruited teachers has increased over the last years from 707 in the 2014/15 school year to 1.007 in the 2017/18 school year, corresponding to a 42% increase. In some schools the lessons given by locally recruited teachers are representing the majority of the lessons.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **School Year** | **LRT** | **%** | **SEC** | **%** | **TOT** |
| 2014-15 | 707 | 32.9 | 1441 | 67.1 | 2148 |
| 2015-16 | 825 | 36.6 | 1428 | 63.4 | 2253 |
| 2016-17 | 911 | 39.4 | 1401 | 60.6 | 2312 |
| 2017-18 | 1007 | 42.7 | 1351 | 57.3 | 2358 |

(Table from the Annual Report of the Secretary-General of the European Schools – Doc. 2018-01-D-58-en-2)

It should be noted that “full time equivalent” does not correspond to full-time positions.

The schools are also facing increased difficulties to recruit and retain qualified locally recruited teaching staff in some areas.

This has at least the following four reasons:

1. salary decrease as of 1 September 2011,
2. lack of job stability,
3. very limited career opportunities,
4. taxation of salaries.
5. **Salary decrease in 2011**

Like for seconded teachers, the salaries of locally recruited teachers recruited as of 1 September 2011have decreased by about 10%.

1. **Job stability**

Full-time locally recruited teachers have nearly no job stability, as they are meant to occupy positions which would normally be filled by seconded staff. For this reason, the Service Regulations for Locally Recruited Teachers foresee only a two year’s contract which can be prolonged once for two years.

Only after four years a permanent contract can be offered. Also this contract might be subject to an extraordinary termination, if the post can be filled (again) by a seconded teacher.

1. **Lack of career opportunities**

If locally teachers manage to remain in the schools, they have only minor career opportunities.

Locally recruited teachers recruited as of 2011 are entitled to a progression in step every four years. Nevertheless, the highest step in their salary grid provides a lower gross salary than the initial step foreseen before the salary decrease in 2011.

Executive functions in the school management are limited to seconded teachers.

A middle-management, that could be accessible for locally recruited teachers, de facto does not exist in the schools.

1. **Taxation of salaries**

The salaries of locally recruited teachers (and also the salaries of the Administrative and Ancillary Staff) are subject to national taxation. The EU supplement of seconded teachers is exempted from national taxation and subject to a “European” taxation, generally more favorable. This is regulated in the individual agreements between the hosting Member States and the Board of Governors.

1. **Analysis of the concrete situation in the 13 European Schools**

In preparation of the second meeting of the Enlarged Presidency Working Group the Directors of the 13 European Schools and the National Inspectors of several Member States (AT, BE, DE, DK, FIN, FR, IRL, LUX) were asked to provide an overview in which cases they did face problems to recruit qualified teaching staff for the 2018/19 school year.

Moreover, Directors and Inspectors were asked to provide an overview of cases where teachers left the school before the foreseen end of secondment respectively the envisaged end of the contract.

In summary, it can be stated that in most of the cases the schools could finally fill in positions which were left vacant by seconded teachers. Nevertheless, some four positions could not be filled.

Moreover, several posts could only be filled by locally recruited teachers in the very last moment. Not always the highest ranked candidate accepted the post.

From the replies received from the thirteen schools it can be summarized that in at least thirteen cases the national delegation could not find qualified teachers with a teaching profile in Math and Science.

The schools faced most difficulties to fill in positions requiring English native speakers. Moreover, schools had difficulties to recruit German or French native speakers.

At least 19 teachers left at the end of the 2017/18 school year the system before the end of their secondment respectively their contract due to more attractive offers outside the system.

Fourteen out of them were locally recruited teachers (nine nursery/primary cycle and five secondary cycle) and five of them seconded teachers (three nursery/primary cycle and two secondary cycle). Mainly concerned are the two schools in Luxembourg.

**Based on these facts, the Enlarged Presidency Working Group identified four problematic areas:**

* posts which require English native speakers,
* nursery and primary posts mainly in Luxembourg and Germany,
* posts requiring a math and/or science profile,
* (more general) posts in Luxembourg (seconded and locally recruited).
1. **Potential measures to attract and retain qualified teachers**

In order to address the difficulties of the European Schools to attract and retain qualified teaching staff, a distinction is made between short term solutions within the framework given by the Convention Defining the Status of the European Schools and mid respectively long term solutions, which would require an amendment of the Convention.

This document only addresses measures within the legal frame of the Convention which can be adopted by the Board of Governors in a short or at least middle term.

1. **Potential measures to attract and retain qualified seconded teachers**

This chapter focuses on measures to attract and retain qualified seconded teachers. It does not address a proposal to revise the cost sharing mechanism as a concrete proposal will be presented to the Board of Governors in a separate document[[1]](#footnote-1).

1. **Salary conditions**

As mentioned, the salary of the seconded staff was de facto reduced by around 20% in 2011.

