

because students of these schools during the first four years of studies are subject to compulsory school attendance. Legal provisions were satisfied by all eight-year secondary general schools visited by CSI in the school year 2007/2008. As regards implemented school education programmes 94.0% of them conformed to the requirements stipulated by the Education Act. 80.3% of schools fully accepted the principles for the development of SEPs in accordance with FEP BE while a further 6.1% displayed only partial deficiencies. The main problem of the remaining 13.6% of SEPs was that individual sections of the programmes were quite vague and showed only limited respect for the specificities of lower secondary education.

The analysis of values and inter-links of preferably monitored indicators demonstrating compatibility of both documents made it possible to identify the main strengths and weaknesses of the developed SEPs in the eight-year secondary general schools visited (see the data in Table 21).

Table 21: Strengths and weaknesses of SEPs in six-and eight-year secondary general schools (gymnazium)

Strengths		Weaknesses	
Monitored indicator	Frequency	Monitored indicator	Frequency
SEP clearly sets the focus of a school, the profile of a school-leaver and education strategies	97,1 % 96,0 % 92,9 %	In contrast with good teaching methods SEP does not include rules and methods of pupils' evaluation	56,5 % 52,2 %
SEP develops and ensures the teaching of pupils with special educational needs	94,3 %	Notes on education plans are not drawn up or are not respected	27,1 %
SEP makes it possible to use different teaching methods, procedures and forms as well as all supportive measures with the aim of meeting the individual educational needs of pupils	94,1 %	Schedule for self-evaluation is not clearly planned	21,7 %
SEP provides space for partner cooperation with parents and other entities	92,9 %	Criteria for self-evaluation are not clearly specified	21,4 %
SEP clearly defines the method and tools for school self-evaluation and sets rules and methods for the evaluation of pupils	90,0 % 88,6 % 89,7 %	Time allotment for individual subjects does not comply with the FEP	21,2 %

Results of detailed inspection findings and evaluations of whether SEPs of these schools comply with FEP BE showed the following: 77.8% of assessed SEPs fully complied with FEP and 22.2% of SEPS complied partially. CSI did not find a single failure to comply.