



MINUTES – MEETING OF 17 MARCH 2026

Participant Board Members:

Albert Rädler (DE), Treasurer
Alessia Ghezzi (IT) [online]
Andrea Panizza (IT), Deputy Secretary
Andrew Janis Folkmanis (EN)
Anja Semmelrodt (DE)
Anne Becker (DE), Vice-President for pedagogical matters
Inês Sajara (PT) [online]
Jan Von Pfaler (FI) [online] (resigns from the Board and leaves at 20h55)
José Madeira (DE)
Lena Widefjäll (SE)
Mindaugas Skaraitis (LT), Member of the Bureau
Nicolas Lacroix (FR), Vice-President for administrative matters
Peter Kögler (DE) [online] (resigns from the Board and leaves at 22h40)
Rüdiger Martin (DE)
Soraya Lemaire (FR) [online]
Virgilio Miolato (IT)
Virginie Battu-Henriksson (SE), President

Absent Board Members:

Johanna Peyredieu du Charlat (SE)
Joana Gil (PT), Secretary

Other participants:

N/a

The President announced that Andrea Panizza takes the role of Secretary in absence of Joana Gil.

Before moving to the agenda, the President announced the resignation of six Board members, namely Andrea Grgić (NL), Carin Persson Sveningsson (SE), Elita Petraitenė (LT), Pascale Notarrigo (FR), Pim Geschiere (NL) and Vanessa Batista Coutinho (PT). She stressed that she regrets these resignations.

The Board took note of the letters of resignation received in the late afternoon of the same 17 March and confirmed it will treat the resignations according to applicable procedures, regulations and law.

Anne Becker raised again in this context the known issue of coverage of language sections, now worsened, especially for matters related to pedagogical issues, worrying that certain intersections or perspectives may be missing if such coverage is not comprehensive.

Soraya Lemaire enquired about handover, as in some case, for certain files, the former Board member could handover useful documents to the Board about certain files and discussions. The President noted that some documents could be in possession of the staff while for some others, especially on confidential matters, they would need to be explicitly asked to some former Board members.

1. Approval of the agenda

Decision: The agenda was approved by acclamation.

2. Approval of the public minutes of the Board meeting of 6/03/2026

The Board votes on the approval of the public minutes of the Board meeting of 6/03/2026: **16 yes** (Albert Rädler, Alessia Ghezzi, Andrea Panizza, Andrew Janis Folkmanis, Anja Semmelrodt, Anne Becker, Inês Sajara, Jan Von Pfaler, José Madeira, Lena Widefjäll, Mindaugas Skaraitis, Nicolas Lacroix, Rüdiger Martin, Soraya Lemaire, Virgilio Miolato, Virginie Battu-Henrikson) and **1 abstention** (Peter Kögler).

Decision: The public minutes of the Board meeting of 6/03/2026 were approved.

3. Items for decision

3.1 Isabel cards: additional back-up

The Treasurer introduced the topic and explained the existing payment procedure, that goes from the approval of the expense to the actual payment. This payment is done by using the Isabel software. The Treasurer proposed that another staff member is added as the fourth person in the capacity of launching this payment execution, through the granting of an Isabel card, as an additional backup. A discussion followed (confidential due to data protection and privacy legislation).

The Board votes for the authorisation to grant one additional Isabel card to one additional staff member of the APEEE: **15 yes** and **2 no**.

Decision: The Board authorises the granting of one additional Isabel card to one additional staff member of the APEEE.

3.2. Liquidity management

The Treasurer introduced the topic informing about the Association's liquid funds. These funds are placed in a current account ("compte courant"), which means they are not interest bearing. It is therefore proposed to place the excess liquidity of APEEE in a secure savings account ("compte a terme"), which then would yield an interest at a rate of appr. 1,5 % per year (actual rates need to be verified and depend on amount and duration). The amount to be placed in a savings account would need to be carefully determined: it is important to avoid any premature recalling of the funds which would be penalised by the bank. On the basis of a very conservative liquidity planning prepared by the staff, the investment of an amount of EUR 500 000 EUR for a period of 3 months and an amount of EUR 500 000 EUR for 6 months is proposed. During 2026 the funds can be re-invested without further Board approval.