When considering that the salaries of seconded staff represent roughly half of the total budget of the European Schools, an overall increase of the salary scale of all seconded teachers would bring about a substantial increase in the total budget and particularly in the contribution from the EU Budget.

As a matter of fact, some schools face more difficulties to attract teachers in the primary cycle than in the secondary cycle. Different from the system in many Member States, the salary of teachers in the primary cycle is significantly lower than in the secondary cycle.

Moreover, as it was highlighted by several experts during the Round Table on 22 May 2018, the salaries for seconded teachers are still attractive for candidates from many Member States. In some cases, the salary offered in the European Schools is more than four times than the national salary. The other way around, for candidates from Member States with high national salaries, the system of the European Schools is less attractive and for some no longer attractive at all. For these teachers the increase could represent less than 20% of their national salary. When they do not receive an expatriation allowance (for example Luxemburgish teachers teaching in one of the two Luxemburgish Schools or German teachers teaching in one of the three German Schools), there is nearly no financial incentive at all.

**The Enlarged Presidency Working Group and the Budgetary Committee discussed two proposals to tackle this phenomenon:**

**aa) creation of a particular allowance which ensures a minimum financial incentive,**

**bb) changing to a system comparable to the regime of seconded national experts in the EU Institutions, with a variable national salary and a fixed daily allowance.**

At their meeting on 15 November 2018 the members of the Enlarged Presidency Working Group developed two further options, one linked to the idea of a ‘particular allowance’ and one closer linked to the idea of the idea of a ‘daily allowance’.

**aa) Proposal 1: “Particular allowance”**

One possibility to be able to attract candidates from Member States with high national salaries, could be to introduce a ‘special allowance’ which ensures at least a minimum financial incentive.

Such a measure would have the advantage to focus on those target groups for which the European Schools face most of the difficulties to recruit and retain qualified teaching staff. Moreover, the introduction of such a special allowance probably would not be considered as a major change of the remuneration system.

In fact, there are two options to establish such a ‘particular allowance’.

**(1) ‘Particular allowance’ – Fixed percentage**

One option (already presented to the Budgetary Committee) could be to ensure that the remuneration of the seconded staff member should increase the national salary by a minimum of a certain percentage (for example by 2020%)

This option is likely to create new administrative burden, as the national salary for each seconded teacher may vary from month to month and quite often with retroactivity, which would require also recalculations of the salary. This also risks to lead to legal uncertainty and legal procedures.

**(2) ‘Particular allowance’ – Fixed amount**

Another option (developed by the Enlarged Presidency Working Group at its meeting on 15 November 2018) could be to introduce a ‘particular allowance’ which will ensure for each seconded teacher a minimum difference of € 2.000 per month between the national salary and the remuneration offered by the European Schools as referred to in Article 45 of the Regulations for Members of the Seconded Staff of the European Schools (salary, family allowances and other allowances).

A teacher whose monthly total remuneration does not exceed the monthly national salary by € 2.000 will receive a monthly ‘top up’ to achieve the minimum difference of € 2.000.

Different from the first option this option would be easier to administered. The calculation of the ‘particular allowance’ could be based on the first salary calculation in September. At the beginning of each following school year, a new calculation, taking in consideration the annual remuneration and the potential changes of the national salary during the school year, could be carried out.

Both options do require additional financial resources and do lead to a slight unequal remuneration of seconded teachers depending on their national salary.

A calculation of the potential additional costs of option 2 (‘fixed amount’) can be found in Annex I of this document. The estimated annual costs for the 13 schools would amount to approximately € 1.6 Mio.

**bb) Proposal 2: Daily allowance for all seconded staff members**

Another proposal could be to revise the system of remuneration more substantially and to introduce a system which is based on the national salary and provides to all seconded staff members additional allowances depending on their status.

**(1) END-Model**

One option (already presented to the Budgetary Committee) could be to develop a system in analogy to the system of the National Experts in the European Commission.

These National Experts are temporarily seconded by the EU Member States and receive an allowance on top of their national salaries. This allowance is comprised of a daily allowance of € 138,15 and a monthly allowance depending on the distance between the place of origin and the place of service[[2]](#footnote-2).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Distance between the place of origin/recruitment and the place of secondment in km** | **Sum in euro** |
| 0 - 150 | **0** |
| > 150 | **88,80** |
| > 300 | **157,86** |
| > 500 | **256,55** |
| > 800 | **414,42** |
| > 1300 | **651,23** |
| > 2000 | **779,52** |

**(a) Legal requirements**

The introduction of such a system would be a quite substantial change in the philosophy of the remuneration of the seconded staff of the European Schools as the system would no longer pay a salary complement, but a fixed allowance. As a result, the final remuneration would no longer be the same for all members of staff of the same staff category, but would vary, depending on the different national salaries. On the other hand, there would be an equal treatment with respect to the ‘European School allowance’.

