


HOW ARE SCHOOLS HELD ACCOUNTABLE?

- Most countries have a combination of mechanisms used to hold schools accountable. These mechanisms are covered in 3 broad types of accountability: Performance accountability, regulatory accountability, and market accountability.
- National examinations – a prominent component of performance accountability – are used in 23 of 35 countries at the upper secondary level, while national assessments are more common at the primary and lower secondary levels.
- While required school inspections are more common than required self-evaluations, the practice of school inspection varies considerably across countries, particularly in terms of the frequency in which schools are inspected.
- While most countries permit diverse forms of school choice, in practice, the proportion of students practicing choice is more limited.

Chart D5.1. Performance and regulatory accountability in public schools (2009)



Source: OECD. Tables D5.4a, D5.4b, D5.4c, D5.6a, D5.6b, D5.6c, D5.7a, D5.7b, D5.7c, D5.10a, D5.10b and D5.10c.

See Annex 3 for notes (www.oecd.org/edu/eag2011).

StatLink <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932426092>

Context

Accountability literally means “to take account of”. It refers to the interaction in a hierarchical relationship between those who have power and those who are delegated authority. Those who are delegated authority have to account for what they are doing with this authority or responsibility.

Often, the use of the word accountability refers to a system that involves collecting and sharing data, providing feedback, and making decisions based on the evidence received. Although the notion of accountability has long existed, it was only in the early 1970s that accountability was formally defined (see Levin, 1974; Tyler, 1971) and integrated into the practice of steering or governing education systems.

Accountability functions when those who are delegated authority have to account for what they are doing with this authority or responsibility. In education, elected or appointed government officials are legally responsible for ensuring that a nation's children and youth receive an education that is delivered through school systems. School administrators demonstrate accountability to higher-level education and political authorities, who delegate responsibility to them to provide instruction.

The concept of accountability has evolved over time. Today, with an increasing number of ways to measure school- and system-level performance that can also be used to compare outcomes of schools within or across countries, more attention is focused on accountability for outcomes. However, it is important to note that the use, frequency and scope of accountability mechanisms vary considerably among and within countries.

■ Other findings

- **National examinations**, the results of which can have a formal consequence or impact on a student's future, **are most prevalent at the upper secondary level and least prevalent at the primary level**, where only 4 of 35 countries reported the existence of a national exam at that level. Fifteen of 34 countries reported conducting national examinations at the lower secondary level.
- The key purposes of **national assessments** are to provide feedback to improve instruction and show the relative performance of students. Some 22 of 34 countries reported using national assessments at the lower secondary level. **Some 30 of 35 countries reported using national assessments in at least one subject at the primary level.** Only 11 of 35 countries reported using national assessments at the upper secondary level.
- Regulatory accountability largely considers compliance with relevant laws and regulations. **Of eight areas or domains usually covered in compliance reporting, the most common are related to information about students and student characteristics.** This was followed by safety issues, curriculum, facilities and grounds and teachers' qualifications. The three domains with the fewest countries reporting compliance data are related to school finance and governance.
- **The topics or areas covered by school inspections were most commonly reported to be compliance with rules and regulations, quality of instruction and student performance.** School inspections at the lower secondary level are required as a part of the accountability systems in 24 of 31 countries.
- Market accountability, which refers to the competitive pressures on schools, varies considerably across countries. **While most countries permit diverse forms of school choice, in practice, the proportion of students practicing choice is more limited.** Furthermore, many countries do not have the funding mechanisms, financial incentives, or support in place to ensure that there is enough school choice to create adequate competitive pressures.

■ Trends

Traditionally, regulatory accountability was the most common type of accountability practiced. Over the past two decades, efforts to decentralise schooling and create more site-level autonomy have lessened the importance of regulatory accountability. However, during the same period, performance and market accountability have become more important.

Analysis

Performance accountability

Performance accountability focuses on school outcomes rather than processes. It has grown in importance over time partly due to shifting interest in outcomes, as well as to the technological advances that have made it easier to test large populations of students.

The primary measures of performance accountability that are considered in this indicator relate to national examinations and national assessments used by OECD and other G20 countries. Aside from results on standardised tests, other means of capturing evidence related to school performance include data on student attainment and the success of students after leaving a particular school.

Schools are accountable to a number of stakeholder groups, including government education agencies (local, regional and national, depending on the country), parents and students, and the general public. Fair and effective measures of performance accountability take into account the needs of the students and families they serve and the resources available to serve them.

National examinations

National examinations are standardised tests that have formal consequences for students, such as an impact upon a student's eligibility to progress to a higher level of education or attainment of an officially-recognised degree.

Slightly fewer than half the 34 countries reported using national examinations at the lower secondary level (Table D5.1a). While 10 of the 15 countries that use national examinations indicated that those exams are devised and graded at the central-authority level, three countries indicated that they were devised and graded at the state-authority level. France indicated that this was done at the central- and school-authority levels, and Poland indicated the central- and provincial-authority levels. Twelve of the 15 countries reported that their national examinations were criterion-referenced tests (see Definitions, below). Two countries indicated that their examinations were norm-referenced tests (see Definitions, below). In the United States, both criterion-referenced and norm-referenced tests are allowed, and the decision to use one or the other is taken at the state level.

In 13 of 15 countries, national examinations were compulsory for public schools at the lower secondary level. In Australia and Scotland, although it is not compulsory for public schools to administer national examinations, it is done by all schools in practice. Seven of 9 countries reported that national examinations were compulsory for government-dependent private schools, and 8 of 11 countries reported that examinations were compulsory for independent private schools.

The two subjects that were most commonly covered in national examinations include math, and the national language or language-of-instruction (reading, writing and literature). To a slightly lesser extent, modern foreign languages, science and social studies were also common subjects covered in national examinations (Tables D5.6a, D5.6b and D5.6c, available on line).

In all 14 countries with available data, results from national examinations at the lower secondary level were shared with both external audiences and education authorities. In all countries, results were shared directly with students, in 13 countries results were shared directly with school administrators, and in 12 countries results from national examinations were shared directly with teachers and with parents. In only 8 of the 14 countries were the results from national examinations shared directly with the media (Table D5.1a).

Countries were asked to describe key features of the results from national examinations at the lower secondary level that were reported to external audiences. In 10 of 13 countries, the level of performance for the most recent year was reported. The performance of schools relative to other groups or populations of students was reported in 7 of 13 countries, while in 2 countries the relative growth in student achievement over two or more years (i.e. value added) was reported. In 4 of 12 countries, other indicators of school quality were presented together with results from the national examinations. In 5 of 13 countries, the results were reported to be used by education authorities to sanction or reward schools.

Only four countries reported using national examinations at the primary level (Table D5.1b, available on line). More countries (23 of 35) reported using national examinations at the upper secondary level compared with those that reported using them at the lower secondary level (Table D5.1c, available on line). National examinations were slightly more prevalent in general education programmes compared with pre-vocational/vocational programmes.

National assessments

The key purpose of assessments is to provide formative feedback to improve instruction and inform about the relative performance of students.