Jan Von Pfaler expressed concerns that no cash-flow or liquidity risk calculations had been presented prior to the decision. He expressed the view that choosing banks and

managing liquidity involves significant financial risk and therefore requires proper analysis before any decision is taken. He therefore expressed an objection to proceeding without such financial information because that could be unsafe given the association's upcoming expenses. Lena Widefjäll inquired about the sustainability of investments made with APEEE money.

The Vice-President responsible for administrative matters explained that no actual active investment was going to be made, it would only be setting aside part of the liquidity into a saving account. He further explained that the expected financial return varies depending on the plan, withdrawal conditions, and potential penalties. As a result, the interest would range roughly between 0.7% and 1.5%. He then explained that following the strengthening of anti-terrorism laws in Belgium, banks became far more demanding in their compliance requirements, especially for organisations like APEEE that undergo frequent board changes. AISBLs have become less attractive clients for banks.

For this reason, APEEE should privilege a bank which remains willing and able to facilitate the association's operations.

José Madeira suggested that the financial situation should be reviewed and reported back to the Board by the Treasurer, after three months and again after six months.

The Board voted for the authorisation that excess liquidity in an amount of EUR 500 000 will be invested in a savings account for a three-month period, and in an amount of EUR 500 000 in a savings account of six months until the end of January 2027. Any excess liquidity can be reinvested at its term without further Board approval. These investments are subject to updates to the Board by the Treasurer at the end of each of those terms: **15 yes** (Albert Rädler, Alessia Ghezzi, Andrea Panizza, Andrew Janis Folkmanis, Anja Semmelrodt, Anne Becker, Inês Sajara, José Madeira, Lena Widefjäll, Mindaugas Skaraitis, Nicolas Lacroix, Rüdiger Martin, Soraya Lemaire, Virgilio Miolato, Virginie Battu-Henrikson) and **2 no** (Jan Von Pfaler, Peter Kögler).

Decision: The Board authorises the placing in a savings account of EUR 500 000 for a period of 3 months and an amount of EUR 500 000 for a period of 6 months, subject to reinvestment in the course of the year without the need for further approval and subject to regular update to the Board by the Treasurer.

3.3 Sharing of class representatives contact lists

The Board discussed the framework applicable to the sharing of contact details among elected parent representatives per section. The President recalled that sharing had previously been suspended on GDPR grounds but it should be restored because making class representatives able to communicate among themselves is a core duty of the Association. Communication between representatives is inherent to the representative mandate under the Statutes and should be enabled within a coherent and proportionate framework.

Board members were invited to reassess the issue on the basis of a structured analysis in order to clarify whether such a restrictive approach was in fact required. During the assessment, it was confirmed that the GDPR does not prohibit this type of sharing and that two lawful models — legitimate interest and consent — are available.

Rüdiger Martin presented the two options and their pros and cons. The principles of purpose limitation, necessity, proportionality and transparency were examined. It was noted that the data concerned are limited to basic contact details (name, email address, class represented), are non-sensitive, and would be shared only within a clearly defined and restricted representative circle — typically within the same language section and in no

case directly with the entire parent community. It was clarified that the two models have different implications for the representative structure: under the legitimate interest model, coordination between representatives is treated as an inherent and default element of the mandate, whereas under the consent model, such coordination depends on prior individual confirmation and therefore becomes structurally contingent. At the same time, differing sensitivities among parents were acknowledged. It was highlighted that both models incorporate appropriate safeguards to account for these sensitivities, including purpose-bound and restricted use, deletion of data at the end of the mandate, the possibility to use a separate email address, and — depending on the model chosen — either a right to object at any time or prior explicit confirmation. The discussion reflected the Board's intention to enhance transparency and enable effective coordination while ensuring appropriate protections for those who have concerns.