Probably, this could be considered as a change which ‘modifies the official status of the teachers’, thus requiring (according to Article 3.3 (b) of the Convention defining the Statute of the European Schools a unanimous vote of the Board of Governors

**(b) Suitability**

An allowance comparable to the model of national experts in the European Commission (hereafter: ‘END model’) would help to attract in particular an increased number of seconded staff from Member States with relative high national salaries. These are partly also the Member States which are providing native speakers in the most requested languages (English, French and German), where the European Schools suffer the most to recruit native speakers or staff with language skills on C1/C2 level.

**(c) Administration**

The introduction of a pure ‘END model’ would substantially reduce the administrative burden. The complex salary calculation currently done in every school with permanent, sometimes retroactive changes of the national salary, would be replaced by a simple daily allowance.

Moreover, as these allowances would not be taxable, also the quite complex calculation of the differential allowance would no longer be necessary.

**(d) Same allowance for all categories**

The current system of the National Experts in the EU Commission, does not make any differentiation between different professional categories, while the Regulations for Members of the Seconded Staff of the European Schools do provide nine different salary scales (from scale 1 – ‘Deputy Secretary-General and Directors’ to scale 9 – ‘Educational Adviser without teaching qualifications’).

If the ‘END model’ would be introduced it needs to be decided if the daily allowance should vary between the different categories of staff.

**(e) Costs**

In general, the financing of this new system of remuneration could be cost neutral in the long term and bring even some savings if the amount of the envisaged allowance is equivalent to the END allowance foreseen in the European Commission.

Nevertheless, the introduction of such a change would require a transitory period of a maximum of eight years respecting the acquired rights of the teachers already seconded.

Moreover, transitory measures might be necessary to retain some teachers already in the system. Such transitory measures would lead to an increase over the time span of their secondment.

A simulation linked to the introduction of an ‘END model’ can be found in Annex II of this document. In this simulation the payment of a ‘departure allowance’ (‘severance grant’ as referred to in Article 72 of the Regulations for Members of the Seconded Staff) would be discontinued.

**(2) ‘Daily Allowance plus’**

Another option (developed by the members of the Enlarged Presidency Working Group at their meeting on 15 November 2018) could be to complement the national salary by a daily allowance and several complementary allowances linked to the status of the seconded teacher.

Such a model (‘daily allowance plus’) would reflect the particularities of the qualification profile of the seconded teachers in the European Schools and could help addressing the needs and requirements of these members of staff moving from abroad and/or being accompanied by family members.

Seconded teachers are according to the Convention defining the Status of the European Schools considered as the main contribution from the Member States to the system of the European Schools and they are supposed to represent the vast majority of the (teaching) staff. In this sense their role is very different from the National Experts in the European Commission, who are supposed to complement the staff by providing additional expertise. This is also reflected in the length of secondment which is limited for the seconded National Experts to a maximum of six years.

Particular allowances complementing the basic daily allowance could help to address the specific situation of each seconded staff member.

Besides an installation allowance and a reinstallation allowance at the beginning and at the end of the secondment, additional allowances could be foreseen.

These allowances could be a monthly allowance based on the distance between the place of origin and the place of secondment (comparable to the ‘END model’) and different family allowances as already currently foreseen for seconded staff in their Staff Regulations. Moreover, a particular allowance addressing the cost of housing could be introduced.

**cc) Summary**

The following table tries to summarize the different aspects and the pros and cons of the two proposals including two options for each proposal.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Proposal 1****Special Allowance** | **Proposal 2****Daily Allowance** |
|  | **Ensure a minimum difference of 20%** | **Ensure a minimum difference of** **€ 2.000** | **‘END model’** | **‘Daily allowance plus’** |
| **Suitability** | + | + | + | + |
| **Impact of the change** | **Middle**Staff members would maintain the same basic salary, but some would receive a top-up | **Middle**Staff members would maintain the same basic salary, only a few would receive a top-up | **High**no longer all members of the same staff category will have the same final salary, but the same ‘EU allowance’ would apply, at least to the same category of members of staff | **High**no longer all members of the same staff category will have the same final salary, but the same ‘EU allowance’ would apply, at least to the same category of members of staff |
| **Administrative burden** | **Substantial increase in comparison to the current system** | **Slight increase in comparison to the current system** | **substantial decrease in comparison to the current system** | **Decrease in comparison to the current system** |
| **Legal constraints** | **yes**Risk of appeals concerning the concrete calculation of the allowance | **Minor**  | **Potentially yes**linked in particular to the requirements of the Convention | **Potentially yes**linked in particular to the requirements of the Convention |
| **Differentiation between professional categories** | Would be maintained | Would be maintained  | Not foreseen | Could be maintained |
| **Other allowances** | No impact | No impact | Not foreseen | New allowances  |
| **Financing** | **Additional budget required** | **Additional budget required** | **Depending on the amount of the allowances;** **transitory measures will require additional financial means** | **Depending on the amount of the allowances;****Costlier than the pure ‘END-model’** **transitory measures will require additional financial means** |
| **Transitory measures needed?**  | **No** | **No** | **Yes**with financial impact | **Yes**with financial impact |

**b) Length of secondment**

According to Article 29 of the Regulations for Seconded Staff Members of the European Schools the length of secondment of the teaching staff is limited to nine years and can be prolonged exceptionally by one additional year up to ten years. Moreover, a second secondment is in general not possible.

