



european school of administration

Overview of the 2015/16 Certification exercise ¹

The candidates

In total, 80 candidates completed the training programme from 7 EU institutions, the European External Action Service, the European Data Protection Supervisor and 3 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 candidates
European Parliament	7
Council of the EU	4
European Commission	50 ^{*)}
Court of Justice of the EU	1
European Court of Auditors	3 ^{**)}
European Economic and Social Committee	3
Committee of the Regions	2
European External Action Service	2
European Data Protection Supervisor	2
European Union Intellectual Property Office, Alicante	2
Fusion for Energy, Barcelona	2
Community Plant Variety Office, Angers	2
Total	80

^{*)} excluding one candidate who was selected in 2015/16 and who postponed her participation to 2016/17 for duly justified reasons; including one candidate who was selected in 2014/15 and who postponed her participation to 2015/16 for duly justified reasons;

^{**)} including one candidate selected for the 2014/15 exercise who postponed her participation to 2015/16 for duly justified reasons

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.

¹ The information provided refers to the Certification programme for candidates selected in the exercise launched by the institutions in 2015.

N° of candidates having followed the training programme in Brussels and Luxembourg		
Institution	Brussels	Luxembourg
European Parliament	5	2
Council of the EU	4	-
European Commission	47	3
Court of Justice of the EU	-	1
European Court of Auditors	-	3
European Economic and Social Committee	3	-
Committee of the Regions	2	-
European External Action Service	2	-
European Data Protection Supervisor	2	-
European Union Intellectual Property Office, Alicante	2	-
Fusion for Energy, Barcelona	2	-
Community Plant Variety Office, Angers	2	-
Total	71	9

Language used during the training programme and for the exams			
	Brussels	Luxembourg	TOTAL
English	59	9	68
French	12	0	12

*) due to an insufficient number of Luxembourg-based candidates to follow the training programme in French, it was not possible to create a viable training group in French, and candidates therefore followed the training programme in Brussels

Gender distribution by Institution		
Institution	Male	Female
European Parliament	2	5
Council of the EU	1	3
European Commission	18	32
Court of Justice of the EU	-	1
European Court of Auditors	-	3
European Economic and Social Committee	-	3
Committee of the Regions	-	2
European External Action Service	1	1
European Data Protection Supervisor	1	1
European Union Intellectual Property Office, Alicante	1	1
Fusion for Energy, Barcelona	1	1
Community Plant Variety Office, Angers	0	2
Total	25	55

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 (30 May – 22 June 2016)	1	Starting the journey
	2	Presenting with impact 1
	3	Reaching sound decisions 1
	4	Negotiating successfully
	5	Writing with impact 1
Block 2 (12 - 23 September 2016)	6	Reaching sound decisions 2
	7	Writing with impact 2
	8	Presenting with impact 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 2000 candidate-days (classroom-based training), there were only 7 days of absence on these grounds.

Candidates were divided into 7 groups, 1 of which was 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).

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 School.

Below is a summary of candidates' evaluation of the 2015/16 training programme:

Satisfaction levels Scale 1 (poor) - 4 (very satisfied)	% of candidates satisfied or very satisfied
Development of new skills	89,70%
Trainers	97,80%
Course materials	88,97%
Overall satisfaction (blocks 1 & 2)	97,06%

Evaluation by module:

	Modules	% of candidates satisfied or very satisfied
Block 1	Starting the journey	92.43%
	Presenting with impact 1	78.79%
	Reaching sound decisions 1	80.30%
	Negotiating successfully	86.36%
	Writing with impact 1	80.30%
Block 2	Reaching sound decisions 2	62.86%
	Writing with impact 2	68.57%
	Presenting with impact 2	95.71%

The examinations

In order to be "certified", candidates had to sit and pass four examinations.

The examinations for the 2015/16 exercise were structured as follows:

- E1** Assessment of candidates' ability to negotiate, to reason and put forward creative ideas, and their interpersonal skills through observing a group exercise.

The examination consisted of a discussion in groups of 5 or 6 candidates to choose a project in the framework of a programme of the United Countries' Community (UCC) to tackle the problem of premature school-leaving in Northland. Each candidate in the group assumed the role of a project manager at the Northland Ministry of Education. They had to defend their project as strongly as possible whilst, by the end of the meeting, the group had to agree on just one project from those put forward.

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

- E2** Assessment of candidates' abilities to analyse information and to solve problems, to think strategically (seeing the bigger picture) and to get the message across.

Candidates were given a file relating to 3 projects concerning open space planning in Ecocity in order to enhance the quality of life within the town in the context of a sustainable development plan. By assuming the role of a member of the Administrative Council of Ecocity, candidates were asked to analyse the advantages and disadvantages of the three projects and make a reasoned proposal to the Chair of the Administrative Council about which one to select. They also had to formulate suggestions for dealing with any possible opposition to the proposed project.

Candidates typed their texts on computer.

- E3** Assessment of candidates' ability to find, understand and process information, to present a case logically and to get the message across.

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

- E4** Assessment of candidates' ability to organise and prioritise, to solve problems and to demonstrate awareness of customer and stakeholder interests.

Candidates assumed the role of the Head of the Emergency Welfare Centre (EWC) in Grufos who was in charge of coordinating the reception and accommodation of evacuees, following the flooding caused by the River Tigrá. Candidates received background information on the activities of the Centre and a series of e-mails related to the arrival of the evacuees. Candidates were required to solve 15 problems by identifying the best and worst course of action for each problem from 4 possible options. The best and worst option had been determined in advance.

Overview of the results of the examinations:

2015/16 Candidates	N° / Percentage
Candidates who passed all four examinations	41
Overall pass rate	51.25%
Pass rate for women	54.55%
Pass rate for men	44.00%
Failed 1 examination	24
Failed 2 examinations	9
Failed 3 examinations	5
Failed 4 examinations	1
Pass rate for examination E1	82.50%
Pass rate for examination E2	75.00%
Pass rate for examination E3	67.50%
Pass rate for examination E4	98.75%
Pass rate for those taking training and examinations in English	52.94%
Pass rate for those taking training and examinations in French	41.67%

Candidates re-sitting in 2016	Percentage
Overall pass rate	61.22%

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.

December 2016