

APEEE BXL II – WOLUWE
BOARD REPORT

Date : 25 June 2020 from 19:00 to 22:45

Location : ZOOM conference call

Present (20) : Tatiana ALMEIDA - Vanessa AULEHLA - Bengt DAVIDSSON -
Sanjee GOONETILAKE – Giles HOUGHTON-CLARKE (Chair) –
Raquel JIMENEZ LOPEZ - Szilvia KALMAN - Natalia KARPENKO -
Roberta MAGGIO - Minna MELLERI - Elita PETRAITIENĖ – Renate
REPPLINGER-HACH – Sara RODA - Andreas ROGAL – Suzana
ROSEIRO - Bettina SCHMIDBAUER-MOGENSEN – Michael
TEUTSCH – Marjo TOIVO - Francesca TUDINI - Anna YAVORSKA

Absent (1) : Anthony BISCH

Others : Anja GALLE, Director of the APEEE
Ferhan Pelister, APEEE Administration

I Agenda points:

1. Approval of the agenda: Agenda is approved including the request to move up the Welcome service point in order to discuss the welcome event for new parents in September. 11 Board members approved the agenda and 1 Board member abstained, therefore agenda is approved.
2. Approval of the report of the 7/5 Board meeting: Board report is approved including adding the 2 sentences under the point on Health, Safety & Wellbeing as requested by S. Goonetilake. 15 Board members voted in favor of the report therefore the Board report is approved.
3. Approval of the report of the 27/5 Board meeting: Board meeting report is approved. 11 Board members voted in favor, 2 voted no and 1 abstained. Therefore the report is approved.

The first 1h of the meeting was taken by discussing the internal workings of the Board. Especially one board member made repeated interventions and negative comments, including personal attacks on some other board members.

Action point: S. Goonetilake to prepare a document for the Board's consideration to substantiate her dissatisfactions with its operations

IIa Discussion points and vote:

1. Update on Corona virus: R. Maggio gave an update on how the school is addressing possible cases: If a student presents symptoms, the child is taken to the school nurses, the parents are called and asked to take child to the doctor. School can't demand a test, but parents are very cooperative and are asking for the test themselves. The school informs pupils in the same 'Bubble' who are quarantined. The school also informs the APEEE, who can then check whether the child takes the bus. The APEEE will then inform the parents of all children taking the same bus. The school subsequently informs the APEEE if the child is to be readmitted to the school or otherwise and the APEEE informal bus parents accordingly.

The APEEE is developing and updating written Covid Procedures for each of its services. Those for the canteen and the transport are complete. All will be checked by the WG members of the Compliance & Risk assessment WG, the concerned working group coordinators and the HSS working group members.

APEEE periscolaires reimbursements - donations from parents

F. Tudini send the information on the reimbursements to the Board. Several parents (about 23) have asked to donate the money to the APEEE. Following options are proposed for the donated money:

1. Use it for periscolaires costs of next year"
2. Use it for the "social fund"
3. Use it for "a possible specific project may be related to COVID-19"

A vote is taken on the 3 described options. The result of the voting is:

1. Use it for periscolaires costs of next year" : 10 votes in favor
2. Use it for the "social fund" : 3 votes in favor
3. Use it for "a possible specific project may be related to COVID-19" : 2 votes in favor
4. 1 Board member abstained

Decision: the donated money will be used for periscolaires costs for next school year.

2. Chinese class: APEEE after school Chinese classes are given by a teacher provided by the Chinese embassy/Confucius programme, with a large part of her salary paid by the Chinese state Given the decision of the Board of Governors and the OSG to sever links with organs of the Chinese state, the Board discussed whether to continue with this teacher, even if she declares she will not take further payments from the embassy.

A replacement teacher will most likely be significantly more expensive, without these financial subsidies

Vote is held on whether the APEEE wants to continue the cooperation with the current Chinese teacher if she signs a self-declaration of not working through the Confucius programme.

Result of voting is: 2 Board members voted yes, 12 Board members voted no and 3 Board members abstained.

Decision: the cooperation with the current Chinese teacher will not be continued.

I Ib Discussion points:

1. Update on NATO: G. Houghton-Clarke gives an update on the NATO site. The new plans from the Secretary General are for both Evere and Berkendael to be filled from new enrolments who do not have siblings in other schools or at the main Woluwe or Uccle school sites, plus families who volunteer for these schools. Confirmation of details are awaited from the Secretary General prior to official communication to parents

Proposition is made to organize a joint meeting with the school management to address questions and present the future school.