The Board of Governors discussed at its meeting in April 2016 to revise these strict rules, but failed to achieve the necessary two-third-majority for any of the proposals forwarded by the Office of the Secretary-General.

During the European Schools Summit again some delegations underlined that more flexible rules could help to retain qualified seconded teachers in the system or to second them for a second term.

In fact, in various cases teachers stay after their nine year secondment in the system as locally recruited teachers or reenter the system as locally recruited teachers after a while.

**The Enlarged Presidency Working Group and the Budgetary Committee discussed the following options:**

* **to give more flexibility with respect to the nine-year rule in the interest of the service of the school and to foresee an extension to 12 years and**
* **to provide a legal framework in the Staff Regulations for Seconded Staff Members of the European Schools which allows Member States to second a teacher for a second time under certain conditions.**

**The conditions for a second secondment could be:**

* **a positive evaluation at the end of the first secondment,**
* **a minimum interruption of the secondment for a certain amount of years.**

**aa) Extension of the nine-years rule**

The majority of the members of the Enlarged Presidency Working Group considered that a prolongation of the secondment might help punctual in a particular situation, but concluded that in general a termination of the secondment after nine respectively ten years should be maintained in order to have a frequent turnover of seconded staff and also in order to maintain the possibility to reintegrate in the national system.

Nevertheless, in very exceptional cases a prolongation of the secondment up to 12 years (9 + 3) should be allowed.

In general, also members of the Budgetary Committee supported this proposal.

Nevertheless, the basis for the calculation of the ‘severance grant’ (if this allowance will also be maintained in future) should not exceed nine years.

**bb) Multiple secondments**

With respect to the possibility of a second secondment the members of the Enlarged Presidency Working Group underlined the importance of an at least temporary return to the national educational system.

**Conditions for a second secondment should be:**

* return to the national system for a minimum period of time and
* a positive evaluation at the end of the fifth year of secondment.

Also the members of the Budgetary Committee supported the proposal to provide the possibility of a second secondment.

In this context it was underlined, that the Service Regulations would provide the legal frame for a second secondment. Nevertheless, Member States would keep their autonomy to provide within their national secondment policy deviating rules respecting the frame set by the Service Regulations.

1. **Potential measures to attract and retain locally recruited teachers**

In order to attract and retain locally recruited teachers targeted proposals are needed. As already stated, not all schools really face difficulties to attract and retain qualified locally recruited teachers.

The competitiveness with national salaries and the competition with other international schools in the area varies among the schools. For the time being the schools in Luxembourg and some of the schools in Germany face more problems than other schools. The situation in Brussels also becomes increasingly challenging.

These are the proposals to improve the situation:

* to review of the salary scheme at certain schools,
* to offer to all locally recruited teachers a ‘permanent’ contract, subject to one-year probation period, but to keep the priority of secondments,
* to overcome for certain posts, the priority of secondments and to convert these posts to permanent posts for locally recruited teacher,
* to open middle management functions for locally recruited teachers.

In the long term perspective, the taxation of locally recruited teachers could be reviewed.

**a) Review of the salary scheme at certain schools**

As already mentioned, the European Schools do not face in all sites (hosting Member States) the same difficulties to recruit and retain qualified locally recruited teachers.

Those schools which are no longer competitive with national and in particular international schools in the same area are suffering most.

**It is therefore proposed to link the salaries of the locally recruited teachers to the level of salary in the national public schools in the same place.**

This would require a revision of the salary grids at the different European Schools and a revision of the yearly salary adaptation.

In order to align the salaries of the locally recruited teachers with the teachers in the national schools on a permanent basis the mechanism of the annual salary adjustment of the locally recruited teachers should be based on the national salary adaptation mechanism.

Annex II of this document provides a simulation for the two schools in Luxembourg and for the three schools in Germany if these schools would offer a salary comparable to the salary offered in the public national schools in Luxembourg respectively Germany.

The simulation is based on the assumption that the salary increase would be offered to all locally recruited teachers in these schools.

The salaries provided in the four European Schools in Belgium and in the European schools in Alicante, Bergen and Varese still exceed the salary offered in the competing national public schools.

**aa) Comparison with public schools in Luxembourg**

The annual gross salary of teachers in the primary cycle in the national schools in Luxembourg amounts to € 76.480 on average while the annual gross salary of locally recruited teachers in the primary cycle in the two European Schools does amount to € 48.960 on average (difference: € 27.520).