Two-thirds of the 34 countries reported using national assessments at the lower secondary level (Table D5.2a), and most of those indicated that national assessments are devised and graded at the central-authority level (17 of 22) or state-authority level (3 of 22). Sweden indicated that the central authorities are involved in devising assessments, while the school authorities are involved in grading them. Belgium (Flemish Community) indicated that the state authorities are involved in devising assessments. However, these tests are developed, administered, graded and analysed by a research team of a university. The Russian Federation indicated that both the central and provincial authorities were involved in doing so. Thirteen of 22 countries reported that their national assessments were criterion-referenced tests, 8 countries indicated that their assessments were norm-referenced tests, and Japan indicated that its assessments were a combination of both.

In 15 of 22 countries, national assessments were compulsory for lower secondary public schools. Ten of 14 countries reported that national assessments were compulsory for government-dependent private schools, and 5 of 13 countries reported that assessments were compulsory for independent private schools.

As with national examinations, the two subjects that were most commonly covered in national assessments were math, and the national language or language-of-instruction (reading, writing and literature). Science and modern foreign languages were also commonly covered in national assessments (Tables D5.7a, D5.7b and D5.7c, available on line).

In 21 of 22 countries, results from national assessments at the lower secondary level were shared with external audiences in addition to education authorities. In 20 countries, the results were directly shared with school administrators. In 15 countries, results were shared directly with classroom teachers. In 14 countries, results from national assessments were shared directly with parents and with students. In only 12 of the 21 countries were the results from national assessments shared directly with the media (Table D5.2a).

Countries were asked to describe key features of the results from national assessments at the lower secondary level that were reported to external audiences. In 16 of 20 countries, the level of performance for the most recent year was reported. The performance of schools relative to other groups or populations of students was reported in 14 of 20 countries, while in 6 of 21 countries the relative growth in student achievement over two or more years (i.e. value added) was reported. In 7 of 20 countries, other indicators of school quality were presented together with results from the national assessments. Four of 19 countries reported that education authorities use the results to sanction or reward schools.

Most of the 35 countries reported using national assessments at the primary level (Table D5.2b, available on line). While national examinations were prevalent at the upper secondary level, national assessments were used in fewer than a third of the 35 countries at the upper secondary level (Table D5.2c, available on line).

Regulatory accountability

A large portion of regulatory accountability, which focuses on compliance with relevant laws and regulations, typically focuses on inputs and processes within the school. It involves schools completing reports and forms for higher levels of authority – those education agencies that plan and oversee the education system. To a lesser extent, parents and students, as well as the general public, also have a need to know about the extent to which their schools comply with established laws and regulations.

Because of the nature of internal reporting, a large portion of regulatory accountability is largely hidden from public scrutiny, although some of the information that schools submit may appear in reports released to parents, students, or the general public. Countries were asked whether they report data from eight specific domains to education authorities (Table D5.3 and Tables D5.3a, D5.3b and D5.3c, available on line). Nearly all (30 of 31) countries indicated that they report data about student numbers and characteristics from public schools to regional or national authorities. Other domains in which public schools report data to regional or national authorities include teacher qualifications/credentials (23 countries), curriculum (22 countries), facilities and grounds (20 countries), safety issues (18 countries), closing budget or financial audit from previous year (18 countries), proposed budget for subsequent year (18 countries) and issues related to governance (17 countries). Table D5.3 outlines variable patterns of compliance reporting depending upon stakeholder groups.

Schools most commonly report compliance data to school boards. Government-dependent private schools are more likely to report compliance data to their school board compared with public schools. At the same time, public schools are more likely than private schools to report compliance level data to education authorities at local and regional levels. Data concerning safety issues was more commonly reported to lower-level education authorities than to regional or national authorities.

School inspection


A school inspection is a mandated, formal process of external evaluation with the aim of holding schools accountable. The practice of school inspections varies considerably among and within countries. Formal school inspection involves one or more trained inspectors to evaluate quality based on a standard procedure. The results of a school inspection are given to the school in a formal report and are used to identify strengths and weaknesses. The reports are also made available to education authorities, parents, and the public. School inspections may include evaluating such areas as student achievement, staff, administration, curriculum and the school environment. Schools may be rewarded or sanctioned based on results from these inspections.

School inspections are used as a means of external evaluation in many countries. School inspections, like other forms of external evaluations, are mandated by higher-level education or political authorities. The level of the government at which school inspections are devised and organised varies across countries from the local school board to central education authorities or governments. The education authority or government sets standards that schools must meet and regulations with which schools must comply. The government thus collects information on the extent to which those standards are met and how well the schools are complying with those regulations by appointing inspectors to evaluate schools.

School inspections are required as part of the accountability system in 24 of 31 countries at the lower secondary level. In 7 of 24 countries, school inspections are a component of a school-accreditation process, through which schools are granted recognition or credentials if they meet or exceed minimum standards. Accreditation organisations typically emphasise inputs and processes rather than outcomes. While school inspections commonly involve all schools, in 9 of 23 countries, school inspections were targeted at low-performing schools (Table D5.4a). Similar proportions of countries reported targeting primary and upper secondary level schools for inspection (Tables D5.4b and D5.4c, available on line).

Results from school inspections are most commonly used to evaluate school performance, though they are also used to evaluate school administration and to make decisions about whether or not to close schools. The results of these inspections also influence the evaluation of individual teachers. Fewer countries reported that school inspections affect decisions about remuneration and bonuses for teachers, and school budgets (Chart D5.2 and Table D5.11, available on line).


Chart D5.3 illustrates areas addressed in school inspections and self-evaluations, and shows that the areas where school inspections were most commonly reported by countries are in compliance with rules and regulations and quality of instruction.

Chart D5.2. Distribution of influence of school inspections, by domains (2009)

Areas are ranked in descending order of the number of countries reporting school inspections as having a high level of influence on them.

Source: OECD, Table D5.11, available on line. See Annex 3 for notes (www.oecd.org/edu/eag2011).

StatLink <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932462111>

Chart D5.3. Distribution of areas addressed during school inspections and school self-evaluations at the lower secondary level (2009)

Areas are ranked in descending order of the number of countries reporting these areas as being addressed during school inspections.

Source: OECD, Table D5.4a and Table D5.10a, available on line. See Annex 3 for notes (www.oecd.org/edu/eag2011).

StatLink <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932462130>

School self-evaluation

In a self-evaluation, a school systematically reviews and reflects on the quality of the instruction and education services provided and on school outcomes. Formal self-evaluation activities are mandated by external education authorities that range from local school boards to central education authorities. Results from self-evaluations can be used to inform internal audiences, or they could be used to inform school inspectors or accreditation teams. In fact, self-evaluations are often designed in connection with an external evaluation activity, such as a school inspection or a school accreditation visit. Some of the advantages of self-evaluations are that they are less costly and results can be more easily interpreted in light of the local context. The main disadvantage is that results are often seen to be less credible to external groups and more suitable to be used for improvement, rather than for accountability.