Jan Von Pfaler recalled that the problems related to such lists sharing, in the past, had two main causes. First, the consent-based model had been implemented incorrectly: consent was obtained in a manner the DPO found incorrect, leading the DPO to halt the process until a proper model could be developed. Second, there were some difficulties with the follow-up at staff level, preventing the DPO from clarifying the sequence of changes made to the consent text. He acknowledged that both the consent-based model and the legitimate-interest model are legally valid. However, he expressed concerns about the practical implications of distributing class representative lists, arguing that broad distribution —potentially to all 600 class representatives—would expose large numbers of people to unnecessary data-protection risks, even if individuals could later be asked to delete specific information. He noted such deletion would be difficult to enforce. Jan Von Pfaler added that for him the core issue was the need to avoid unnecessary and widespread circulation of personal data. He said a clear proposal on how the distribution of lists would be organised in practice was still missing and asked whether the intention was to send the full list to the entire school community or whether a more limited, structured approach was envisioned.

Rüdiger Martin clarified that the intention was never to share the class representatives' contact lists with the entire school community and recalled that the sharing is meant to be strictly limited to each section, which significantly restricts the number of recipients and aligns with the principle of data minimisation. He addressed the suggestion of using technological solutions, noting that GDPR does not require such an approach and that introducing additional ICT systems could create new challenges. These might include managing system access logs, cybersecurity risks, or administrative overhead, potentially shifting the problem rather than solving it. The simplest and most appropriate method, in his view, is to share the information as a clearly marked, purpose-limited list, specifying its intended use and restrictions. When applied only within sections and only among class representatives, he argued that this constitutes a reasonable and sufficiently limited form of data sharing.

Jan Von Pfaler acknowledged the difference between sharing contact lists widely and limiting them to specific groups, agreeing that restricted sharing within sections carries far lower risk. He clarified, however, that the issue is not about technical logging or securing access to a list: putting a list behind digital locks does not change the fact that it is still being distributed. Instead, he argued that the real alternative is to provide a communication mechanism within each section—allowing contact without distributing personal data. In his view, enabling communication without circulating names and email addresses would significantly reduce exposure. He nevertheless agreed that sharing within a limited group is acceptable if it is supported by a clear model, proper legal basis, and correctly recorded consent or legitimate-interest documentation and stressed that the organisation must handle and record the data properly, publicise the chosen legal basis,

and ensure compliance. Once this framework is in place, the model could be workable. However, he also emphasised that the main question remains whether it is necessary to distribute lists at all when an alternative—facilitating communication without sharing personal data—could achieve the same purpose with less risk.

The President reiterated that the Board must decide how class-representative lists will be shared for each section, and recalled that the available documents and explanations outline two possible models: a consent-based model and a legitimate-interest model. She proposed that, given the current context and the limited time remaining in the school year, for the current year, a consent-based model could be used, while for the following year the Board should prepare a legitimate-interest model, by means of which class representatives' email addresses would be shared by default unless an individual explicitly objects.

However, the Treasurer, supported by several other Board members, argued that applying the legitimate-interest model already this year would be a better approach. Under legitimate interest, parents only need to be informed, and class representatives must express disagreement if they do not want their email shared. By contrast, the consent-based model requires actively collecting consent, storing it securely, and potentially following up with individuals who do not respond. He concluded that the legitimate-interest approach would be easier to understand and more practical to implement.

Anne Beker noted that it would make sense to manage the lists separately for primary and secondary levels, as communication practices differ across cycles and sites. She suggested that each language section should therefore have one list for secondary and one separate list for primary, ensuring clearer and more relevant communication within each group. Anja Semmelrodt agreed that the communication among the two groups is very different.

The President noted that the lists would indeed include the class level, allowing de facto for separate distribution, as needed.