This is agreed to by the Board.

Action point: G. Houghton-Clarke to send report on Groupe de Suivi meeting of 25/6 to the Board.

Action point: Taskforce on NATO to contact the Director to prepare for a future parents event.

2. Distance/hybrid learning September:

1. V. Aulehla informs about the ongoing work at interparents level:
 - a) Thanks also to the continuous work of interparents delegates, the OSG recommendations document (latest version: 2020-03-D-11-en-5) has been updated regularly shifting it from open recommendations to binding requirements. While much progress has been made during the lockdown period, there should now be a serious evaluation of lessons learned in order to raise and harmonize standards across the system going into September. During the lockdown period, students' experience with teachers has ranged from exemplary to completely absent. It would be necessary to evaluate and identify the reasons for any absences, in order to provide training, support or resources. While an adjustment period was acceptable, anything that does not meet the standards set by the OSG should no longer be tolerated.
 - b) On 5 June 2020, the Joint Teaching Committee (JTC) of the European Schools (ES) gathered for an extra-ordinary meeting to discuss i.e. the preparation of the 2020/21 school year (2020-05-D-25-en-1). In order to be prepared for any situation and scenario, the JTC has mandated a Task Force for this purpose, starting in the second week of June until mid-July, in time for the BoG to take the necessary decisions by Written Procedure (WP) at the end of July. The Task force is led by the OSG and includes representatives of Inspectors, Directors, Directors of EAS, EU Commission, ISTC and Interparents.
2. While the task force is working and following the action points decided and votes

taken at the Board meeting of 27 May, a small Apeee board delegation (G. Houghton-Clarke, APEEE President, T. Almeida, Vice President Pedagogical Affaires, S. Kalman, Coordinator CEES, R. Maggio, Coordinator of Risk Assessment & Compliance WG, V. Aulehla and R. Repplinger-Hach coordinators of the distance learning task force) had a meeting with director Malik to discuss distance teaching at our school, planning ideas for September and common understanding on the developments at system level (see point 1). Based on the APEEE survey on distance teaching, the more recent one on education support and the minimum guidelines developed by the OSG, discussion was held on how the school can ensure quality and consistency in distance learning, how best practices can be captured and spread through the teaching community. In addition, Apeee board members wanted to understand, what the options could be for September and if there would be any need for additional budget in order to do investments in equipment, infrastructure, human resources etc. and potentially what measures can be undertaken to ensure secondary pupils are able to safely participate in more in-situ lessons. Ms Malik informed that reflections were still in the making as too many parameters in particular the Belgian safety requirements were unknown, but that she is already looking at expanding the technical equipment for distance/hybrid learning.

Discussions will continue when more details on the situation of September are known.

3. BOYD update: A. Rogal and S. Kalman give an update on the meeting which took place on 16/6 with the school on the project BOYD (Bring Your Own Device). F Charlier, the school IT manager, proposes a joint purchase solution with an external supplier to enable parents to buy standard laptops for S4 and S4 pupils through the APEEE. Mr Schmelz informed at the meeting on 16/6 that due to the fact that there were no CEES meetings organized because of the Covid-19 situation, the parents were not informed about the BYOD project and the school management had not the opportunity to inform about the framework. He therefore proposed to postpone the project until September in order to have time to inform the parents and discuss how to proceed.

During the meeting on 16/6 it was pointed out by the teachers that it will become more and more difficult to teach mathematics without this device. The S5 students will no longer use the calculators for the new mathematics and physics syllabuses since it has been replaced by the tool GeoGebra software/application, which requires individual use of a digital device starting in S5 at the beginning of the 2020-2021 school year. At the moment it's also possible to download the GeoGebra software/application for free via the smartphone. But this can only be a temporary solution. For the S4+S5 students starting school year 2020-2021 temporary solution is offered by the school to download the software via the smart phone.

Discussion is held on how to move forward. Conclusion is that a discussion is needed with all stakeholders (parents, teachers, school management) in order to look at the options and discuss a BOYD policy.

Action point: to be discussed further in the CEES working group and prepare suggestions to be presented at the CEES meeting in September 2020.

