

(6) The strengthening of school autonomy is a common feature of the education systems of the OECD countries of our interest. Simultaneously, the importance of school assessment is upheld. Methodologically, national curricula, education goals and standards create content and performance benchmarks for evaluation purposes. The close relationship between the quality of education goals and standards on one hand and education evaluation on the other is noteworthy.

(7) Both, formative and summative approaches are used for student evaluation in all the OECD countries of our interest. However, the emphasis on either of these approaches is the difference between these countries. Moreover, there are two general trends in this respect. First, the number of evaluation methods has been widening. Second, the importance of close links between evaluation methods is generally stressed. Thus, formative approaches are expected to support summative approaches and vice versa. However, misunderstanding of formative evaluation principles may counteract the idea.

(8) There are rather less formalized processes of teacher evaluation in the OECD countries of our interest. Teacher self-evaluation is the most commonly used method. Other methods, on the contrary, are used less frequently. These include teacher quality standards, young teacher evaluation systems, or teacher professional growth systems.

(9) The prestige of the teacher profession is the key feature of the most successful education systems of the OECD countries of our interest (e.g. Canada, Finland). It is noteworthy that the prestige of the profession influences students' decision to choose their education path. Consequently, pedagogical faculties in the most successful education systems are preferred by the best students in the country.

(10) The increasing importance of school self-evaluation is emphasised in all the OECD countries of our interest. Methodologically, strategic planning processes are used. The quality of these processes is given by the ability of school directors to define goals, and measurements for their fulfilment and evaluation. The wide range of available evaluation methods and potential synergies among them are crucial in this context.

(11) There are different approaches to external school evaluation in the OECD countries of our interest. School inspectorates, as independent institutions, evaluate schools in half of the countries. The other countries prefer the link between regional/local authorities and schools. In addition, there are different responsibilities of school inspectorates in the OECD countries of our interest. However, two main trends may be observed. First, the advising role of school inspectorates is generally stressed. Second, some countries (e.g. Ireland, Sweden) emphasize the importance of education results in the selection process of schools for inspection.

(12) There is a similar range of methods for education system evaluation in all the OECD countries of our interest. This range includes international and national comparative testing, international and national statistical systems (e.g. Europe 2020 Strategy indicators), or thematic reports from external evaluation of students, teachers and schools.

(13) The link between financial allocation on one hand and education performance on the other is the most common way how to evaluate education efficiency in the OECD countries of our interest. There are various methods of operationalization of this idea. They include financing conditioned by defined requirements (most of the countries), targeted assistance to lagging students and schools (e.g. Canada, Finland), or calculation of financial normative based on expected education outcomes (e.g. Australia, Finland).

(14) The strengthening of school decision autonomy and the link between the framework education programmes and school education programmes are typical features of the Czech education system (see