The annual gross salary of teachers in the secondary cycle in the national schools in Luxembourg amounts to € 91.509 on average while the annual gross salary of locally recruited teachers in the secondary cycle in the two European Schools does amount to € 65.520 on average (difference: € 25.989).

In fact, such an approach would lead to additional costs of in total around € 6.7 Mio. per year (including social charges) for both schools in Luxembourg together (for the details see Annex III Table 1).

**bb) Comparison with public schools in Germany**

With respect to the European Schools located in Germany a differentiation has to be made between the schools in Frankfurt, Karlsruhe and Munich.

Firstly, the salary scales of the three different Bundesländer do slightly vary from each other. Secondly, the correction coefficient to be applied to the salary of the locally recruited teachers does differ from school to school.

In Hessen the average the annual gross salary of teachers in the primary cycle in amounts to € 51.700 while the annual gross salary of locally recruited teachers in the primary cycle in the three European School in Frankfurt does amount to € 47.736 on average (difference: € 3.964).

The annual gross salary of teachers in the secondary cycle in the national schools in Hessen amounts to € 65.000 on average while the annual gross salary of locally recruited teachers in the secondary cycle in the three European Schools in Frankfurt does amount to € 63.882 on average (difference: € 1.118).

In summary, offering a competitive salary in the ES Frankfurt would lead to additional costs of in total around € 282.000 per year (including social charges; for the details see Annex III Table 2 a).

In Bavaria the average the annual gross salary of teachers in the primary cycle in amounts to € 51.700 while the annual gross salary of locally recruited teachers in the primary cycle in the three European School in Munich does amount to € 52.632 on average (difference: - € 932).

The annual gross salary of teachers in the secondary cycle in the national schools in Bavaria amounts to € 63.800 on average while the annual gross salary of locally recruited teachers in the secondary cycle in the three European Schools in Frankfurt does amount to € 70.434 on average (difference: - € 6.634).

In summary, the salary offered in the ES Munich seems to be already competitive in comparison with national public schools (for the details see Annex III Table 2 b).

In Baden-Württemberg the average the annual gross salary of teachers in the primary cycle in amounts to € 55.470 while the annual gross salary of locally recruited teachers in the primary cycle in the three European School in Karlsruhe does amount to € 46.316 on average (difference: € 9.154).

The annual gross salary of teachers in the secondary cycle in the national schools in Baden-Württemberg amounts to € 67.080 on average while the annual gross salary of locally recruited teachers in the secondary cycle in the three European Schools in Karlsruhe does amount to € 61.982 on average (difference: € 5.098).

In summary, offering a competitive salary in the ES Karlsruhe would lead to additional costs of in total around € 427.000 per year (including social charges; for the details see Annex III Table 2 c).

**cc) Comparison with public schools in Belgium**

The comparison with public schools in Belgium demonstrates that the current salaries of locally recruited teachers in the five schools in Belgium are still competitive (for the details see Annex III, table 3).

The same is valid for the European Schools in Alicante, Bergen and Varese.

**dd) Summary**

An alignment of the salary of the locally recruited teachers in the European Schools with the salary offered in competing national public schools would require a substantial financial commitment of roughly 6.7 Mio. € for the European Schools in Luxembourg and some additional means for the budget of the European School Frankfurt (approximately 0.3 Mio. €) and the European School Karlsruhe (approximately 0.4 Mio. €).

Currently, the approach would have no impact on the budget of the other nine European Schools.

Moreover, it is proposed to link the mechanism of the annual salary adjustment to the national salary adjustment mechanism applied in national public schools in order to maintain the competitiveness. If the current mechanism of the annual salary adjustment would be maintained, a biennial review of the salary tables should be envisaged in order to keep the salaries provided by the European Schools competitive in relation to the salaries provided in national public schools.

**b) Job security**

**aa) General approach**

As already explained, locally recruited teachers receive a permanent contract only after four years. The schools offer first a temporary contract of one, two or three years, which can be prolonged once up to four years.

**In order to be competitive with other national and international schools it is proposed to offer a permanent contract already from the beginning, subject to a probationary period of one year.**

At the end of the probationary period an evaluation should be carried out, which should involve the Director and a National Inspector.

Nevertheless, in general the principle of the ‘priority of secondments’ should be maintained, as long as the current system of financing of the European Schools is maintained. This means that in case a Member State can replace a locally recruited teacher, the school may end the contract of the locally recruited teacher in accordance with Article 17 of the Service Regulations for Locally Recruited Teachers in the European Schools. In any case, efforts for a redeployment of the teacher concerned in another European School should be foreseen.

Moreover, a review of the period of notice established in Article 17 of the Service Regulations could be foreseen in order to provide a minimum level of security.