The Board votes on the proposal to adopt the “legitimate interest” approach to share the mailing lists of the class representatives per section and implements this decision as soon as possible: **16 yes** (Albert Rädler, Alessia Ghezzi, Andrea Panizza, Andrew Janis Folkmanis, Anja Semmelrodt, Anne Becker, Inês Sajara, José Madeira, Lena Widefjäll, Mindaugas Skaraitis, Nicolas Lacroix, Peter Kögler, Rüdiger Martin, Soraya Lemaire, Virgilio Miolato, Virginie Battu-Henrikson) and **1 no** (Jan Von Pfaler).

Decision: The Board decides to adopt the “legitimate interest” approach to share the mailing lists of the class representatives per section to implement this decision as soon as possible

After the voting Jan Von Pfaler stated that he had consistently tried to cooperate in good faith and had dedicated significant personal time to supporting the organisation. However, he felt that the situation had reached a point where continuing was no longer possible. He emphasised that decisions must be made by the Board, not unilaterally by the President, and that decisions should only be taken following proper preparation; he acknowledged that the specific topic of the class representatives lists sharing had been handled professionally, but he felt that other matters had not been prepared to an adequate standard. He expressed frustration that his views—and those of others—had been commented on without sufficient opportunity for them to respond. He also formally objected to the fact that the voting of the confidential minutes is handled under confidential matters and not in what he sees as the right point of the agenda. Jan Von Pfaler then announced, for the record, his resignation, since in his view the legal risks associated with

continuing under current conditions were too great for him to accept and he felt he had no other choice.

The President clarified that the confidential minutes were intended to be addressed under the relevant confidential agenda point, since the inherent discussions cannot be part of the public report. Concerning Jan Von Pflaler's resignation, the President expressed regret and noted that she similarly regretted the resignations of other board members.

Jan von Pflaler formally objected to the content of the confidential minutes of the meeting of 25 February 2026 and then left the meeting at 20h55.

3.4 Overcrowding Working Group

The President proposed to revive the overcrowding Working Group. A discussion took place regarding the usefulness of having a dedicated structure within the Board to handle overcrowding issues. Anne Becker emphasised that overcrowding is a cross-cutting issue affecting every aspect of the school and cannot be treated as a sector-specific problem. Anja Semmelrodt supported this view and stressed the importance that the work on overcrowding remains constructive and not being used to foster resistance to change, notably the move to Evere.

Andrew Janis Folkmanis argued that addressing these issues in a structured manner remains useful: i) to closely monitor the political and administrative process surrounding the planned move to Evere in September 2026, notably to prepare positions for upcoming discussions with Belgian authorities, including within the Brussels Steering Committee, as well as to coordinate with Interparents; ii) to address the long-term outlook for the Brussels school system, since overcrowding might not be solved even with a fifth school expected in 2030; and iii) to explore interim measures for the period between 2026 and 2030.

Anne Beker wondered whether some of the relevant topics, are not already under the scope of the existing Health, Safety and Security Working Group. Virgilio Miolato questioned the usefulness of a dedicated structure on overcrowding, as for instance obtaining a special mandate for discussions in Interparents is not necessary since Board members already have the freedom to raise overcrowding concerns whenever relevant.

Andrew Janis Folkmanis clarified that in his view the intention would be to ensure that the issue is given structured attention, and that a specific person or group is clearly responsible for shaping the APEEE's position on overcrowding and supporting the President in preparing the strategy for the Steering Committee.

In light of the discussion, the President proposed to appoint one or more focal points instead of reviving the formal working group, allowing to feed the work on pedagogy or services, without adding additional structures. Andrew Janis Folkmanis, Mindaugas Skaraitis and Soraya Lemaire volunteer to act as focal points.

The Board votes on appointing Andrew Janis Folkmanis, Mindaugas Skaraitis and Soraya Lemaire as focal points for overcrowding: approved by unanimity.

