



european school of administration

Overview of the 2016/17 Certification exercise ¹

The candidates

In total, 79 candidates completed the training programme from 6 EU institutions, the European Data Protection Supervisor 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 candidates
European Parliament	7
Council of the EU	4
European Commission	59 ^{*)}
Court of Justice of the EU	3
European Court of Auditors	1
European Economic and Social Committee	0
European Committee of the Regions	1
European External Action Service	0
European Data Protection Supervisor	1
European Union Intellectual Property Office, Alicante	2
Fusion for Energy, Barcelona	1
Total	79

*) excluding two candidates who were selected in 2016/17 and who postponed their participation to 2017/18 for duly justified reasons; including one candidate who was selected in 2015/16 and who postponed the participation to 2016/17 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 2016.

N° of candidates having followed the training programme in Brussels and Luxembourg		
Institution	Brussels	Luxembourg
European Parliament	5	2
Council of the EU	4	0
European Commission	52	7
Court of Justice of the EU	0	3
European Court of Auditors	0	1
European Economic and Social Committee	0	0
European Committee of the Regions	1	0
European External Action Service	0	0
European Data Protection Supervisor	1	0
European Union Intellectual Property Office, Alicante	2	0
Fusion for Energy, Barcelona	1	0
Total	66	13

Language used during the training programme and for the exams			
	Brussels	Luxembourg	TOTAL
English	47	13	60
French	19	0	19

*) 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 these candidates therefore followed the training programme in Brussels.

Gender distribution by Institution		
Institution	Male	Female
European Parliament	4	3
Council of the EU	4	0
European Commission	19	40
Court of Justice of the EU	3	0
European Court of Auditors	0	1
European Economic and Social Committee	0	0
European Committee of the Regions	1	0
European External Action Service	0	0
European Data Protection Supervisor	0	1
European Union Intellectual Property Office, Alicante	1	1
Fusion for Energy, Barcelona	0	1
Total	32	47

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 – 21 June 2017)	1	Starting the journey
	2	Presenting with impact 1
	3	Reaching sound decisions 1
	4	Negotiating successfully
	5	Writing with impact 1
Block 2 (11 - 22 September 2017)	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 1975 candidate-days (classroom-based training), there were only 9 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 2016/17 training programme:

Satisfaction levels Scale 1 (poor) - 4 (very satisfied)	% of candidates satisfied or very satisfied
Development of new skills	96.43%
Trainers	97.15%
Course materials	85.72%
Overall satisfaction (blocks 1 & 2)	97.14%

Evaluation by module:

	Modules	% of candidates satisfied or very satisfied
Block 1	Starting the journey	95.95%
	Presenting with impact 1	95.95%
	Reaching sound decisions 1	86.48%
	Negotiating successfully	93.25%
	Writing with impact 1	91.89%
Block 2	Reaching sound decisions 2	84.85%
	Writing with impact 2	81.81%
	Presenting with impact 2	95.45%

The examinations

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

The examinations for the 2016/17 exercise were structured as follows:

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

The examination consisted of a discussion in groups of 5 or 6 candidates in order to choose a project in the framework of a development programme for Emergia island, an uninhabited volcanic island on the border between Gadland and Rupon's territorial waters. Each candidate in the group assumed the role of a project manager of one of the ministries concerned in Gadland. They had to defend their project for development of the island as strongly as possible, but 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 for improving urban mobility and fighting pollution in the city of Mexacruz. Assuming the role of the Head of the Regional Mobility Department, candidates were asked to analyse the advantages and disadvantages of three proposals aiming to improve the flow of traffic in Mexacruz and fight pollution, and make a reasoned proposal to the National Minister for Mobility about which project 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 day team of the City of Maro Crisis Centre in Oneland who, in the absence of the Director, was in charge of the operational coordination of the centre and was required to take swift decisions in response to a fictitious disease.

Candidates received background information on the activities of the Centre and a series of e-mails related to the outbreak of a contagious disease in a school. 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:

2016/17 Candidates	N° / Percentage
Candidates who passed all four examinations	46
Overall pass rate	58.23%
Pass rate for women	59.57%
Pass rate for men	56.25%
Failed 1 examination	21
Failed 2 examinations	10
Failed 3 examinations	2
Failed 4 examinations	0
Pass rate for examination E1	86.08%
Pass rate for examination E2	82.28%
Pass rate for examination E3	71.79%
Pass rate for examination E4	100.00%
Pass rate for those taking training and examinations in English	60.00%
Pass rate for those taking training and examinations in French	52.63%

Candidates re-sitting in 2017	Percentage
Overall pass rate	53.06%

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.

January 2018