As Member States have to indicate each year by December their willingness to fill in seconded posts, the minimum period of notice established in Article 17 of the Service Regulations could be extended from three to six months.[[3]](#footnote-3)

**bb) Creation of permanent posts for locally recruited teachers**

The annual efforts to fill teaching posts with seconded teachers as well as the discussions linked to the revision of the ‘cost sharing mechanism’ confirm that by far not all teaching obligations can be covered by seconded teachers.

Within the current discussions of the ‘cost sharing mechanism’ a target level of 70% of teaching needs covered by seconded teachers is under discussion.

The remaining 30% of the teaching needs refer on one hand to teaching needs in the thirteen schools which do not justify the creation of a full time post.

But they also concern fulltime posts which require English native speakers.

The further loss of seconded teachers with UK nationality due to the BREXIT may justify special measures for posts which require English native speakers.

The members of the Enlarged Presidency Working Group agreed that one option could be to declare posts linked to this profile as ‘permanent posts’.

This would mean that these posts would no longer be published for secondment.

A limitation of such a measure to posts requiring English native speakers could be based on Article 31.2 of the Convention of the European Schools which entitles the Board of Governors to agree upon particular measures in case a Member State is leaving the system of the European Schools.

**cc) Summary**

It is proposed

* to offer to all locally recruited teachers a contract for an indefinite period of time as of the beginning of the contract and to maintain a one-year probationary period,
* to maintain - in general - the priority of secondments and the extraordinary termination of contracts (Article 17 of the Service Regulations),
* but to foresee a more protective period of notice (minimum six instead of three months) and
* to create in the context of the BREXIT permanent posts for locally recruited teachers linked to functions which require English native speakers, which no longer will be requested to be converted in posts for secondment.

**c) Career opportunities**

So far, locally recruited teachers are subject to a merit based step system, but do not have real career opportunities within the European Schools.

The ‘Educational Adviser Working Group’ is currently discussing proposals to establish a kind of ‘middle-management structure’ in the schools.

**One proposal is to create in each school two middle management functions (one in the nursery/primary cycle and one in the secondary cycle), which will be open for secondments as well as for locally recruitments.**

Like for other teaching posts, priority would be given to secondments, but in case no qualified seconded candidate can be appointed, the function would be open for a local recruitment.

The appointment to this function would be limited to a maximum of nine years, similarly to the other managerial functions in the schools.

This would open some career opportunities for locally recruited teachers.

In general, the members of the Enlarged Presidency Working Group and the Budgetary Committee supported the idea of career opportunities for locally recruited teachers.

The proposal provided by the Educational Adviser Working Group, to create in each school two middle management positions and to open these functions also for locally recruited teachers found general support of the members of the Enlarged Presidency Working Group, the Joint Teaching Committee and also the Budgetary Committee. Nevertheless, it was highlighted that these opportunities would be only limited and moreover the likelihood that the position would not be taken by seconded staff members was questioned.

The annual costs for 26 additional functions could – depending on the final conditions - amount to around € 130.000 for each school.

1. **Additional measures addressed to both categories of teaching staff**

Other aspects which attract teachers and help to retrain them are:

* training possibilities,
* opportunities to further qualify,
* job enrichment,
* support the teachers and their families when taking over the function in the European Schools,
* measures to support the teachers when they reintegrate the national system.

These are measures referred to by several experts during the European School Summit which need further elaboration.

Currently, the Office of the Secretary-General and the European Commission are exploring ways to establish a Service Level Agreement (SLA) which would allow members of staff of the European Schools to participate in specific programs to support the integration of new staff and their families.

**V. Conclusions of the Budgetary Committee**

As regards the proposals made for seconded staff, the Budgetary Committee was favourably disposed towards option 2, the so-called ‘END scenario’, despite some reservations expressed by Italy, Lithuania and Belgium. The Committee was also in favour of developing a second period of secondment.

As regards the proposals made for locally recruited teaching staff and for particular measures, the Budgetary Committee proposed that the working group should reflect on development of a permanent contract for locally recruited teachers and raised concerns about the total costs.

The Budgetary Committee invited the Working Group to revise the document and to present it to the Board of Governors at its forthcoming meeting in December.

**VI. Proposal**

The members of the Board of Governors are invited to discuss and to prioritize the different proposals and to mandate the Office of the Secretary-General to provide to the Board of Governors in April 2019 with concrete proposals

* to increase the attractiveness of the remuneration of seconded teachers,
* to prolong the length of secondment up to 12 years in exceptional cases,
* to provide the legal frame for multiple secondments,
* to align the salary of locally recruited teachers to the one of competing public national schools,
* to offer contracts for an indefinite period,
* to identify permanent posts for locally recruited teachers and
* to establish ‘middle management function’ open to locally recruited teachers in each school.

