



Tuesday, 28 April 2020 at 20:00

as an online Video Conference for titular Board Members (meeting invitation sent separately)

DRAFT MINUTES

ATTENDEES:

Voting Board Members: Georg BECKER (DE Prim), Nils BEHRNDT (VP Administration, DE Sec), Noemie BEIGBEDER (Berkendael), Marek BOBIS (Berkendael), Henning EHRENSTEIN (VP Berkendael), Brian GRAY (Treasurer, member elected by GA), Marc GUITART (VP Pedagogy, ES Sec), Anne-Marie HAMMER (member elected by GA), Karin HUNDEBOLL (DK Sec), Christina KARAKOSTA (Berkendael), Patryk MALESA (PL Prim), Alejandro MARTINEZ TUREGANO (ES Prim), Kathryn MATHE (President, EN Sec), Gundars OSTROVSKIS (Berkendael), Pere MOLES PALLEJA (Bureau, member elected by GA), Valentina PAPA (Secretary, EN Prim), Julien REICHSTADT (Dep Sec Information, FR Prim), Emese SAVOIA-KELETI (HU Sec), Thomas SPOORMANS (FR Sec), Diana SENCZYSZYN (PL Sec), Ivan TORRE (IT Sec), Monika VELIKONJA (SWALS)

Deputy Board Members (non-voting): Bartosz HACKBART (Berkendael), Maria DE YTURRIAGA-SALDANA (ES Sec)

Other participants: Samantha CHAITKIN (CE IT Prim), Andrew LYSTER (CE EN Prim), Veronika ORTIZ (CE FR Sec), Bojana ROŽIČ (CE SWALS Prim)

APEEE Secretariat: Selena GRAY

Board members can find all supporting documents in the shared folder in One Drive (2020-04-28 APEEE Board Meeting/Supporting Documents)

1) Technical check

Board members, and non-voting members who requested to participate, successfully join the online Video conference.

2) Adoption of the agenda

GDPR is added under Point 15. Secretariat Update. The agenda is adopted.

3) Approval of draft minutes of the Board meeting on 19 March; action points reviewed

The draft minutes are approved unanimously, and action points reviewed. Julien REICHSTADT is working on an inventory of the APEEE webpage; digital document and guidelines from Central Office have been uploaded; Pere MOLES PALLEJA has formally joined the Child Protection WG; the

list of delegates was sent to the School; the Spring Call was approved and circulated; feedback was gathered and circulated on Remote Learning (to be discussed under Point 6), feedback on cancelled trips and events to be discussed under Point 7; remaining action points also covered later in the agenda.

| |
|--|
| Action - APEEE Secretariat to send 2 nd mailing for Spring Call |
|--|

Points for discussion and decision

4) Future of the Brussels School: proposal to BoG; formulation of APEEE position; communication to parents

- o Proposals and timeline of the Belgian government
- o Temporary site at Evere as annex to Woluwe: proposed structure and population
- o Temporary site at Berkendael as annex to Uccle: proposed structure and population
- o Fate of Berkendael families and site

Supporting Documents: Pt._4.1._FutureBrusselsSchools_2020-03-D-47-en 1_temporary_site, Pt._4.2._FutureBrusselsSchools_FourAPEEEPosition_2020-03-D-47-en-1_Temporary_school, Pt._4.3._FutureBrusselsSchools_EEBIIAPEEECommunication_Important_information_on_how_the_NATO_temporary_school_will_be

Three supporting documents were circulated to the Board prior to the meeting. Berkendael members report, noting that this is only a starting point. It is outlined that the Secretary General proposed to attach Berkendael to Uccle (P5 Berkendael transitioning to S1 in Uccle) - with some sections moving out (for example the Greek and Slovakian section moving to Ixelles, the Latvian section to Woluwe). However, if the 2 sites become 1 school, it is not clear how they will make more room for additional secondary students in Uccle. There needs to be more thinking in terms of infrastructure and overcrowding. The idea impacts both sites, and it is essential to push for more concrete plans.

Kathryn MATHE, the President, takes the Board through Doc 4.2 and highlights the problems with the feasibility of the Régie de Bâtiments plans (the framing element of the whole plan):

- the tight timeline for Evere, now impacted by the virus;
- the existing infrastructure constraints at Uccle and Woluwe and how the plan will depend on renovating these sites to accommodate secondary children;
- how planning should look at the whole picture in setting up the section structure, looking carefully at how sections are moved around and keeping it balanced (namely the French section);
- also the multi-sections (EN, DE, IT, NL, ES) should be analysed in particular the effect of creating new sections to fill the empty site.