The approach to self-evaluation draws heavily on the literature on school effectiveness and improvement. This activity involves internal evaluation that is formative in nature. When schools are required to conduct self-evaluations, a set of questionnaires or tools is used to structure the activity.

Some 21 of 32 countries reported that school self-evaluation was a required part of the accountability system at the lower secondary level. Thirteen of 19 countries reported school self-evaluation was a component of the school inspection process, and 2 of 19 countries reported that it was a component of an accreditation process (Tables D5.10a, D5.10b, and D5.10c, available on line).

Market accountability

In market accountability, parents are seen as consumers who choose the school in which they wish to enroll their child. This type of accountability assumes that funding follows students, so that if parents decide to withdraw their child from one school and enroll him or her in another school, the funding would follow to the next school. As such, there would be a financial incentive for schools to attract and retain students. The proper functioning of market accountability presumes that schools will create a diversity of options, parents will have accurate information about schools, and schools will have limited ability to select or screen students. Thus, in this type of accountability, schools are largely accountable to parents and students. However, higher educational authorities might also be involved, as they might need to close failing schools.

Most countries reported having school choice, which indicates market accountability. Some 20 of 35 countries reported that families generally had the right to choose among public schools at the primary level and 19 of 34 countries at the lower secondary level. Some 20 of 33 countries reported that this was the case at the upper secondary level. Similarly, 28 of 36 countries reported that government-dependent private schools were permitted at the lower secondary level and could provide compulsory education. By definition, government-dependent private schools receive more than half of their funding from government sources. Independent private schools were permitted in 27 of 36 countries at the lower secondary level, and homeschooling at that level was permitted as a form of school choice in 24 of 35 countries. In practice, however, a very small proportion of students enroll in private schools (Table D5.5).

Data from *Education at a Glance 2010* indicate that four out of five OECD countries allow government-dependent private schools and independent private schools to provide compulsory education. In addition, 70% of OECD countries reported that homeschooling could be a legal means of providing compulsory education. Actual enrollment patterns suggest that, in practice, enrollment in government-dependent private schools exceeds 10% in only seven countries (Belgium, Chile, Denmark, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand, and Spain) and, in independent private schools, exceeds 10% only in Brazil, Mexico and Portugal. Only half of the countries reported enrollments in homeschooling, representing an average of only 0.4% of total enrollments (Table D5.2, OECD, 2010h).

Financial incentives for schools and parents that facilitated school choice and were important for the existence of a market accountability mechanism are the presence of school vouchers or scholarships, tuition tax credits, and minimal obligatory financial contributions from parents who wish to choose a school other than the one assigned for their child(ren). Furthermore, a funding mechanism that ensured that funding followed students when they leave for another public or private school was also critical to ensure that schools were negatively or positively affected when students choose to enrol or to leave (Table D5.5 and Table D5.15, available on line).

A *school voucher*, often referred to as a scholarship, is a certificate issued by the government that parents can use to pay for their child's education at a school of their choice, rather than have the child attend the public school to which he or she was assigned. In most instances, parents do not actually receive a certificate or redeemable check. Instead, schools verify that they are serving qualified students and the government provides funding to the school on the basis of the number of qualified students enrolled. Qualified students are the subgroup of students targeted by many voucher or scholarship programmes; these usually include ethnic minorities or students from low-income families. Some 13 of 29 countries reported having vouchers or scholarships that parents could use at the lower secondary level when choosing a public school. Eleven of 23 countries reported the use of vouchers to facilitate attending government-dependent private schools. Only 4 of 20 countries reported the use of vouchers to facilitate enrolment in independent private schools at the lower secondary level. At the lower secondary level, 8 of 13 countries that have vouchers or scholarships for public schools report that these are only for students from socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds.

Seven of 11 countries that provide vouchers for government-dependent private schools provide them to disadvantaged students; and 2 of 4 countries that offer vouchers for independent private schools provide them to disadvantaged students (Table D5.5 and Table D5.14, available on line).

Tuition tax credits allow parents to deduct educational expenses, including private-school tuition, from their taxes. As a result, governments pay the costs for private schools through foregone revenues. Only 3 of 26 countries reported the use of tuition tax credits to facilitate attending government-dependent private schools at the lower secondary level. Tuition tax credits were more commonly used to facilitate enrolment in independent private schools: 6 of 24 countries reported such use of tuition tax credits at the lower secondary level. Only Estonia and the Russian Federation permit tuition tax credits for costs related to homeschooling (Table D5.5 and Table D5.16, available on line).

Perhaps most important to market accountability is a funding mechanism that ensures that funding follows the student when he or she leaves to attend a different school. This mechanism ensures that schools have an incentive to attract students, and a disincentive to lose students. In 15 of 34 countries, funding was reported to follow students who leave one public school for another at the lower secondary level within the school year. Twelve of 25 countries reported that funding directly followed students who choose to enrol in government-dependent private schools, and 6 of 12 countries reported having this mechanism in place for students who choose to enrol in independent private schools.

Countries also reported whether the funding mechanism was gradually adjusted to reflect changes in student enrolments over time. Seventeen of 35 countries reported that although funding did not directly follow the student, adjustments were made over time within the public school sector at the lower secondary level. Twelve of 25 countries reported delayed funding adjustments to reflect the movement of students among government-dependent schools, and 4 of 12 countries reported delayed funding to reflect school choice to and from independent private schools (Table D5.15, available on line).

Compulsory fees for schools at the lower secondary level are least common in public schools (2 of 35 countries), more common in government-dependent private schools (15 of 25 countries) and most common for independent private schools (all 23 countries with available data). At the lower secondary level, some 28 of 35 countries reported accepting voluntary contributions for public schools, 24 of 25 countries had voluntary contributions for government-dependent private schools, and all 21 countries with comparable data reported that independent private schools accepted voluntary contributions. The picture is similar at the primary and upper secondary levels (Table D5.5 and Table D5.17, available on line).

Tables D5.18 and D5.19 (available on line) contain data on two important components of school choice: public support for transportation, and access to information about school choice.

While countries emphasise market accountability, often the conditions required for such accountability do not exist. These conditions include – among other things – widespread school choice, where families choose and schools are restricted from selecting students, funding formulae through which money follows students, ready access to information on the choices available, and funding incentives/supports.

Definitions

A **criterion-referenced test** (CRT) assesses the extent to which students have reached the goals of a set of standards or national curriculum. Results are typically reported as cut scores, which represent a passing score or a passing point.

“**Directly**” **sharing information or results** refers to information being made available to designated groups without them having to request it. When results are available on line, they are considered as shared directly.

A **government-dependent private institution** is an institution that receives more than 50% of its core funding from government agencies or one whose teaching personnel are paid by a government agency. The term “government-dependent” refers only to the degree of a private institution’s dependence on funding from government sources; it does not refer to the degree of government direction or regulation.

Homeschooling involves educating children at home, typically by parents but sometimes by tutors, in a way that meets compulsory school requirements. This should not be confused with tutoring, which supplements compulsory education.

