



inspectors met the legally binding provisions. In the first reading the CSI evaluated a further 122 SEPs and the number of the evaluated SEPs for the lower level of SGs rose to 192.

Table 12

Strengths and weaknesses of SEPs in basic schools

Strengths			Weaknesses		
Monitored indicator	Frequency (%)		Monitored indicator	Frequency (%)	
	large BSs	small BSs		large BSs	small BSs
SEP clearly specifies aims of education and objectives of a school.	97.2	96.4	Comprehensive coverage of socially disadvantaged pupils is not developed in full detail.	41.4	51.1
SEP elaborates strategy aimed at achieving objectives of education.	89.5	86.8	Notes to curricula are neither elaborated nor respected	35.8	41.7
SEP clearly defines areas to be covered by school self-evaluation.	88.0	79.9	Criteria of school-assessment are not clearly specified.	34.1	42.8
SEP creates opportunities for development and use of partnership cooperation with parents.	87.1	81.8	Cross-cutting themes and topics are not concretised.	32.3	41.7
SEP includes both the content and forms of teaching of exceptionally gifted pupils.	87.0	76.3	SEP does not take into account involvement in long-term projects and international cooperation.	32.2	47.5
Pedagogical staff are well described in the SEP.	86.0	83.1	SEP does not encompass rules for evaluation of pupils.	29.0	39.0
Basic curricula defined by the FEP BE are well developed.	79.7	78.7	Schedule for school self-evaluation is missing.	28.1	36.1

Evaluations are carried out by an inspection team that also comprises an external expert and a relevant head teacher. They follow an identical evaluation scheme. The following table shows the results of analyses of the strengths and weaknesses of school documents **at the lower level of secondary general schools:**

Table 13

Strengths and weaknesses of SEPs at the lower level of secondary general schools

Strengths		Weaknesses	
Monitored indicator	Frequency (%)	Monitored indicator	Frequency (%)
SEP clearly specifies aims of education and objectives of the school.	99.2	Comprehensive coverage of socially disadvantaged pupils is not developed in full detail.	54.2
Compliance of profile of school-leaver with the aims of education and objectives of the school incorporated in the SEP.	94.3	Rules for evaluation of students are not part of the SEP.	30.3
SEP elaborates strategy aimed at achieving objectives of education.	92.6	Organisation of school-leaving examination is only cursory.	30.3
Areas of school-assessment are clearly specified in the SEP.	92.6	Notes to curricula are not respected.	28.7
Organisation of enrolment proceedings are described in full detail.	89.3	Cross-cutting topics are not sufficiently specific.	27.0
SEP creates opportunities for development and use of partnership cooperation with parents.	89.3	Comprehensive coverage of disabled pupils is not developed in full detail.	26.3