It is important that students are not moved all the time (principle of 1 transfer is introduced) and that sections are not moved against the will of parents. (Latvians for example oppose moving to Woluwe). Also important in the case of satellite classes (already originally placed in Berkendael against their will).

The Board will strive for a detailed common position, not taking the positions of different sections but defining common positions and general principles across sections (to avoid friction amongst sections and due to the potentially different interests of Berkendael and Uccle parents).

An Evere Task Force is set up to establish an EEBI APEEE whole-school position and is composed of Nils BEHRNDT, Thomas ELSNER, Thomas SPOORMANS, Julien REICHSTADT, Gundars OSTRAVSKIS, Pere MOLE PALLEJA, Marek BOBIS, Istvan VANYOLOS, Alejandro MARTINEZ TUREGANO, Noemie BEIGBEDER and Kathryn MATHE. This Task Force will meet next week. The intention is to focus on basic principles and methodologies that should be followed in developing the final proposal.

| |
|---|
| ACTION POINT: Evere Task Force should be set up |
|---|

5) CdE (Student Committee) / COSUP Proposal for Students' and Teachers' Workload Guidelines during COVID

Supporting Documents: Pt._5._Proposal_for_Workload_during_COVID-19_(CoSup)

The Board discusses document Pt.5. Marc GUITART, VP Pedagogy, summarises the background to this proposal (which only concerns Secondary), where the workload is now affected by remote learning (full-day video conferences on top of regular assignments). CdE surveys have been taken in the schools and there is general agreement as to the heavy workloads. The proposal is to implement enforced guidelines for the amount of work given, especially in the BAC cycle, to harmonise the workload. Munich homework guidelines are taken as the basis. Points raised during the discussion include the importance of keeping to the timetable, striving for coordination where flexibility is given to the timetable, the importance of not having homework at weekends (to give a break mentally to the students - already recommended in S1-S3). It is also mentioned that it would be useful to know the workload envisaged in normal situations.

There is general support to come up with clear guidelines but without endorsing the indicative time given. This homework policy was asked for even before remote learning took place and is now essential which could act as a guiding document and as a tool for a future contingency plan.

It is concluded that the Board accepts the premise of the proposal, to support the benchmark without endorsing it, but that figures should be discussed more in detail during the CE meeting, giving the Secondary CE Representatives leeway to discuss in more detail per subject.

6) EEBI remote learning programme in primary and secondary: survey results; guidance from the Central Office; proposed next steps

Supporting Documents:

Pt._6.1. EEBI Remote Learning_NextSteps_April2020, Pt._6.2._EEBIRemoteLearning_2020-03-D-11-en-3_DistanceLearningRecommendations_copy

The question posed to the Board is if (and how) the APEEE should support parents with quality control issues. Kathryn MATHE, President, takes the Board through Document 6.1. With an overabundance of surveys, including the APEEE qualitative surveys, things are improving, but the question is: is it good enough or do we still have to work on the quality control of remote learning (which could be extended until autumn!)?

The Board discusses the different points raised in the document (general, primary and secondary problems). The 3rd version of the Recommendation document from the Central Office was also circulated, and it is noted that while OSGES are working hard, many of these recommendations have not yet been put into place at EEB1.

In general the Board members agree that there is still a lot of work to be done on quality control, to establish clear guidelines for teachers and define a coherent strategy across levels, especially keeping in mind these could be for the long term or for a potential future confinement phase. The

school has been operating on emergency mode, and what has been developed, although fine for a few weeks, must now be strengthened. Data should be broken down by level, discrepancies and extremes addressed and exchange of best practices amongst teachers guaranteed. Training for teachers across levels should be compulsory (as well as some technical guidance for families) and more video conferencing encouraged (fundamental for L2 classes).

There is also concern about the fact that some teachers do not have equipment, that there are no laptops to give to teachers – reference is made to Annex 1 (ICT equipment) which highlights that the number of tablets owned by EEB1 is very low, even relative to other Brussels schools. It is agreed that both the cycle-wide distance learning strategy and concerns about equipment are worth raising with the school.

Further suggestions made include school management having more control over the remote learning situation (by being part of TEAMS), a Conseiller taking part in class in order to monitor discipline and a class teacher being nominated and made responsible for communicating with a team of teachers across a class. This would also facilitate bilateral discussion with the class representative, the latter structural problem brought to light through remote learning: how do teachers exchange best practices and share feedback?