IIC Info points:

1. Working groups

- a) Budget working group: V. Aulehla informs about the meeting with budget & transport WG members which took place on 24/6/2020 and during which the follow points were decided:

Extra costs for bus companies for restarting the school bus service in June: bus companies have informed us about the extra costs which they had to make in order to restart the school bus service in June. This concerns cleaning costs, insurance costs and staff costs. The 3 APEEEs discussed this in a meeting on 16/6 and they all agree on the principle for the bus companies to invoice these costs related to the restart. For APEEE Bxl II Erwin has made a calculation based on information received from 7 bus companies. The calculation was shared with the working group members. The average cost is € 2895 euro per bus for 4 weeks. These costs will be invoiced to the institutions in the normal manner.

The Parents Payeurs (Maternelle parents etc) will be invoiced the normal abonnement on a pro rata basis as this had already been communicated to them.

It is agreed that the transport department can inform the bus companies that they can invoice the extra costs of 2895,33 euro per bus for the month of June, and that the PMO & Institutions can be invoiced accordingly.

- b) 2 notes from the PMO asking for a reimbursement: PMO has sent 2 notes to the APEEE asking for a reimbursement for the period of 2015 to 2018, and from 2018 to 2019. This concerns a reimbursement for 202K and a reimbursement for 40K. The PMO informs that the amounts can be reduced from 202K to 104K and from 40K to 7K, if the APEEE can justify the 2% administrative cost. The PMO have requested to see the financial accounts of the APEEE and then decided to refuse the representation costs, amortization costs & provision costs, which then led to their calculation of reimbursement.

According to the regulations of the Commission the APEEE is allowed a 2% extra administrative cost, without justification. Now the PMO is suddenly asking for the justification of the 2%.

Furthermore, the APEEE never intentionally creates a benefit or loss, if a benefit happens it's unintentionally because we were not able to hire all the bus supervisors as budgeted.

What should the approach be of the APEEE towards the PMO? Proposition is made to contact the PMO for a meeting, as has taken place with the other APEEEs who have been requested a reimbursement form the PMO. It is agreed that the PMO should be informed that:

- Commission regulations don't stipulate to provide justifications for the 2%
- Over the past 10 years the APEEE has made a marging of only 0.98%, not the 2% it is entitled to
- The cost categories of investments (amortization) and representation expenses are necessary for the APEEE to provide a bus service and are allowed under the Commission regulations, therefore do not form the basis of a rebate
- Provisions are required because the PMO itself takes 4 years to confirm which the bus users are entitled to have the costs paid by the Commission.

- c) Bus contracts 2020-2021: the 3 APEEEs have been meeting with the bus companies to discuss prices for 2020-2021. The Federation of bus companies (FBAA) has prepared a calculation of a price increase of 10,26%. The percentage will be negotiated with the bus companies and they will be asked to provide a green plan between now and 2030.
- d) Transport: key developments: M. Melleri informs about the key developments of the transport
- The extra costs for the restart of the school bus service as of 8/6/2020: the extra costs are listed and APEEEs agree on the principle to pay for cleaning costs, insurance and staff. Each APEEE will decide on the amount depending on their finances.
 - Prime de solidarité : file is closed: all 3 APEEEs have made a decision: APEEE Laeken decided not to pay a fee, APEEE Ixelles and Uccle will pay 3%, and Woluwe has informed the bus companies they can invoice 3% following the cahier de charge.
 - Negotiations for 2020-2021: first set of elements were discussed between the 3 APEEEs and the bus companies which might be at the basis of a price increase + clause to be added to the cahier de charge.

S. Goonetilake asks 3 questions:

1) Why was the decision of the restart of the transport service so urgent in June?

Could we not have waited? Reply is given that the school only informed the APEEE on 28/5 about the potential reopening of the school on 8/6. School asked the APEEE whether it would be possible to provide transport. The APEEE contacted the transport companies who informed that they normally need at least 10 working days to organize a restart. The bus companies however worked hard to prepare for the restart to be realized in such short notice.

2) Can we trust the PMO to pay for the extra cost? Did they confirm this in writing?

The extra costs are part of the costs which were needed to restart the transport buses: without these costs the school bus service could not have restarted. These are effective costs which the bus companies had to pay. The PMO was informed in writing by the President that for the restart of the school bus service there would be extra costs involved. The PMO replied that they had no special comments regarding the process and that according to the elements provided, it seems acceptable and justified.