Decision: Andrew Janis Folkmanis, Mindaugas Skaraitis and Soraya Lemaire are appointed as focal points for overcrowding

3.5 Approval of the calendar of future Board meetings

The calendar of meetings is presented for approval as circulated, the only change being 13 May meeting moved to 12 May, to avoid the eve of a public holiday. The Board votes on approving the calendar for upcoming ordinary meetings in 2026 (Monday, 20/04/2026; Tuesday, 12/05/2026; Thursday, 04/06/2026; Wednesday, 10/06/2026; Tuesday,

30/06/2026; Monday, 07/09/2026; Thursday, 1/10/2026; Wednesday, 14/10/2026; Tuesday, 17/11/2026; Thursday, 10/12/2026): approved by unanimity.

Decision: the Board approved the calendar for ordinary meetings for the remaining of 2026 as follows: Monday, 20/04/2026; Tuesday, 12/05/2026; Thursday, 04/06/2026; Wednesday, 10/06/2026; Tuesday, 30/06/2026; Monday, 07/09/2026; Thursday, 1/10/2026; Wednesday, 14/10/2026; Tuesday, 17/11/2026; Thursday, 10/12/2026.

3.6 Woluwe canteen: i) options to ensure a less costly renovation; ii) financing of the renovation

The President introduced the topic on the renovation of the school canteen. She emphasised that proper consultation with students will have to be ensured and stressed the importance of moving forward to ensure that the renovation can take place ahead of next school year. The original renovation plan had to be adjusted. During the meeting of the Budgetary Committee the week before, the European Commission indicated that they could only finance the renovation with a budget of up to EUR 200 000.

In this context, the Board received an updated draft acquisition plan within this budget limit just on that day. Given the urgency (to be on time for the next school year), the President proposed that the Board vote to proceed with a canteen transformation with a more modest budget than initially planned. The President added that, in parallel to the infrastructure question, the Board will need to make decisions on the service model—for example, menu options such as salads, pasta, or soup—and that this will require structured consultation with students.

She also stressed the importance of comparing proposals from external service providers with the provision in-house, based on concrete, comparable data, to inform a discussion about the long-term operating model.

Anja Semmelrodt noted the large difference between the original projections and the new figures, which are now much lower. The President explained that the earlier amount reflected a full renovation and was based on catalogue prices and assumptions made before knowing the school would do the purchasing via the framework contract. Using the Commission's procurement channels which are VAT-exempt significantly reduces costs, especially when combined with a more pragmatic layout and simplified equipment needs. The Vice-President responsible for administrative matters added that some of the previously expensive items—such as large freezers, specific stations, and plumbing for water lines—were scaled back in the new design. The President further informed that the renovation plan presented by the staff had been supported by a consultant and that several layout scenarios were considered before settling on the current configuration, although the final layout and equipment choices will require a dedicated discussion involving the students and the parents, as these decisions shape long-term service options (e.g., pasta bar, salad bar, soup station).

Anne Becker emphasised that the canteen renovation is a long-term decision and argued that the Board should not shy away from asking parents for contributions, even on a voluntary basis, to avoid decisions that would negatively impact future generations. She stressed that the consultation of the essential given they are the primary users of the canteen.

Virgilio Miolato asked whether a proper student consultation had been done before designing the new kitchen and the Vice-President for administrative matters explained that the initial plan produced an overly ambitious and expensive “dream canteen”. The President added that the School and Commission have since asked for a drastic reduction in scope and cost.

Peter Kögler stated he did not feel equipped to make a decision because the documentation provided was incomplete and lacked a proper budget. He described the overall quality of the material as insufficient and expressed strong discomfort with being asked to decide under such pressure. He also argued that discussions about fundraising were even less desirable and suggested that moving towards an outsourced model for the Woluwe canteen could free up internal funds.

The President clarified that the immediate goal is to reassure the School and the Commission that a functional self-service canteen can be delivered within the EUR 200 000 budget. Any additional improvements— however they are funded—can be explored later. For now, the priority is simply to confirm that an amount of EUR 200 000 can be used effectively to transform the canteen into a self-service model.

