## Overview of the 2013/14 Certification exercise ${ }^{1}$

## The candidates

In total, 71 candidates completed the training programme from 7 EU institutions, the European External Action Service and 2 Agencies. The selection of the candidates was, as always, the responsibility of each institution/agency.

The breakdown of candidates was as follows:

| Institution | Number of <br> candidates |
| :--- | :---: |
| European Parliament | 6 |
| Council of the EU | 4 |
| European Commission | 47 |
| Court of Justice of the EU | 2 |
| European Court of Auditors | 1 |
| European Economic and Social <br> Committee | 2 |
| Committee of the Regions | 2 |
| European External Action Service | 4 |
| Office for Harmonisation in the Internal <br> Market, Alicante | 2 |
| Fusion for Energy, Barcelona | 1 |
| Total | $\mathbf{7 1 *}$ |

*) excluding 2 candidates of whom one did not complete the training programme for duly justified reasons, and one who abandoned the training programme.

There is no limit in the Staff Regulations to the number of candidates that can be selected each year, nor to the number of candidates who may succeed. However, they do specify that no more than $20 \%$ of all AD appointments in an institution in a year can be made from among certified staff. In practice, the institutions take this limit into account when deciding on the number of candidates to select.

[^0]| $\mathbf{N}^{\circ}$ of candidates having followed the training programme in Brussels and Luxembourg |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Institution | Brussels | Luxembourg |
| European Parliament | 4 | 2 |
| Council of the EU | 4 | - |
| European Commission | 42 | 5 |
| Court of Justice of the EU | - | 2 |
| European Court of Auditors | - | 1 |
| European Economic and Social Committee | 2 | - |
| Committee of the Regions | 2 | - |
| European External Action Service | 4 | - |
| Office for Harmonisation in the Internal <br> Market, Alicante | - | 2 |
| Fusion for Energy, Barcelona | - | 1 |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 3}$ |


| Language used during the training programme and for the exams |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Brussels | Luxembourg | TOTAL |
| English | 50 | 7 | 57 |
| French | 8 | 6 | 14 |


| Gender distribution by Institution |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Institution | Male | Female |
| European Parliament | 3 | 3 |
| Council of the EU | 2 | 2 |
| European Commission | 18 | 29 |
| Court of Justice of the EU | 1 | 1 |
| European Court of Auditors | 1 | - |
| European Economic and Social Committee | 1 | 1 |
| Committee of the Regions | 1 | 1 |
| European External Action Service | - | 4 |
| Office for Harmonisation in the Internal | - | 2 |
| Market, Alicante | 1 | - |
| Fusion for Energy, Barcelona | $\mathbf{2 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 3}$ |
| Total |  |  |

## The training programme

The training programme consisted of 25 days of classroom-based training divided into 2 blocks plus the equivalent of 10 days individual study period in between. The purpose of this programme is to help candidates acquire or strengthen their skills in a number of key areas necessary to become an effective administrator. They were then tested on these skills in four different examinations.

The structure of the training programme was very similar to that of previous years:

|  | Modules |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Block 1 <br> (2-25/26 June 2014) | 1 | Starting the journey |
|  | 2 | Presenting with impact 1 |
|  | 3 | Reaching sound decisions 1 |
|  | 5 | Wegotiating successfully |
| Block 2 <br> (22 September - <br> 3 October 2014) | 8 | Block 1 Conclusions |
|  | 8 | Reaching sound decisions 2 |

Candidates were required to follow the whole training programme, the only exception being for duly justified medical or personal reasons. From a total of 1775 candidate-days (classroom-based training), there were only 23.5 days of absence on these grounds.

Candidates were divided into 8 groups, 2 of which were based in Luxembourg and 6 in Brussels. Wherever possible, a gender balance was kept as well as a balance between the institutions (and in the case of the Commission, the DGs) in which candidates worked.

## Evaluation of the training programme

The School continued its policy of asking candidates to evaluate the training programme at the end of each of the blocks in relation to content, delivery and course material.

Additionally, the School asked each of the groups to appoint a spokesperson in order to provide further feedback in a meeting with the Director of the School.