An **independent private institution** is an institution that receives less than 50% of its core funding from government agencies and whose teaching personnel are not paid by a government agency. The term “independent” refers only to the degree of the institution’s dependence on funding from government sources; it does not refer to the degree of government direction or regulation.

Market accountability refers to the competitive pressure on schools from parents and students who are seen as consumers. In other words, there is a financial incentive for schools to attract and retain students. Schools that are not accountable will lose students and funding and will eventually close.

National assessments are similar to national examinations in that they aim to measure the extent to which students have acquired a certain amount of knowledge in a given subject. National assessments may be mandatory but they do not have an impact on students’ progression or certification as examinations do. Assessments are mostly used to monitor the quality of education at the system and/or school level. They also provide feedback to improve instruction and show the relative performance of students.

National examinations are standardised student tests that have a formal consequence for students, such as an impact upon a student’s eligibility to progress to a higher level of education or completion of an officially recognised degree. They assess a major portion of what students are expected to know or be able to do in a given subject.

In a **norm-referenced test** (NRT), students’ results are compared among their peers. Results are usually reported as a percentile rank, illustrating how many of the student’s peers scored below or above.

Performance accountability focuses on school outcomes rather than processes. Aside from results on standardised tests, evidence related to school performance is included in data on student attainment and the success of students after leaving a particular school.

An institution is classified as a **private institution** if: *i*) it is controlled and managed by a non-governmental organisation (e.g. a church, trade union or business enterprise); or *ii*) most of the members of its governing board are not selected by a public agency.

An institution is classified as a **public institution** if it is: *i*) controlled and managed directly by a public education authority or agency; or *ii*) controlled and managed either by a government agency directly or by a governing body (council, committee, etc.), most of whose members are either appointed by a public authority or elected by public franchise.

Regulatory accountability refers to compliance with relevant laws and regulations: Are schools doing the things they are required to do to ensure that they are safe and effective?

Methodology

Data are from the 2010 OECD-INES Survey on School Accountability and refer to the school year 2008-09. Data on enrolments are based on the UOE data collection on educational systems administered annually by the OECD and refer to the school year 2008-09.

Notes on definitions and methodologies for each country are provided in Annex 3 at www.oecd.org/edu/eag2011.

The statistical data for Israel are supplied by and under the responsibility of the relevant Israeli authorities. The use of such data by the OECD is without prejudice to the status of the Golan Heights, East Jerusalem and Israeli settlements in the West Bank under the terms of international law.

References

- Kogan, M. (1988), *Education Accountability: An Analytic Overview*, (2nd Ed.), Century Hutchinson, Dover.
- Levin, H. (1974), “A conceptual framework for accountability in education”, *School Review*, No. 82(33), pp. 363-390.
- OECD (2010h), *Education at a Glance 2010: OECD Indicators*, OECD, Paris.
- Tyler, R.W. (1971), “Accountability in perspective”, in L.M. Lessinger and R.W. Tyler (eds.), *Accountability in Education*, Charles A. Jones, Worthington.

The following additional material relevant to this indicator is available on line:

- **Table D5.1b. National examinations at the primary level (2009)**
StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465455>
- **Table D5.1c. National examinations at the upper secondary level (2009)**
StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465474>
- **Table D5.2b. National assessments at the primary level (2009)**
StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465512>
- **Table D5.2c. National assessments at the upper secondary level (2009)**
StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465531>
- **Table D5.3a. Regulatory accountability: Domains in which public schools are expected to submit compliance-oriented reports and the groups or authorities to which these reports are submitted (2009)**
StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465569>
- **Table D5.3b. Regulatory accountability: Domains in which government-dependent private schools are expected to submit compliance-oriented reports and the groups or authorities to which these reports are submitted (2009)**
StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465588>
- **Table D5.3c. Regulatory accountability: Domains in which independent private schools are expected to submit compliance-oriented reports and the groups or authorities to which these reports are submitted (2009)**
StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465607>
- **Table D5.4b. School inspection at the primary level (2009)**
StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465645>
- **Table D5.4c. School inspection at the upper secondary level (2009)**
StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465664>
- **Table D5.6a. Subjects covered in national examinations in lower secondary education (2009)**
StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465702>
- **Table D5.6b. Subjects covered in national examinations in primary education (2009)**
StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465721>
- **Table D5.6c. Subjects covered in national examinations in upper secondary education (2009)**
StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465740>
- **Table D5.7a. Subjects covered in national assessments in lower secondary education (2009)**
StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465759>
- **Table D5.7b. Subjects covered in national assessments in primary education (2009)**
StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465778>
- **Table D5.7c. Subjects covered in national assessments in upper secondary education (2009)**
StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465797>
- **Table D5.8. Existence and use of other forms or measures of performance accountability (2009)**
StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465816>
- **Table D5.9a. Means and methods for collecting and reporting data related to regulatory accountability for public schools (2009)**
StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465835>
- **Table D5.9b. Means and methods for collecting and reporting data related to regulatory accountability for government-dependent private schools (2009)**
StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465854>
- **Table D5.9c. Means and methods for collecting and reporting data related to regulatory accountability for independent private schools (2009)**
StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465873>













- **Table D5.10a. School self-evaluation at the lower secondary level (2009)**
StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465892>
- **Table D5.10b. School self-evaluation at the primary level (2009)**
StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465911>
- **Table D5.10c. School self-evaluation at the upper secondary level (2009)**
StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465930>
- **Table D5.11. Possible influence of school inspections, school self-evaluations, national examinations and national assessments (2009)**
StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465949>
- **Table D5.12. Freedom for parents to choose a public school for their child(ren) (2009)**
StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465968>
- **Table D5.13. Criteria used by public and private schools when assigning and selecting students (2009)**
StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465987>
- **Table D5.14. Availability of school vouchers (or scholarships) (2009)**
StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932466006>
- **Table D5.15. Extent to which public funding follows students when they leave for another public or private school (2009)**
StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932466025>
- **Table D5.16. Financial incentives and disincentives for school choice (2009)**
StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932466044>
- **Table D5.17. Compulsory and/or voluntary financial contributions from parents are permitted (2009)**
StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932466063>
- **Table D5.18. Use of public resources for transporting students (2009)**
StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932466082>
- **Table D5.19. Responsibility for informing parents about school choices available to them (2009)**
StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932466101>