With regards to a gradual phasing out of confinement, parallel (or: hybrid) teaching (where some students or teachers would be on site, but some would remain off site, for example due to health reasons) should also be addressed and the logistical challenges this would bring.

It is agreed that class representatives should work together to tackle issues for quality concerns. Especially for S6 and S7, where parents fear complaining will affect the A marks which have become so crucial now for the final grades.

Action: The President will write to section reps to encourage them to support parents with quality concerns.
The Bureau will arrange a meeting with the Direction to discuss a distance learning strategy and support for teachers.

Points for discussion

7) COVID-19 Consequences: school calendar; end of year evaluation; trips and special programmes; APEEE Services; support for families

Supporting Documents:

Pt. 7.1. COVID Consequences ReopeningSchool_S&HDraftLettertoDirector,Pt. 7.1. COVID Consequences ReopeningSchools_FWB_-_Circulaire_7550_(7803_20200425_153614)

Pt. 7.2. COVID Consequences S4-S6Marks_package, Pt. 7.2. COVIDConsequences_S4-S6Marks_COSUPLetterBoG&OSGES

Nils BEHRNDT, VP Administration, reports on the meeting held today with the Director, teachers and APEEE Services where it was agreed that both sites would not reopen before 25 May. The main question was what to do with the school before the summer and many questions around the safety of students and teachers. The Director updated on all the decisions and measures the Belgians had taken and that would de facto be the guidance for EEB1. (Mr Goggins made it clear that though we are not totally bound by the Belgian guidance, we cannot go below). It was a first brainstorming meeting, with further reflection meetings to follow shortly, so no decisions were taken. Nils BEHRNDT had made it clear that APEEE did not yet have a clear position and that the Board would be discussing it tonight.

Teachers were quite against reopening before summer for pedagogical reasons, they feel that they have now reached a good level of pedagogical support with the remote learning, whereas a return could bring a new mess due to the rules of social distancing in the classroom. As a rule of thumb the Director suggested 1/3 of the school would be on site and 2/3 at home, therefore teachers would have to teach partially at home, partially at school, and this context could result in logistical problems for teaching and a problem of ensuring equal content of education.

APEEE Services were also against a return as this would mean organising buses for only a few weeks, with the complicated logistics involved if transporting students in shifts.

S7 Students would clearly like to come back to school, first to allow teachers to properly assess them (although teachers do not agree that their physical presence in such a short time would make a big difference), secondly to have the chance to say goodbye. Mr Goggins however reassured them that if it did not work out before summer, a celebration would take place whatever moment it becomes possible.

As regards the APEEE position, Nils BEHRNDT mainly asked questions (raised in document Pt 7.1), Noemie BEIGBEDER and Marek BOBIS raised additional points, some questions around Safety and Hygiene were raised, clarification sought whether school would be totally bound by Belgian rules, and if partial return to school, whether parents still have the choice.

The final key question was how to prepare for September, if the situation is not solved by then, with partial presence of students onsite and parallel teaching online. And resulting effects on transport and other logistics.

The Board members have different approaches, different issues from class representatives and different reflections for primary and secondary classes. The Board agree that there are many views and many directions to take.

The predicament of the S6 and S7 students is raised, that they should be prioritised. The end of year tests defines the rest of their academic career, University admissions and their professional lives; proper end of year tests in school are essential, at the least to correct some of the mistakes made in distance learning.

The question is whether APEEE should try to push the school to consider for some classes to be allowed to return before the summer (whether it be S6 / S7, or P1 / P3) This could also be used as a test stage for the period after summer. If there is no clear and strong signal from APEEE tonight, then the feeling is that school will not open before summer.

It is generally agreed that it is risky for the APEEE to come up with a general position but that we should push for a can-do attitude and keeping the doors open for a potential return, if it becomes possible.

The President, Kathryn MATHE, takes the Board through the end of year evaluation, (Docs 7.2) which raised quite a bit of controversy, especially for S7 where there is still an ongoing debate because the formula is not finalised and where it seems there is still room for pushing an opinion. Interparents ask (and it is suggested that APEEE support this) that they call on the BAC Observatory Group (a WG that each year sets the BAC arrangements, containing different stakeholders including parents, inspectors and directors – therefore a group in a good position to speak in more detail about the BAC formula). The Interparents position being that of more weighting of the BAC subjects.

The Board votes in favour (15 votes For) to write a letter to Mr Beckmann, to support Interparents position to call a BAC Observatory Group.