**Annex I**

**Table: Estimated annual costs for a top-up (€ 2.000/months)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **School** | **Budgetary implication in €/year** |
| Alicante | *85.000*[[4]](#footnote-4) |
| Bergen | *0* |
| Brussels I | 73.000 |
| Brussels II | 46.000 |
| Brussels III | *140.000* |
| Brussels IV | 81.000 |
| Frankfurt | 280.000 |
| Karlsruhe | 196.000 |
| Luxembourg I | 166.000 |
| Luxembourg II | *132.000* |
| Mol | 0 |
| Munich | 185.000 |
| Varese | 174.000 |
| **total** | **€ 1.558.000** |

**Annex II**

 **Table 1: Seconded Staff 2017 (without ES Munich)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| **Total current cost, of which:**  | **135,554,305** |
|  salaries | 120,665,903 |
|  departure allowances | 10,878,058 |
|  installation allowances | 2,485,546 |
|  removal allowances | 1,524,798 |
| National Salaries (revenue) | 50,620,572 |
| **Total net cost** | **84,933,733** |
|   |   |
| **Total Cost END scenario** |   |
| Daily allowances | 63,954,440 |
| Monthly allowances | 5,300,212 |
| Installation allowances | 2,485,546 |
| Removal allowances | 1,524,798 |
|   | **73,264,996** |
| **Difference** | **11,668,737** |
|  |  |