Table D5.1a. [1/2] **National examinations at the lower secondary level (2009)**

		Existence	Level of government by which they are devised and graded	Based on norm-reference (N) or criterion-reference (C) test	Year first established	Public		Government-dependent private		Independent private		Percentage of students exempted from taking them	
						Compulsory to administer	Percentage that administer them	Compulsory to administer	Percentage that administer them	Compulsory to administer	Percentage that administer them		
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	
OECD	Australia	All programmes	Yes	2	N	m	No	100	No	99	a	a	m
	Austria	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Belgium (Fl.)	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Belgium (Fr.)	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Canada	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Chile	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Czech Republic	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Denmark	All programmes	Yes	1	C	1975	Yes	100	No	95	a	a	3
	England	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Estonia	General	Yes	1	C	1992	Yes	100	Yes	100	a	a	0
		Pre-voc and voc	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Finland	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	France	All programmes	Yes	1, 6	C	1988	Yes	100	Yes	100	Yes	100	0
	Germany	All programmes	Yes	2	C	1949	Yes	100	Yes	100	a	a	0
	Greece	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Hungary	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Iceland	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Ireland	All programmes	Yes	1	C	1926	Yes	100	a	a	No	m	m
	Israel	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Italy	All programmes	Yes	1	C	1962	Yes	100	a	a	Yes	100	0
	Japan	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Korea	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Luxembourg	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Mexico	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Netherlands	General	Yes	1	N	1968	Yes	100	Yes	100	Yes	100	3
		Pre-voc and voc	Yes	1	N	1968	Yes	100	Yes	100	Yes	100	6
	New Zealand	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Norway	All programmes	Yes	1	C	2007	Yes	100	Yes	100	Yes	100	m
	Poland	All programmes	Yes	1, 3	C	2002	Yes	100	Yes	100	Yes	100	1.2
	Portugal	General	Yes	1	C	2005	Yes	100	Yes	100	Yes	100	0
Pre-voc and voc		No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	
Scotland	All programmes	Yes	1	C	1962	No	100	a	a	No	100	a	
Slovak Republic	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	
Slovenia	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	
Spain	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	
Sweden	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	
Switzerland	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	
Turkey	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	
United States	All programmes	Yes	2	m	2001	Yes	100	a	a	No	m	m	
Other G20	Argentina	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Brazil	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	China	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	India	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Indonesia	All programmes	Yes	1	C	1982	Yes	100	a	a	Yes	100	0
	Russian Federation	All programmes	Yes	1	C	m	Yes	100	a	a	Yes	100	1-2
	Saudi Arabia	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	South Africa	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m

Levels of government

- 1: Central authority or government
- 2: State authorities or governments
- 3: Provincial/regional authorities or governments
- 4: Sub-regional or inter-municipal authorities or governments
- 5: Local authorities or governments
- 6: School, school board or committee

Note: Federal states or countries with highly decentralised school systems may experience regulatory differences between states, provinces or regions. Refer to Annex 3 for additional information.

Source: OECD. See Annex 3 for notes (www.oecd.org/edu/eag2011).

Please refer to the Reader's Guide for information concerning the symbols replacing missing data.


StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465436>

Table D5.1a. [2/2] National examinations at the lower secondary level (2009)

		How results are shared						Features used when reporting results					
		Shared with external audience in addition to education authorities	Shared directly with school administrators	Shared directly with classroom teachers	Shared directly with parents	Shared directly with students	Shared directly with media	Show level of performance for most recent year	Show "value added" or growth in student achievement based on progress of students over 2 or more years	Context sensitive	Compared with other groups or populations of students	Reported together with other indicators of school quality	Used by authorities external to the school for sanctions or rewards
		(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)	(21)	(22)	(23)
OECD	Australia	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Austria	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Belgium (FL)	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Belgium (Fr.)	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Canada	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Chile	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Czech Republic	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Denmark	All programmes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
	England	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Estonia	General	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
		Pre-voc and voc	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Finland	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	France	All programmes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
	Germany	All programmes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
	Greece	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Hungary	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Iceland	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Ireland	All programmes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
	Israel	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Italy	All programmes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
	Japan	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Korea	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Luxembourg	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Mexico	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Netherlands	General	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
		Pre-voc and voc	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
	New Zealand	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Norway	All programmes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Poland	All programmes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	
Portugal	General	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	
	Pre-voc and voc	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	
Scotland	All programmes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	
Slovak Republic	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	
Slovenia	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	
Spain	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	
Sweden	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	
Switzerland	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	
Turkey	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	
United States	All programmes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	
Other G20	Argentina	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Brazil	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	China	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	India	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Indonesia	All programmes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Russian Federation	All programmes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
	Saudi Arabia	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	South Africa	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m

Levels of government

- 1: Central authority or government
- 2: State authorities or governments
- 3: Provincial/regional authorities or governments
- 4: Sub-regional or inter-municipal authorities or governments
- 5: Local authorities or governments
- 6: School, school board or committee

Note: Federal states or countries with highly decentralised school systems may experience regulatory differences between states, provinces or regions. Refer to Annex 3 for additional information.

Source: OECD. See Annex 3 for notes (www.oecd.org/edu/eag2011).

Please refer to the Reader's Guide for information concerning the symbols replacing missing data.


StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465436>

Table D5.2a. [1/2] National assessments at the lower secondary level (2009)

		Existence (1)	Level of government by which they are devised and graded (2)	Based on norm-reference (N) or criterion-reference (C) test (3)	Year first established (4)	Public		Government-dependent private		Independent private		Percentage of students exempted from taking them (11)	
						Compulsory to administer (5)	Percentage that administer them (6)	Compulsory to administer (7)	Percentage that administer them (8)	Compulsory to administer (9)	Percentage that administer them (10)		
OECD	Australia	All programmes	Yes	1	N	2003	Yes	100	Yes	100	a	a	1.5
	Austria	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Belgium (Fl.)	All programmes	Yes	2	C	2004	No	11.2	No	13.6	No ¹	a	m
	Belgium (Fr.)	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Canada	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Chile	All programmes	Yes	1	C	1988	Yes	100	Yes	100	Yes	100	7
	Czech Republic	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Denmark	All programmes	Yes	1	C	2009	No	m	No	m	No	m	a
	England	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Estonia	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Finland	All programmes	Yes	1	C	1998	No	10-15	No	10-15	a	a	m
	France	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Germany	All programmes	Yes	2	C	2007	No	100	No	100	a	a	0.7
	Greece	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Hungary	All programmes	Yes	1	C	2001	Yes	100	Yes	100	a	a	0
	Iceland	All programmes	Yes	1	N	2009	Yes	100	Yes	100	a	a	10
	Ireland	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Israel	All programmes	Yes	1	N	2002	Yes	100	Yes	100	m	m	5
	Italy	All programmes	Yes	1	N	2008	Yes	100	a	a	No	95	0
	Japan	All programmes	Yes	1	N, C	2007	No	100	a	a	No	55	a
	Korea	All programmes	Yes	1	C	2001	Yes	100	Yes	100	a	a	0
	Luxembourg	All programmes	Yes	1	C	2007	Yes	100	m	a	No	m	0
	Mexico	All programmes	Yes	1	C	2006	Yes	100	a	a	Yes	100	0
	Netherlands	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	New Zealand	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Norway	All programmes	Yes	1	N	2004	Yes	100	Yes	100	Yes	100	1.7
	Poland	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Portugal	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Scotland	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	
Slovak Republic	General	Yes	1	N	2004	Yes	100	Yes	100	a	a	3.01	
	Pre-voc and voc	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	
Slovenia	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	
Spain	All programmes	Yes	2	C	2007	Yes	100	Yes	100	Yes	100	0	
Sweden	All programmes	Yes	1, 6	C	1998	Yes	100	Yes	100	a	a	m	
Switzerland	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	
Turkey	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	
United States	All programmes	Yes	1	C	1969	No	21	a	a	No	m	a	
Other G20	Argentina	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	
	Brazil	All programmes	Yes	1	N	1993	Yes	100	a	a	No	3.5	0
	China	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	
	India	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	
	Indonesia	All programmes	Yes	1	N	2008	No	2	a	a	No	2	0
	Russian Federation	All programmes	Yes	1, 3	C	m	Yes	8	a	a	Yes	8	a
	Saudi Arabia	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	

Levels of government

- 1: Central authority or government
- 2: State authorities or governments
- 3: Provincial/regional authorities or governments
- 4: Sub-regional or inter-municipal authorities or governments
- 5: Local authorities or governments
- 6: School, school board or committee

Note: Federal states or countries with highly decentralised school systems may experience regulatory differences between states, provinces or regions. Refer to Annex 3 for additional information.