The second issue is S6, where it is felt that the duplication of first semester B marks for the second semester is possibly damaging for University admissions. Concerns have been raised by students, a Lux1 petition and in the EEB1 Italian section.

IT S6 parents have written to the director asking to find another way to get the second B Mark and not just a replication of the first B Mark (some combination of mid term results and the B Marks). However, the note also misrepresents the situation to some degree. The APEEE has been asked to circulate the letter to all S6 parents but there is an ethical dilemma as there is a risk of spreading misinformation mixed with well-founded concerns. The role of class representatives is discussed. It is agreed that the APEEE Bureau will look at the S6IT letter and determine how it can best be circulated to downplay misinformation while getting the message out.

Other measures discussed include: to send a reminder to teachers (from Central Office) to use their discretion in the final grade; to annotate the transcripts explaining the source of the second semester B mark (which would be within the rules).

Action:

Nils BEHRNDT to revise the draft letter (document 7.1) which is now outdated because of Safety and Hygiene issues.

The President to write a letter to Mr Beckmann to support INTERPARENTS position to call the BAC Observatory Group.

The President to forward S6IT letter to the Bureau.

VP Pedagogy, Marc GUITART, reports that the **Mobility Program** for S5 students has not been cancelled at EEBI up till now; the **ESSS** (Science Symposium) is cancelled without replacement activity; there is a possibility that **Work Experience** can be postponed to a later stage once the situation is safe, via an addendum to the agreements, given the effort put in place by companies and families. With regards to **School Trips**: the school is dealing with suppliers and taking legal advice to ensure they can recover all expenses. There has been no refund to parents to date and will not be made until the process ends and they know how much they can recover. **End of year events for S7** are not planned or have been postponed. The School Management commits to holding some sort of ceremony once school reopens and once it is in a position to be able to gather the group together.

The President reminds the Board that the Coordinators of MUNUCCLE are still searching for contacts to help book meeting rooms in the Borschette for October 2021 (during a weekend) and appeals to Board members to network.

Finally, for APEEE Services, in terms of reimbursement, it is explained that for the moment it is very hard for them to know where they stand until the situation ends. They still have to continue to pay key staff but they also give some solidarity support to staff that are usually employed by them (canteen, for example). The Treasurer confirms that they have been looking after staff as a priority.

The question of support was raised for single parent families and it is suggested to take this up with BIEN ETRE.

Action Point: The President to raise with Bien Etre the possibility of supporting single parent families

8) Pedagogical Update: language enrichment programme evaluation; work experience; solicit points for Uccle primary 7 May and secondary 12 May CE meetings

Supporting Documents: Pt._8.1.v2_Background_of_pilot_L2_enrichment_programme, Pt._8.1.v2_Evaluation_of_pilot_L2_enrichment_programme

Monika VELIKONJA (SWALS) reports that although it is positive that the school is carrying out an evaluation on the L2 enrichment programme, it is not quite what the APEEE would have expected, as it just covers how the pilot is carried out and does not compare it with the former bilingual classes.

The Language WG provided some comments on the survey on behalf of the APEEE and there was a slight improvement but it is not ideal. The school were asked to provide a report by the May Secondary CE, but this will probably not be possible as the survey was launched with approximately one month delay. Mr Masson, the teacher responsible for the survey, put in a lot of open questions which was positive. Now it is important for the school to provide a detailed breakdown and decide what the follow up will be.

Brian GRAY adds that school management should be reminded that the problem starts already in P4 where there are already big differences in the L2 level. The School Management needs to see that bilingual classes are a necessity, not just something that is wanted by parents. He has drafted a note that adds this new element (focus on P4), where differences are most stark. Samantha CHAITKIN adds that it would be a good complement to the survey to bring Primary in on the discussion.

Action: To continue this discussion with the PedgroupLanguage subgroup to see how best to proceed. Samantha CHAITKIN and Brian GRAY to join discussions.

VP Pedagogy, Marc GUITART, informs the Board that he is soliciting points from CE representatives for the agenda for the next CE Meetings (5 & 7 May), he adds there is a need to prioritise due to the time they will be allocated. The deadline is tomorrow.

The Anglophone section proposes the following concerns for the next Primary CE meeting, all related to preparing for repeated or prolonged school closure in the light of COVID 19.

