

School 1	
Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Having been an inspector for a number of years has helped the head of school to be a better leader.</li> <li>▪ The report clearly indicates the strengths and weaknesses of the school. Colour coding is effective.</li> <li>▪ Report gives recommendations on what the school can do with parents, teachers and children to address weaknesses.</li> </ul>
Weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No support is given to the school after the external evaluation. Heads have to ask to be supported by the SBA. One SBA person has 40-50 schools to support! + a lot of other work to do.</li> </ul>
Recommendations/Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ More support to help in the development of action plan.</li> <li>▪ It should not be left only on the head of school to decide whether to take action or not.</li> </ul>

School 2	
Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ transparent framework</li> <li>▪ external challenge</li> <li>▪ rigorous preparation for inspection</li> <li>▪ trust/respect for judgement</li> <li>▪ includes elements of wellbeing&amp; academic standards</li> <li>▪ inspection process enables school to change and improve</li> </ul>
Weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Publication of report</li> <li>▪ no real challenge following inspection outcomes</li> <li>▪ no follow up</li> <li>▪ lack of focus on school`s self evaluation process</li> <li>▪ involvement of stakeholders is unclear</li> <li>▪ no opportunity to recognize and share good practice</li> <li>▪ no statutory judgement regarding current performance or prospects for future improvement</li> </ul>
Recommendations/Ideas	-----

School 3	
Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ well-structured systematic approach</li> <li>▪ all school groups (parents, students, teachers, etc.) involved</li> <li>▪ transparency</li> <li>▪ inspectors were prepared for this kind of school</li> <li>▪ they organized themselves in feedback and report</li> <li>▪ school appreciates external view on strengths and weaknesses</li> <li>▪ sources of information and evidence for the results were clear in the report</li> <li>▪ adapting the use of instruments to the special needs of the students</li> </ul>
Weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ oral feedback of the results was too detailed</li> <li>▪ additional costs must be paid by SBI (example mediator for sign language)</li> <li>▪ no obligation to work on a target agreement</li> <li>▪ in this school the report did not give impulses for school development</li> </ul>
Recommendations/Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ more concise presentation/feedback</li> <li>▪ reflect balance between indicators on written concepts and reality at school (concept for further teacher training)</li> <li>▪ discuss impact of school report on school development</li> </ul>

School 4	
Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ awareness quality management</li> <li>▪ clear strengths/weaknesses analysis for the school</li> </ul>
Weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Inspectors are not specialists – primary teacher inspected Technical school – credibility?</li> <li>▪ Relationship between inspection findings +subsequent quality improvement work not clear</li> <li>▪ no interaction with school during development plan</li> </ul>
Recommendations/Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Schools`follow-up to inspection must be systematic (+ subject to external check)</li> </ul>

School 5	
Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ awareness raising within the teacher community</li> <li>▪ confirmation of the good work they do at school</li> <li>▪ school took action after evaluation (differentiation e.g.)</li> <li>▪ formation of QM-team</li> <li>▪ improved relationship with authorities and created new ones</li> <li>▪ positive professional development experience for the head and QU team</li> </ul>
Weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ limited engagement with other staff</li> <li>▪ more efforts than use</li> <li>▪ few actions, few actions</li> <li>▪ very little sustainability</li> <li>▪ goals are not differentiated according to target groups</li> <li>▪ no binding procedure/without consequences</li> <li>▪</li> </ul>
Recommendations/Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ schools should be required to create an Action plan/Improvement plan as a result of the report</li> <li>▪ create a better visibility of the QM-system – keep under review</li> <li>▪ create a QM target agenda</li> <li>▪ publishing their report on standards and quality</li> <li>▪ “Q”-day= Quality day: show your best stuff to others</li> <li>▪ use collected data wisely to ask questions</li> </ul>