3) Extra cost for the bus companies seem a lot for only cleaning of the buses. Is that normal? Explanation is given that the extra costs were not only for the cleaning & hygiene measures which are obligatory & the products, but also for putting the buses back into circulation which entailed restarting insurance policies and taking bus drivers out of chômage temporaire solely for the European schools services

- e) Canteen: B. Schmidbauer-Mogensen informs about the different scenario's which P. Orlovski has prepared for the restart of the canteen in September. The scenario's are:
1. All pupils come back to school then the canteen can work as normal
 2. A second scenario with only half of the students coming to school -> deficit of 577K
 3. A third scenario in which all maternelle & primary students will attend the school full time, and the secondary will only attend part time -> deficit of 457K

A meeting has been held to review what can be done to address this loss. the following options are being investigated:

- Reducing food costs by eliminating most expensive items, without compromising nutritional quality
- alternative serving model to eliminate serving staff costs
 - Re-working serving in the cafeteria and teachers canteen to lower costs

P. Orlovski has been asked to explore the option of replacing the offering of a warm meal in the canteen, by offering a meal in a which is collected directly by the students as part of a take away lunch bag. several scenarios are discussed:

1. Serving a lunch box (warm meal & dessert) to all students who can come to the canteen and eat it there
2. Serving a lunch box to Maternelle & primary students who will eat the meal in their class, and serve the lunch box to the secondary students in the canteen
3. All students (maternelle, primary & secondary students) eat the meal from their lunch box in their class
4. Scenario where the opening of the canteen is postponed from 3 September to end September

Another scenario to look at is:

5. Scenario where the canteen is not reopened and kitchen team is on economical unemployment

In any case, in order to prepare for food services, the canteen needs to know by mid-August at the latest what the school scenario will be and the school management will be informed about this constraint.

P. Orlovski will contact the 3 other Brussels APEEEs and discuss the following:

- Have they foreseen any scenario's for September?
- Have they any information on serving meals in lunch boxes?
- How will they deal with the situation in case a member of their kitchen team is down with Covid-19? Will they close the kitchen? Will they ask an external provider to come in and provide food / sandwiches?
- Can the kitchens act as backups for each other in the event that one kitchen is closed for 2 weeks due to a coronavirus case amongst the staff
- Do they consider not re-opening the canteen?

It's clear that any scenario which is not the normal situation will cause a deficit for the canteen. The reserves for the canteen are currently at 350K, which means that the canteen cannot sustain a big loss.

Once the new scenario's with the lunch box option are ready they will be shared with the Board.

f) Extra-curricular activities:

- The APEEE has launched the registrations for next school year, updated the rules with a new clause for the "force majeure". Webpages and the brochure are updated accordingly
 - o To date there are: Statistics 2020-2021 (vs 2019 – 2020)
 - Number of different activities : 46 (50)
 - Activities per week : 304 (343)
 - Total number of places : 2662 (3418) *we have reduced the total number of places to minimise possible COVID impacts Ex: Culturelle activities, from 12 to 10
 - Registrations to the activities : 2460 (2982)
 - Average filling : 92% * (87%)
 - Number of students registered to activities : 1235 (1596)
 - Number of students registered for supervision : 128 (434) – most of the registrations for supervision are done in September
 - Registrations for supervision : 314 (848)
 - Monitors : 65 (69)
 - We have communicated to parents about the reimbursements of the lost classes in the third trimester. About 20 families have expressed their wish to leave the money to the APEEE.
 - We have launched the invitation for the summer stages (5 from 6 July to 2 Sept)
 - We will be working on a safety protocol for next year classes
- g) Task forces:
- Mobility programme: The school decided to suspend all exchanges planned for September.
 - Digital privacy awareness: S. Roda informs about the meeting which took place with the school management and the school DPO officer on 17/6/2020. Report on the meeting has been mailed to the Board.
- h) Educational support working group: is postponed to the next Board meeting.
- i) School community building: is postponed to the next Board meeting.
- j) Compliance & risk assessment: is postponed to the next Board meeting.
- k) Interparents: is postponed to the next Board meeting.
- l) CEP&M: is postponed to the next Board meeting.
- m) CEES: is postponed to the next Board meeting.
- h) Health, Safety & Security WG: is postponed to the next Board meeting
- n) Communication WG: is postponed to the next Board meeting.

- o) Enrolment policy group: F. Tudini has send the report on the CEA meeting of 25/6 to the Board.
- p) Active community WG: is postponed to the next Board meeting.
- q) Welcome committee WG: is postponed to the next Board meeting.
- r) IT group: is postponed to the next Board meeting.

III Any other business: suggestion is made to organize a supplementary Board meeting during the month of July in order to follow up on developments concerning the APEEE services for September.

Next Board meeting will take place on 22/9/2020 at 19:00 via ZOOM conference call.