



ing of basic education in accordance with the Education Act. There are considerable differences in per capita financing between comparable groups of schools with seats in different regions. According to the MEYS, comparisons of per capita funds in regions and republic-wide per capita funds show that almost all regions, with the exception of the Central Bohemian Region, are increasing the budgets of basic schools but the differences between the highest and lowest regional per capita funding was 3.4%. The highest support was provided to schools in the Liberec Region.

The MEYS published the differences between regional per capita funds earmarked for salaries. As regards basic schools consisting only of the grades of the elementary level the gap between the highest and lowest average amount of normative funds specified for salaries in 2009 was the highest at schools with ten pupils, amounting to CZK 17,681; with regard to schools with 150 pupils the difference was CZK 4,893 per pupil and as regards basic schools with 200 pupils the gap was CZK 3,993. In basic schools comprising both levels of basic education attended by 140 pupils the difference was CZK 2,926; in schools with 200 pupils the difference increased to CZK 3,506.

Founders of schools indirectly affected the economic conditions of schools (mainly small schools) in particular by establishing classes which were granted exceptions. Nevertheless, founders only rarely used the option to establish large schools through associations of municipalities, which could improve the economic conditions of schools.

Basic schools had an opportunity to draw on funds from the European Social Fund, namely the “Education for Competitiveness” Operational Programme, through global grants managed by regions. Results of how such money is used are published by the MEYS in its reports.

On the basis of the Government Policy Statement it was decided that the budget for basic education can be increased through a measure which would lead to an increase in the absorption capacity of basic schools when drawing on the financial resources of the ESF (the OP Education for Competitiveness). In the course of the past school year no money was used from the programme entitled “The EU – Money for Schools”.

II.

Quality of Basic Education

The fact that at the national level there is no comprehensive system for the evaluation of pupils’ achievement in the key points of their education path appears to be a problem. No steps have been taken so far to build such a system. Although the FEP encompasses the compulsory content of education, outcomes are not defined as standards with clearly defined reference levels, and, moreover, the terminology of fundamental documents which schools are obliged to follow contradicts the Education Act. Methods and the content of evaluation are specified in school education programmes drawn up independently by schools; however, each SEP is based on the FEP. Nevertheless, objectives formulated in the FEP are not very specific, thus allowing for large differences. The CSI has repeatedly warned that there is an absence of a standardised evaluation.

Evaluation of individual pupils is an integral part of the educational activities of schools and it should bring about feedback to both pupils and teachers on educational achievement. School rules for the evaluation of pupils contained in school education programmes and instructions encompassed in the school Rules of Order often contradict each other. In evaluating individual and group results in accordance with the principles and objectives of the Education Act and Framework Education Programmes pedagogical boards of schools are rather passive. In the vast majority of schools overall evaluation of pupils’ achievement consists of individual evaluations made by teachers.