School 6	
Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ starting to hold schools accountable</li> <li>▪ begin to self-evaluate (schools)</li> <li>▪ 20 -30 lesson observations</li> </ul>
Weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ schools have limited confidence in/ acceptance of the reports</li> <li>▪ feedback after lesson observations/professional discussion undeveloped</li> <li>▪ report is <u>not</u> binding – no follow-up.</li> <li>▪ If school doesn` t act – so what?</li> </ul>
Recommendations/Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ consider the use of pupil performance data, over three year period, in the inspection process</li> <li>▪ inspectors provide all teachers observed with feedback on their lesson (professional dialogue and courtesy )</li> </ul>

School 7	
Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ principal is good manager, is visiting classes (he has instruments, standards), is discussing with teachers, visits each teacher per year</li> <li>▪ focus on lesson quality</li> <li>▪ frequent discussion about quality in school</li> </ul>
Weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ in report is not proposal for area of improvement</li> <li>▪ good schools don`t know what they have to improve caused by inspection</li> <li>▪ no instruments, standards and indicators for specific schools</li> </ul>
Recommendations/Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ schools make action plan after inspection plan</li> <li>▪ make standards, instruments and indicators for specific schools</li> <li>▪ to give chance to schools to ask/ communicate with inspection about additional support and direction</li> </ul>

School 8	
Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ report of 2010 helped the head to make career decision → is report accessible to outsiders (Inform. Freedom A.)</li> <li>▪ target agreements were made three years later</li> </ul>
Weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ not enough awareness of inspection criteria on school level</li> <li>▪ report had no impact/influence on target agreement</li> <li>▪ the (former) SBA didn`t enforce target agreements</li> <li>▪ little focus on pupils</li> </ul>
Recommendations/Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ critical report findings should be followed up by the inspection team (not SBA)</li> <li>▪ the controlling of any follow-up activity should be in the hands of the inspector</li> </ul>

School 9
----------

Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ provides new perspective/fresh view of practice in school to management+teachers – stimulate reflection</li> <li>▪ use of same inspection criteria across inspections supports comparison with other schools</li> </ul>
Weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ inspection report focusses on average – no opportunity to highlight best or weakest practice in school</li> <li>▪ no clear guidance in the report on what actions school should take</li> <li>▪ left to school to decide what it will do /change</li> <li>▪ inspection team consists of teachers from other schools only –not lead by inspector (full-time) – need broader perspective</li> <li>▪ inspection period (3 days) too short??</li> <li>▪ inspection criteria not shared pre – inspection</li> </ul>
Recommendations/Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ extend consultation with parents (sample too small)</li> <li>▪ prepare schools better for evaluation →share evaluation criteria</li> <li>▪ change regulation re: access to data relevant to inspection e. g. →background of students →examination data</li> <li>▪ clarity expectations re: sharing of report with school stakeholders and public e.g. publish report</li> <li>▪ include more specific recommendations for action by school in the report</li> <li>▪ give school opportunity to respond to report and specify what actions it will take</li> <li>▪ introduce follow-up e. g. →school develops action plan →school submits progress report →follow-up inspection on implementation of recommendations</li> </ul>

School 10

Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ approachability of evaluators ( kind, friendly)</li> <li>▪ final discussion of L/T seen as positive/helpful</li> <li>▪ evaluation seen as validation of self-evaluation</li> <li>▪ positive reaction to class visits</li> <li>▪ clear grading system, understood well by the school</li> <li>▪ evaluation used as a basis for the subsequent improvement plan</li> </ul>
Weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ school felt that their specific focus had not adequately been taken into account</li> <li>▪ school felt stress because of dual evaluation (GOC)</li> <li>▪ no real consequences to school to take issues of weakness on</li> <li>▪ no account taken of boarding students` welfare (separate responsibilities)</li> </ul>
Recommendations/Ideas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ some specialist input (music school same?)</li> <li>▪ greater investment of SBI in follow-through?</li> <li>▪ need for greater flexibility(?) not one-size-fits-all</li> <li>▪ adapting second cycle to deal with above</li> <li>▪ CONSEQUENCES?</li> <li>▪ some attention to results (e. g. trends)</li> </ul>