The President acknowledged that, ideally, the Board would have had more time and could have considered broader strategic options, including outsourcing the canteen, or using outsourcing as a way to finance renovations. However, since most Board members only arrived in January, and since no outsourcing option currently exists, the Board must work within the present constraints. The President nevertheless committed to explore all operational models, including outsourcing, once more complete information becomes available, making sure the Board can properly evaluate longer-term options.

The Board votes on:

- submitting a revised budget, limited to EUR 200 000, to the School to present to the Board of Governors for the renovation of the canteen to transform it into a self-service model. This revised budget should be prepared, as much as possible, in consultation with secondary students in a structured manner, with other European schools, and with relevant stakeholders. The Board mandates the President, Vice-President for Administrative Matters and/or the Treasurer to finalise this renovation plan and revised budget before the Easter break;
- exploring options for APEEE to contribute additional funds to further develop the canteen renovation project;
- exploring all options, including outsourcing, for the operation of the Woluwe canteen, and to gather all possible information for the Board to assess these options.

11 yes (Albert Rädler, Alessia Ghezzi, Andrew Janis Folkmanis, Anja Semmelrodt, Anne Becker, Inês Sajara, Lena Widefjäll, Mindaugas Skaraitis, Nicolas Lacroix, Rüdiger Martin, Virginie Battu-Henrikson), **1 no** (Peter Kögler) and **4 abstention** (Andrea Panizza, José Madeira, Soraya Lemaire, Virgilio Miolato)

Decision: The Board approves to:

- submit a revised budget, limited to EUR 200 000, to the school to present to the Board of Governors for the renovation of the canteen to transform it into a self-service model. This revised budget should be prepared, as much as possible, in consultation with secondary students in a structured manner, with other European schools, and with relevant stakeholders. The Board mandates the President, Vice-President for Administrative Matters and/or the Treasurer to finalise this renovation plan and revised budget before the Easter break;
- explore options for APEEE to contribute additional funds to further develop the canteen renovation project;
- explore all options, including outsourcing, for the operation of the Woluwe canteen, and to gather all possible information for the Board to assess these options.

3.7 HR Matters

a) APEEE Director's vacant post and recruitment process

The Vice-President responsible for administrative matters presented the new APEEE Director job description, which had been drafted using the most recent examples from other European Schools, adapting it to the APEEE Woluwe-Evere needs and by including comments and suggestions received from Board members. He stressed the need for a job posting that is attractive but not overly restrictive, so as not to discourage candidates. He explained that the recruitment process outlined is standard for non-profit organisations: a board-appointed committee reviews applications, and the full Board makes the final decision. He also explained that, after careful consideration, hiring external head-hunters would be unnecessarily costly, except for behavioural or personality testing, which would require paid licences and is in any case envisaged in the recruitment plan as presented. The Board now needs to finalise the posting— and ideally keeping it open for about a month on different public job platforms.

The President explained that the selection committee for recruiting the new APEEE Director should be established at the next Board meeting. Board members interested in joining the selection committee are invited to express their interest. She also informed that the initial draft for the job application had been adjusted to cater for some Board members concerned by what they considered low experience expectations. The President clarified that a university degree is and remains a mandatory requirement, and the wording has now been adjusted to clearly distinguish minimum requirements from desirable criteria, ensuring the position targets a sufficiently senior profile.

The Board votes on the internal process with a selection committee, which will be composed of volunteer Board members appointed on the Board meeting of 20 April 2026: **14 yes** (Albert Rädler, Alessia Ghezzi, Andrea Panizza, Andrew Janis Folkmanis, Anja Semmelrodt, Anne Becker, Inês Sajara, José Madeira, Lena Widefjäll, Mindaugas Skaraitis, Nicolas Lacroix, Rüdiger Martin, Soraya Lemaire, Virginie Battu-Henrikson), **1 no** (Peter Kögler) and **1 abstention** (Virgilio Miolato)

Peter Kögler argued that despite the adjustments the job description was inadequate for the role. In his view, it described a junior or mid-level non-profit manager, whereas the APEEE Director role carries far greater responsibility. He concluded that the job description did not match the seniority or scope required and therefore needed to be revised.