1. Independent private schools are not included in the sample for the national assessment.

Source: OECD. See Annex 3 for notes (www.oecd.org/edu/eag2011).

Please refer to the Reader's Guide for information concerning the symbols replacing missing data.


StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465493>

Table D5.2a. [2/2] National assessments at the lower secondary level (2009)

		How results are shared						Features used when reporting results					
		Shared with external audience in addition to education authorities	Shared directly with school administrators	Shared directly with classroom teachers	Shared directly with parents	Shared directly with students	Shared directly with media	Show level of performance for most recent year	Show "value added" or growth in student achievement based on progress of students over 2 or more years	Context sensitive	Compared with other groups or populations of students	Reported together with other indicators of school quality	Used by authorities external to the school for sanctions or rewards
		(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)	(21)	(22)	(23)
OECD	Australia	All programmes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
	Austria	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Belgium (Fl.)	All programmes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
	Belgium (Fr.)	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Canada	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Chile	All programmes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	m	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
	Czech Republic	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Denmark	All programmes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	a	No	a	a	a
	England	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Estonia	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Finland	All programmes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
	France	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Germany	All programmes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	Greece	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Hungary	All programmes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
	Iceland	All programmes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
	Ireland	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Israel	All programmes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Italy	All programmes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Japan	All programmes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No
	Korea	All programmes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
	Luxembourg	All programmes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Mexico	All programmes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
	Netherlands	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	New Zealand	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Norway	All programmes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
	Poland	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
	Portugal	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Scotland	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	
Slovak Republic	General	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	
	Pre-voc and voc	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	
Slovenia	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	
Spain	All programmes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Sweden	All programmes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	
Switzerland	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	
Turkey	All programmes	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	
United States	All programmes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	
Other G20	Argentina	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Brazil	All programmes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
	China	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	India	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Indonesia	All programmes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
	Russian Federation	All programmes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
	Saudi Arabia	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	South Africa	All programmes	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m

Levels of government

- 1: Central authority or government
- 2: State authorities or governments
- 3: Provincial/regional authorities or governments
- 4: Sub-regional or inter-municipal authorities or governments
- 5: Local authorities or governments
- 6: School, school board or committee

Note: Federal states or countries with highly decentralised school systems may experience regulatory differences between states, provinces or regions. Refer to Annex 3 for additional information.

1. Independent private schools are not included in the sample for the national assessment.

Source: OECD. See Annex 3 for notes (www.oecd.org/edu/eag2011).

Please refer to the Reader's Guide for information concerning the symbols replacing missing data.


StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465493>

Table D5.3. Regulatory accountability: Domains in which public schools are expected to submit compliance-oriented reports (2009)

	School board (S) OR Municipal or local government/education authority (M)								Regional government/education authority (R) OR National government/education authority (N)								Parents and students								
	Student data	Teachers' qualifications/credentials	Curriculum	Safety issues	Facilities and grounds	Proposed budget for subsequent year	Closing budget or financial audit from previous year	Issues related to governance	Student data	Teachers' qualifications/credentials	Curriculum	Safety issues	Facilities and grounds	Proposed budget for subsequent year	Closing budget or financial audit from previous year	Issues related to governance	Student data	Teachers' qualifications/credentials	Curriculum	Safety issues	Facilities and grounds	Proposed budget for subsequent year	Closing budget or financial audit from previous year	Issues related to governance	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)	(21)	(22)	(23)	(24)	
OECD	Australia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	
	Austria	M	M	S/M	a	M	M	M	No	R/N	R/N	a	R/N	R/N	R/N	No	m	m	m	a	m	m	m	No	
	Belgium (Fl.)	m	m	m	M	m	m	m	N	N	N	N	N	No	N	N	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	
	Belgium (Fr.)	S/M	S/M	No	m	S/M	S	m	m	N	N	m	m	m	m	m	Yes	Yes	m	m	m	m	m	m	
	Canada	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	
	Chile	No	No	No	No	M	M	M	No	N	N	N	N	No	No	N	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
	Czech Republic	S/M	S/M	S	S	S	S/M	S/M	S	R/N	R/N	No	No	No	R/N	R/N	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	
	Denmark	S/M	No	S/M	S/M	No	S	S	No	R/N	No	N	N	No	N	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	
	England	S/M	S	S	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	N	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
	Estonia	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
	Finland	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	
	France	S/M	S	S	S	S	S	S	R/N	a	a	a	a	a	R	R	R	Yes	a	a	a	a	No	No	No
	Germany	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	m	R	R	R	R	R	R	No	m	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	m	
	Greece	M	No	No	S/M	S/M	No	S	M	R/N	R	R/N	R	R/N	No	R	R/N	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	
	Hungary	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	N	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
	Iceland	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	N	N	N	No	No	No	No	N	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	
	Ireland	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	N	N	N	N	No	N	N	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	
	Israel	S/M	S/M	S	S/M	S/M	S/M	m	R/N	R/N	R/N	R/N	R	R	R	m	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	m	
	Italy	M	No	S	S/M	M	S	S	No	R/N	R/N	R/N	No	R	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
	Japan	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	No	No	No	m	m	No	No	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	
	Korea	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	R/N	R/N	R/N	R/N	R/N	R/N	R/N	R/N	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
	Luxembourg	M	M	No	M	M	a	M	N	N	N	N	N	N	a	N	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	
	Mexico	S	S	No	S	No	No	No	R/N	R/N	R/N	No	R/N	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	
	Netherlands	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	No	No	N	N	No	N	N	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	
	New Zealand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	
	Norway	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	
	Poland	S/M	S/M	S	S/M	S/M	M	S/M	R/N	R/N	No	R/N	R/N	R	R	R	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	
	Portugal	S	No	S/M	S/M	S	S	S	S/M	R/N	N	N	R/N	N	N	N	R/N	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	
	Scotland	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	R/N	R/N	R/N	R/N	R/N	R/N	No	R/N	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	
	Slovak Republic	S/M	No	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	R/N	N	R/N	R/N	R/N	R/N	R/N	R/N	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
	Slovenia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	
	Spain	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	R/N	R/N	R/N	R/N	R/N	R/N	R/N	R/N	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
	Sweden	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	N	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
	Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	
	Turkey	M	No	M	No	M	M	No	R/N	No	R/N	No	R/N	R/N	R/N	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	
	United States	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	R/N	R/N	R	R/N	R	R	R	R	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	
Other G20	Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	
	Brazil	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	
	China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	
	India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	
	Indonesia	M	M	M	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	R/N	R/N	R/N	No	No	No	No	R/N	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
	Russian Federation	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	S/M	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	
	Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	
	South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	

Note: Federal states or countries with highly decentralised school systems may experience regulatory differences between states, provinces or regions. Refer to Annex 3 for additional information.