**Table 2 : Commission-like END scenario**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |   | Average National salaries | Average EU Salary | END daily allowance | END monthly allowance | New total salary | Net average gain/loss | Relative gain with respect to national salary |
|  |   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5=1+3+4 | 6=5-2 | 7=5/1 |
|  | *Germany* | 59,661 | 95,137 | 50,424 | 3,079 | 113,164 | 18,026 | 89.7% |
|  | *Belgium* | 49,796 | 95,137 | 50,424 | 0 | 100,220 | 5,083 | 101.3% |
|  | *Denmark* | 59,924 | 95,137 | 50,424 | 4,973 | 115,321 | 20,184 | 92.4% |
|  | *Spain* | 31,784 | 95,137 | 50,424 | 7,815 | 90,023 | -5,115 | 183.2% |
|  | *France* | 32,032 | 95,137 | 50,424 | 1,894 | 84,350 | -10,787 | 163.3% |
|  | *Greece* | 17,896 | 95,137 | 50,424 | 9,354 | 77,674 | -17,464 | 334.0% |
|  | *Ireland* | 51,935 | 95,137 | 50,424 | 4,973 | 107,332 | 12,195 | 106.7% |
|  | *Italy* | 28,197 | 95,137 | 50,424 | 7,815 | 86,436 | -8,701 | 206.5% |
|  | *Luxembourg* | 83,184 | 95,137 | 50,424 | 1,066 | 134,673 | 39,536 | 61.9% |
|  | *The Netherlands* | 50,977 | 95,137 | 50,424 | 1,066 | 102,467 | 7,330 | 101.0% |
|  | *Portugal* | 25,924 | 95,137 | 50,424 | 9,354 | 85,702 | -9,436 | 230.6% |
|  | *UK* | 38,018 | 95,137 | 50,424 | 1,894 | 90,336 | -4,801 | 137.6% |
|  | *Austria* | 49,365 | 95,137 | 50,424 | 4,973 | 104,762 | 9,625 | 112.2% |
|  | *Finland* | 38,877 | 95,137 | 50,424 | 9,354 | 98,656 | 3,518 | 153.8% |
|  | *Sweden* | 46,455 | 95,137 | 50,424 | 7,815 | 104,694 | 9,556 | 125.4% |
|  | *Cyprus* | 30,815 | 95,137 | 50,424 | 9,354 | 90,593 | -4,544 | 194.0% |
|  | *Estonia* | 15,945 | 95,137 | 50,424 | 9,354 | 75,724 | -19,414 | 374.9% |
|  | *Hungary* | 6,606 | 95,137 | 50,424 | 7,815 | 64,845 | -30,292 | 881.5% |
|  | *Latvia* | 7,718 | 95,137 | 50,424 | 7,815 | 65,957 | -29,181 | 754.6% |
|  | *Lithuania* | 6,638 | 95,137 | 50,424 | 7,815 | 64,876 | -30,261 | 877.4% |
|  | *Malta* | 24,378 | 95,137 | 50,424 | 9,354 | 84,156 | -10,982 | 245.2% |
|  | *Poland* | 9,428 | 95,137 | 50,424 | 7,815 | 67,667 | -27,471 | 617.7% |
|  | *Slovakia* | 7,753 | 95,137 | 50,424 | 4,973 | 63,150 | -31,987 | 714.5% |
|  | *Slovenia* | 20,831 | 95,137 | 50,424 | 4,973 | 76,228 | -18,909 | 265.9% |
|  | *Czech Republic* | 12,184 | 95,137 | 50,424 | 4,973 | 67,582 | -27,556 | 454.7% |
|  | *Bulgaria* | 4,633 | 95,137 | 50,424 | 9,354 | 64,411 | -30,726 | 1290.2% |
|  | *Croatia* | 20,489 | 95,137 | 50,424 | 4,973 | 75,886 | -19,251 | 270.4% |
|  | *Romania* | 8,184 | 95,137 | 50,424 | 9,354 | 67,962 | -27,176 | 730.5% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Annex III**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Table 1: Comparison with Locally Recruited Teachers in public schools in Luxembourg** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Luxembourg salaries** |   | EUROS |  |
|  | Primary |  | 76,480 |  |
|  | Secondary |   | 91,509 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **European Schools salaries** |   |   |  |
|  | Primary |  | 48,960 |  |
|  | Secondary |   | 65,520 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Difference** |   |   |  |
|  | per teacher Primary |  | 27,520 |  |
|  | per teacher Secondary |   | 25,989 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Locally recruited teachers (FTE)** |   |  |
|  |   |  | *Total* |  |
|  | FTE Primary |  | 80 |  |
|  | FTE Secondary |  | 114 |  |
|  | Total |   | **194** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Additional cost in Luxembourg in 2019** |   |  |
|  |   |  |   |  |
|  | Total Primary |  | 2,201,577 |  |
|  | Total Secondary |  | 2,962,748 |  |
|  | Social Charges (30%) |  | 1,549,297 |  |
|  | Total |   | **6,713,622** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 2a: Comparison with Locally Recruited Teachers in Frankfurt** |
|  |  |  |
| **Local salaries** |   | EUROS |
| Primary |  | 51,700 |
| Secondary |   | 65,000 |
|  |  |  |
| **European Schools salaries (corr. coeff. = 97.5)** |
| Primary |  | 47,736 |
| Secondary |   | 63,882 |
|  |  |  |
| **Difference** |   |   |
| per teacher Primary | 3,964 |
| per teacher Secondary | 1,118 |
|  |  |  |
| **Locally recruited teachers (FTE)** | *Total* |
|   |  |   |
| FTE Primary |  | 42 |
| FTE Secondary | 45 |
| Total |   | **87** |
|  |  |  |
| **Additional cost in ES Frankfurt in 2019** |   |
| Total Primary |  | 166,488 |
| Total Secondary | 50,310 |
| Social Charges (30%) | 65,039 |
| **Total** |   | **281,837** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 2b: Comparison with Locally Recruited Teachers in Munich** |
|  |  |  |
| **Local salaries** | EUROS |
| Primary |  | 51,700 |
| Secondary |   | 63,800 |
|  |  |  |
| **European Schools salaries (corr. coeff. = 107.5)** |
| Primary |  | 52,632 |
| Secondary |   | 70,434 |
|  |  |  |
| **Difference** |   |   |
| per teacher Primary | -932 |
| per teacher Secondary | -6,634 |
|  |  |  |
| **Locally recruited teachers (FTE)** | *Total* |
|   |  |   |
| FTE Primary |  | 34 |
| FTE Secondary | 29 |
| Total |   | **63** |
|  |  |  |
| **Additional cost in the ES Munich in 2019** |   |
| Total Primary | -31,688 |
| Total Secondary | -192,386 |
| Social Charges (30%) | -67,222 |
| **Total** |   | **-291,296** |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Table 2c: Comparison with Locally Recruited Teachers in Karlsruhe** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | **Local salaries** | EUROS |
|  | Primary |  | 55,470 |
|  | Secondary |   | 67,080 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | **European Schools salaries (corr. coeff. = 94.6)** |
|  | Primary |  | 46,316 |
|  | Secondary |   | 61,982 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | **Difference** |   |   |
|  | per teacher Primary | 9,154 |
|  | per teacher Secondary | 5,098 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | **Locally recruited teachers (FTE)** | *Total* |
|  |   |  |   |
|  | FTE Primary | 22 |
|  | FTE Secondary | 25 |
|  | Total |   | **47** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | **Additional cost in the ES Karlsruhe in 2019** |   |
|  | Total Primary | 201,384 |
|  | Total Secondary | 127,452 |
|  | Social Charges (30%) | 98,651 |
|  | **Total** |   | **427,487** |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 3: Comparison with Locally Recruited Teachers in Belgium** |
| **Belgian salaries** |   | EUROS |
| Primary |  | 46,136 |
| Secondary |   | 58,535 |
|  |  |  |
| **European Schools salaries** |   |
| Primary |  | 48,960 |
| Secondary |   | 65,520 |
|  |  |  |
| **Difference** |   |   |
| per teacher Primary |  | -2,824 |
| per teacher Secondary |   | -6,985 |

1. See document 2018-10-D-62-en-2. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. See for the details C(2008) 6866 final. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. This concrete proposal has been added after the meeting of the Budgetary Committee. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Numbers in *italic* are estimations based on SAP [↑](#footnote-ref-4)