Anne Becker mentioned that using a European School job description is a good basis but stressed that the vacancy must remain broad enough to attract candidates. Essential criteria should therefore be minimal, while more detailed expectations should be placed under “desirable” criteria to guide the selection process later.

Rudiger Martin agreed with the previous points about avoiding an overly restrictive job description and argued that nothing obliges the Board to hire someone underqualified. He acknowledged that the role carries significant financial and managerial responsibility and noted positively that the required experience level had already been increased at six years of which three in a managerial position.

Soraya Lemaire considered that ten years of which five in a managerial position would be safer in order not to risk of losing good candidates that would consider the position as junior. The Vice-President responsible for administrative matters noted that strong candidates should assess the role themselves, including compensation, and that APEEE offers competitive packages for the non-profit sector and an overall attractive post.

Anne Becker acknowledged concerns about minimum experience requirements but she warned that setting overly strict criteria, such as formally requiring ten years of experience, could drastically reduce the number of applicants and force the board to redo the process. To balance this, she suggested adding a category “between essential” and “desirable”, allowing the board to emphasise leadership and seniority without formally excluding otherwise promising candidates. She proposed wording such as “significant relevant experience will be given particular weight”. The President proposed to add, under essential, after “Minimum of six years’ experience, including three years’ experience in a managerial role.”; the following: “Additional experience in managerial role will be a strong asset.”

Soraya Lemaire expressed her support for this compromise, which was then reflected in the job description.

Peter Kögler expressed deep frustration with the approach taken in the discussion. He stated he was extremely dissatisfied with how things were being handled and, as a result, announced his resignation from the Board and left the meeting at 22h40.

The Board votes on the job description for the post of APEEE Director: **14 yes** (Albert Rädler, Alessia Ghezzi, Andrea Panizza, Andrew Janis Folkmanis, Anja Semmelrodt, Anne Becker, Inês Sajara, José Madeira, Lena Widefjäll, Mindaugas Skaraitis, Nicolas Lacroix, Rüdiger Martin, Soraya Lemaire, Virginie Battu-Henrikson) and **1 abstention** (Virgilio Miolato)

Decision: the Board approved the internal recruitment process and the job description for the APEEE Director post.

b) Revocation of the delegation of powers for day-to-day management

Since there is a delegation of powers for day-to-day management published in the “Moniteur belge” concerning Mr. Emmanuel Bellis but he is no longer working for the APEEE, it is proposed to revoke the delegation of powers to him with effects since the termination of his work contract with the APEEE. Andrea Panizza, as Secretary for Information, will carry out all the necessary formalities for the publication of this revocation in the Moniteur Belge. The proposal is approved by unanimity.

Decision: the Board revokes, with effect from 9 March 2026, of all powers delegated to Mr. Emmanuel Bellis as published in the Moniteur Belge on 17 September 2025.

[Confidential point due to data protection and privacy legislation]

3.8 Information sharing and document filing

It was agreed to postpone this point to another Board meeting.

4. Items for discussion

It was agreed to postpone the discussions to the next Board meeting.

5. Items for information

5.1 Update on pedagogical matters

Anne Becker explained that the upcoming “whole-school inspection” follows a four-year EU Schools cycle.

The school must submit extensive documentation, including a self-evaluation, which students and parents contribute to. Inspectors will visit from 20–24 April, observe classes, tour the school, and hold meetings with staff, students, and once with the APEEE.

Because the inspectors need the school’s self-evaluation one week before their visit, the school has asked the APEEE to submit its parent input by 27 March. A digital version of the evaluation form will be circulated to the parents’ community and results forwarded to the inspectors within the deadline indicated.

Remaining points will be covered at the next Board meeting.

The meeting ended at 23h20.