Source: OECD. See Annex 3 for notes (www.oecd.org/edu/eag2011).

Please refer to the Reader's Guide for information concerning the symbols replacing missing data.


StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465550>

Table D5.4a. [1/2] **School inspection at the lower secondary level (2009)**

	School inspections required as part of accountability system	Frequency of school inspections			Percentage that have inspections conducted each year			Component of school accreditation process	Extent to which they are structured	Target low performance schools	Level of the government school inspections are devised and organised	Composition of school inspection teams
		Public	Government-dependent private	Independent private	Public	Government-dependent private	Independent private					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
OECD												
Australia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Austria	Yes	1	1	a	m	m	a	No	U	No	5, 3	m
Belgium (Fl.)	Yes	6	6	6	15	15	a	Yes	H	Yes	2	T
Belgium (Fr.)	Yes	5	5	a	30	30	a	Yes	P	No	2	S
Canada	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Chile	Yes	2	2	1	m	m	a	No	H	m	1, 3	T
Czech Republic	Yes	5	5	a	33	33	a	Yes	H	No	3	S
Denmark	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
England	Yes	6	6	5	25	25	33	No	H	Yes	1	T
Estonia	Yes	3	3	a	10	10	a	No	H	No	1	S
Finland	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
France	Yes	1	1	1	m	m	m	Yes	P	No	3	T
Germany	Yes	4	1	a	50	a	a	No	H	No	2	T
Greece	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Hungary	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Iceland	Yes	1	1	1	8	m	m	No	P	No	1, 5	T
Ireland	Yes	6	a	1	10	a	0	Yes	H	Yes	1	T
Israel	Yes	2	3	m	100	50	m	No	H	Yes	1	S
Italy	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Japan	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Korea	Yes	5	5	a	33	33	a	No	H	Yes	3	T
Luxembourg	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Mexico	No	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Netherlands	Yes	3	3	3	55	55	55	No	P, U	Yes	1	T
New Zealand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Norway	Yes	6	6	6	20	4	m	No	P	No	1	T
Poland ¹	Yes	6	6	6	20	20	20	No	H	Yes	1, 3	S
Portugal	Yes	6	1	1	25	a	a	No	H	No	1	T
Scotland	Yes	6	6	6	16.7	16.7	16.7	No	H	No	2	T
Slovak Republic	Yes	6	6	a	20	20	a	No	H	No	1	T
Slovenia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Spain	Yes	2	2	2	100	100	100	No	P	No	2	T
Sweden	Yes	6	6	a	17 ²	17 ²	a	No	H	No	1	T
Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Turkey	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
United States	Yes	m	a	1	m	a	m	Yes	m	Yes	2, 5, 6	B
Other G20												
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	Yes	2	a	2	100	a	100	No	H	Yes	5	S
Russian Federation	Yes	6	a	6	8	a	8	Yes	H	No	1, 3	T
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m

Frequency of school inspections:

- 1: There are no requirement for school inspections
- 2: More often than once a year
- 3: Once a year
- 4: Once every two years
- 5: Once every three years
- 6: Once every three plus years

Extent to which the school inspections are structured:

- H: Highly structured, similar activities completed at each school based on specific set of data collection tools
- P: Partially structured
- U: Unstructured, activities at each site vary and depend on the strengths and weaknesses of the school

Levels of government:

- 1: Central authority or government
- 2: State authorities or governments
- 3: Provincial/regional authorities or governments
- 4: Sub-regional or inter-municipal authorities or governments
- 5: Local authorities or governments
- 6: School, school board or committee

Composition of school inspection teams:

- T: Team
- S: One person
- B: Mixed

Note: Federal states or countries with highly decentralised school systems may experience regulatory differences between states, provinces or regions. Refer to Annex 3 for additional information.

1. Year of reference 2010.

2. The percentage refers to the proportion of municipalities in which all schools have inspections conducted each year.

Source: OECD. See Annex 3 for notes (www.oecd.org/edu/eag2011).

Please refer to the Reader's Guide for information concerning the symbols replacing missing data.


StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465626>

Table D5.4a. [2/2] **School inspection at the lower secondary level (2009)**

	Areas addressed during school inspections							Sharing of results from school inspections						
	Compliance with rules and regulations	Financial management	Quality of instruction	Student performance	Satisfaction and perceptions of students	Satisfaction and perceptions of parents	Satisfaction and perceptions of staff	Shared with external audience in additional to education authorities	Shared directly with higher level education authorities	Shared directly with school administrators	Shared directly with classroom teachers	Shared directly with parents	Shared directly with students	Shared directly with media
	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)	(21)	(22)	(23)	(24)	(25)	(26)
OECD														
Australia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Austria	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	No	m	m	m	m	m	m
Belgium (Fl.)	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Belgium (Fr.)	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
Canada	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Chile	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	a	a	a	a	a	a
Czech Republic	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Denmark	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
England	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Estonia	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Finland	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
France	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Germany	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	m	No
Greece	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Hungary	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Iceland	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ireland	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Israel	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
Italy	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Japan	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Korea	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	a	a	a	a	a	a
Luxembourg	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Mexico	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
Netherlands	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
New Zealand	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Norway	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Poland ¹	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Portugal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Scotland	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Slovak Republic	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Slovenia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Spain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Sweden	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Switzerland	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Turkey	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a
United States	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Other G20														
Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Brazil	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
Indonesia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Russian Federation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m

Frequency of school inspections:

- 1: There are no requirement for school inspections
- 2: More often than once a year
- 3: Once a year
- 4: Once every two years
- 5: Once every three years
- 6: Once every three plus years

Extent to which the school inspections are structured:

- H: Highly structured, similar activities completed at each school based on specific set of data collection tools
- P: Partially structured
- U: Unstructured, activities at each site vary and depend on the strengths and weaknesses of the school

Levels of government:

- 1: Central authority or government
- 2: State authorities or governments
- 3: Provincial/regional authorities or governments
- 4: Sub-regional or inter-municipal authorities or governments
- 5: Local authorities or governments
- 6: School, school board or committee

Composition of school inspection teams:

- T: Team
- S: One person
- B: Mixed

Note: Federal states or countries with highly decentralised school systems may experience regulatory differences between states, provinces or regions. Refer to Annex 3 for additional information.

1. Year of reference 2010.

2. The percentage refers to the proportion of municipalities in which all schools have inspections conducted each year.

Source: OECD. See Annex 3 for notes (www.oecd.org/edu/eag2011).