Below is a summary of candidates' evaluation of the 2013/14 training programme:

| Satisfaction levels <br> Scale 1 (poor) - 4 (very satisfied) | \% of candidates satisfied <br> or very satisfied |
| :--- | :---: |
| Development of new skills | $93.55 \%$ |
| Trainers | $99.00 \%$ |
| Course materials | $78.77 \%$ |
| Overall satisfaction (blocks 1\& 2) | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 0 \%}$ |

Evaluation by module:

|  | Modules | \% of candidates <br> satisfied or very <br> satisfied |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
|  | Starting the journey | $99 \%$ |
|  | Presenting with impact 1 | $96 \%$ |
|  | Reaching sound decisions 1 | $91 \%$ |
|  | Negotiating successfully | $94 \%$ |
|  | Writing with impact 1 | $83 \%$ |
|  | Block 1 Conclusions | $84 \%$ |
|  | Reaching sound decisions 2 | $87 \%$ |
|  | Writing with impact 2 | $90 \%$ |
|  | Presenting with impact 2 | $97 \%$ |

## The examinations

In order to be "certified", candidates had to sit and pass four examinations. An inter-institutional Examining Board (EB) was set up to test candidates' competencies. The members of the Board were trained in the necessary assessment techniques to be able to judge the performance of candidates in a consistent and objective way. The training consortium was kept informed about the general structure of the exams.

The examinations for the 2013/14 exercise were structured as follows:

E1 Assessment of candidates' interpersonal skills, reasoning and creative thinking, negotiation and persuasion skills through observing a group exercise.
The examination consisted of a discussion in groups of 5 or 6 candidates to resolve the distribution of a large sum of money that had been left to Coal City in a will. Each candidate in the group assumed the role of a representative of a charity of Coal City. They had to defend their charity's project as strongly as possible whilst also helping the group to reach a decision on how the money should be used. The final proposal could contain elements of several projects providing it did not become so much of a compromise as to be unrealistic or amount in practice to a non-decision.

The exercise involved individual preparation followed by group discussion, the latter of which was observed and marked by the EB.

E2 Assessment of candidates' abilities to analyse information and to solve problems, to think strategically (seeing the bigger picture) and to communicate effectively in writing.

Candidates were given a file relating to 3 projects for representing the country of Kazmistan at the 2016 Universal Exposition. By assuming the role of the special advisor to the Prime Minister of Kazmistan, candidates were asked to analyse and summarise the advantages and disadvantages of the three proposals under consideration and to make a clear recommendation to the Prime Minister as to which one to select including suggestions for dealing with any possible opposition.

Candidates typed their texts on computer.

E3 Assessment of candidates' ability to find, understand and process information, to present a case logically and coherently and to communicate convincingly.

This exam was composed of two parts: a 10-12 minutes presentation on a general topic, communicated 10 working days before the examination date, followed by a 10 minute question \& answer session with the Examining Board.

E4 Assessment of candidates' ability to organise and prioritise, to solve problems and to provide good customer service.

Candidates assumed the role of the deputy to the head of internal services and strategic management support at the Steelbourg Municipal Authority in charge of the move of the I Authority's staff to a new building. In this context, candidates received background information on the move and a series of e-mails. They were required to solve 15 problems by identifying the best and worst course of action for each problem from 4 possible options.

Overview of the results of the examinations:

| 2013/14 Candidates *) | N ${ }^{\circ}$ / Percentage |
| :--- | :---: |
| Candidates who passed all four examinations | 30 |
| Overall pass rate | $42.86 \%$ |
| Pass rate for women | $42.86 \%$ |
| Pass rate for men | $42.86 \%$ |
| Failed 1 examination | 24 |
| Failed 2 examinations | 12 |
| Failed 3 examinations | 4 |
| Failed 4 examinations | 0 |
| Pass rate for examination E1 | $79.17 \%$ |
| Pass rate for examination E2 | $84.51 \%$ |
| Pass rate for examination E3 | $61.43 \%$ |
| Pass rate for examination E4 | $90.14 \%$ |
| Pass rate for those taking training and examinations in English | $42.86 \%$ |
| Pass rate for those taking training and examinations in French | $42.86 \%$ |

*) excluding one candidate who did not complete all examinations

| Re-sitting Candidates | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: |
| Overall pass rate | $48.28 \%$ |

Depending on the provisions of the implementing rules of each of the institutions, candidates who were unsuccessful in one or more of the examinations can re-sit them without going through the selection process again. The general rule is that candidates are allowed to re-sit examinations no more than twice.


[^0]:    1 The information provided refers to the Certification programme for candidates selected in the exercise launched in the institutions in 2013.