A **review of teaching materials** intended to be used in the 2020/21 academic year (some of the assigned school-books lend themselves to distance learning, while others do not); the **Continuity of SEN assistance** (due to the difficulty of assessing children during distance learning, will the school consider prolonging current SEN contracts for the 2020/21 academic year); if teachers could emphasise a focus on **differentiated teaching** and "rattrapage" when the school does return (due to a huge variance in different families' ability to deliver home schooling as a result of differing circumstances); if the school would consider establishing **APP best practice policy**, and roll out **training modules** / programmes (to help kids get up to speed on the apps / devices and harmonise the teacher's APP practices across primary); if the school could **confirm** ahead of time what **IT platforms** will be used for forthcoming potential closures, so that parent can be ready for such eventualities.

Finally, while the direct messaging and video call aspects of TEAMS have facilitated an enhancement of distance learning, and provided a social link that the primary students have largely embraced, the manner in which the student profiles are set up represents a **child protection risk**. Any child can be messaged or video linked to any other user within the European schools, or persons with access to those users' devices. Could the school take measures to limit this risk; could class teachers deliver a short module on safe use of social media, and reinforce the rules that the school has set for TEAMS; could the school provide a mechanism to temporarily restrict functionality for students who have broken the terms of use rules? Many questions remain.

The President suggests taking into consideration a special request for S4 students who had their trips cancelled this year, in light of the S5 mandatory work experience week which will come up:

to make an exception for them to be able to participate in these trips (in which case the S5 work experience could be carried out in June).

Points raised under distance learning during this meeting will also be adapted for the CE Meeting.

Action point: VP Pedagogy to take up issues raised in the CE meetings.

9) APEEE Working Groups and Task Forces: state of play

The Legal WG are asked to support Pere MOLES PALLEJA with the work on producing guidelines for the internal procedures. Out of time for the rest.

Action Point: The Legal Working Group is requested to support the work on producing guidelines for the internal procedures.

Oral Points for Information

10) INTERPARENTS/BoG Report: "Special Powers"; Obligatory L3 in P4; host country language option for L2; NMS update; CatIII solidarity; and more.

Supporting Documents:

Pt._10.1._APEEE_INFORMAL_REPORT_on_Board_of_Governors_15-17_April, Pt._10.2._2019-11-D-23-en-2_UpdateOnTheIntroductionOfTheNewMarkingSystem, Pt._10.2._Comments_on_NMS_Equivalence_Tables_April_BoG,Pt._10.3._IPLetteronCAT-III_COVIDpayment_draft

Out of time. Postponed to next meeting.

11) Update on Spring Funding Call

One application received to date.

Action: APEEE Secretariat to send out reminder mailing to all parents

12) Update on eLearning Device Project

Supporting Document: Pt._12.eLearning_Device_Project_Report

The eLearning Device Project Report was submitted by the Treasurer, Brian GRAY. To ensure that all parents could meet the cost of equipping their children for distance learning the APEEE launched offers of basic specification laptops, one for the loan of a PC or purchase in instalments for parents on low incomes, and one for PCs payable when ordered under a bulk order.

22 parents applied under the first scheme. The Bureau decided to accept 12 requests from parents earning 4000 € and under. 33 showed interest in the bulk order, but only 8 followed up with a purchase. The APEEE thus helped 20 parents to acquire a laptop PC in time for the summer school term, 11 on deferred payment terms, 2 on loan and 7 on advance payment. The cost to its budget is -34 euro, plus the depreciation of 400 euro per year over three years for the three PCs which will remain with the APEEE, to be used by APEEE Secretariat or CESAME etc. If the two parents decide to purchase instead of returning the loaned PCs, the depreciation of the one remaining will be 133 euro per year. A total of 4592 euro is to be recovered over the 12 months to April 2021. Purchase contracts have been signed by the parents concerned.

In view of the limited interest shown in a bulk order, the Treasurer recommended that the APEEE limit its involvement in a future order to informing parents of any arrangements recommended by the EEBs.

13) Berkendael Update

Supporting Document: Pt_13_Berkendael Update_April Newsletter_Berkendael 2020 V2 Copy

Update already covered.

14) Update on School Governance: SAC, Safety & Hygiene Committees

Supporting document: Pt._14._School_Governance-Resumption_of_Meeting_Schedule

The Berkendael Safety and Hygiene meeting was cancelled. The Uccle Safety and Hygiene meeting and the SAC are both scheduled for June, and the APEEE have asked for the School to put some clear standards in before then (for ex, sending documents in time).

15) Secretariat Update

The sick leave of APEEE Communications Officer Guendalina COMINOTTI (since 25 February) has been extended another 6 weeks (from mid-April to 31 May). This is the second time now that APEEE is dealing with long term leave and being run by half of its staff.