Please refer to the Reader's Guide for information concerning the symbols replacing missing data.


StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465626>

Table D5.5. [1/2] **Existence of school choice options and financial incentives for school choice (2009)**
 By level of education

		Existence of school choice options												
		Public schools			Government-dependent private schools			Independent private schools			Homeschooling			
		Families are given a general right to enrol in any traditional public school they wish			Legally permitted to operate and provide compulsory education			Legally permitted to operate and provide compulsory education			Permitted as a legal means of providing compulsory education			
		Primary	Lower secondary	Upper secondary	Primary	Lower secondary	Upper secondary	Primary	Lower secondary	Upper secondary	Primary	Lower secondary	Upper secondary	
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	
OECD	Australia	m	m	m	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	m	m	m	
	Austria	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	
	Belgium (Fl.) ¹	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
	Belgium (Fr.) ¹	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
	Canada	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Chile	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
	Czech Republic	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	
	Denmark	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	England	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Estonia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
	Finland	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
	France	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Germany	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	
	Greece	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	
	Hungary	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Iceland	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
	Ireland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Israel	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Italy	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Japan	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	
	Korea	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	
	Luxembourg	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Mexico	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	
	Netherlands	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	New Zealand ²	Yes	Yes	m	Yes	Yes	m	Yes	Yes	m	Yes	Yes	m	
	Norway	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
	Poland	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Portugal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Scotland	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Slovak Republic	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	
	Slovenia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m
	Spain	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	
	Sweden	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	
Switzerland ²	No	No	m	Yes	Yes	m	Yes	Yes	m	Yes	Yes	m		
Turkey	No	a	No	No	a	No	Yes	a	Yes	No	a	No		
United States	m	m	m	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Other G20	Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	
	Brazil	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No		
	China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	
	India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	
	Indonesia	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	
	Russian Federation	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
	Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	
	South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	

Note: Federal states or countries with highly decentralised school systems may experience regulatory differences between states, provinces or regions. Refer to Annex 3 for additional information.

1. Independent private schools are free to arrange education but have no permission to hand out legitimate diplomas.

2. Year of reference 2008.

Source: OECD. See Annex 3 for notes (www.oecd.org/edu/eag2011).

Please refer to the Reader's Guide for information concerning the symbols replacing missing data.


StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465683>

Table D5.5. [2/2] **Existence of school choice options and financial incentives for school choice (2009)**

By level of education

		Financial incentives to promote school choice at the lower secondary level											
		School vouchers (also referred to as scholarships) are available and applicable			Funding follows students when they leave for another public or private school (within the school year)			Tuition tax credits are available to help families offset costs of private schooling			Obligatory financial contributions from parents		
		Public schools	Government- dependent private schools	Independent private schools	Public schools	Government- dependent private schools	Independent private schools	Government- dependent private schools	Independent private schools	Homeschooling	Public schools	Government- dependent private schools	Independent private schools
		(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)	(21)	(22)	(23)	(24)
OECD	Australia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	
	Austria	No	No	No	No	No	a	No	No	No	No	m	
	Belgium (Fl.) ¹	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	a	No	m	No	Yes	Yes	
	Belgium (Fr.) ¹	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	a	No	a	No	No	m	
	Canada	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	
	Chile	Yes	Yes	a	Yes	Yes	a	No	No	a	No	Yes	
	Czech Republic	No	No	a	Yes	Yes	a	No	a	a	No	Yes	
	Denmark	No	No	No	No	No	a	No	No	No	No	Yes	
	England	a	a	No	No	No	a	No	No	No	No	No	
	Estonia	Yes	Yes	a	Yes	Yes	a	Yes	a	Yes	No	Yes	
	Finland	a	a	a	Yes	Yes	a	No	a	No	No	Yes	
	France	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	
	Germany	Yes	Yes	a	No	No	a	Yes	a	a	No	Yes	
	Greece	No	a	No	No	a	a	a	No	a	No	a	
	Hungary	No	No	a	Yes	Yes	a	No	a	No	No	Yes	
	Iceland	No	No	a	Yes	Yes	a	No	a	No	No	No	
	Ireland	No	a	No	Yes	a	No	a	No	No	No	a	
	Israel	Yes	Yes	a	No	No	m	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	
	Italy	Yes	a	No	No	a	No	a	Yes	m	No	a	
	Japan	No	a	No	No	a	No	a	No	a	No	a	
	Korea	No	No	a	No	No	a	No	a	a	No	No	
	Luxembourg	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	
	Mexico	a	a	a	No	a	a	a	No	a	No	a	
	Netherlands	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	
New Zealand ²	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No		
Norway	No	No	No	No	No	a	No	No	No	No	Yes		
Poland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No		
Portugal	a	a	a	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes		
Scotland	No	No	No	Yes	m	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	m		
Slovak Republic	Yes	Yes	a	Yes	Yes	a	No	a	a	No	Yes		
Slovenia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m		
Spain	Yes	Yes	a	No	No	a	No	No	a	No	No		
Sweden	No	No	a	Yes	Yes	a	No	a	No	No	No		
Switzerland ²	No	No	No	No	No	a	No	No	No	No	Yes		
Turkey	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a	a		
United States	a	a	Yes	m	a	Yes	a	Yes	No	No	a		
Other G20	Argentina	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m		
	Brazil	a	a	a	Yes	a	a	a	Yes	a	No		
	China	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m		
	India	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m		
	Indonesia	Yes	a	Yes	Yes	a	Yes	a	No	a	No		
	Russian Federation	No	a	No	No	a	a	a	Yes	Yes	No		
	Saudi Arabia	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m		
South Africa	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m	m			


Note: Federal states or countries with highly decentralised school systems may experience regulatory differences between states, provinces or regions. Refer to Annex 3 for additional information.

1. Independent private schools are free to arrange education but have no permission to hand out legitimate diplomas.

2. Year of reference 2008.

Source: OECD. See Annex 3 for notes (www.oecd.org/edu/eag2011).

Please refer to the Reader's Guide for information concerning the symbols replacing missing data.

StatLink  <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888932465683>

D5



From:
Education at a Glance 2011
OECD Indicators

Access the complete publication at:
<https://doi.org/10.1787/eag-2011-en>

Please cite this chapter as:

OECD (2011), "How are schools held accountable?", in *Education at a Glance 2011: OECD Indicators*, OECD Publishing, Paris.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1787/eag-2011-32-en>

This work is published under the responsibility of the Secretary-General of the OECD. The opinions expressed and arguments employed herein do not necessarily reflect the official views of OECD member countries.

This document and any map included herein are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area.

You can copy, download or print OECD content for your own use, and you can include excerpts from OECD publications, databases and multimedia products in your own documents, presentations, blogs, websites and teaching materials, provided that suitable acknowledgment of OECD as source and copyright owner is given. All requests for public or commercial use and translation rights should be submitted to rights@oecd.org. Requests for permission to photocopy portions of this material for public or commercial use shall be addressed directly to the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) at info@copyright.com or the Centre français d'exploitation du droit de copie (CFC) at contact@cfcopies.com.