Comprehensive Performance Assessment - 2004 (v.14.07)

Worcestershire LEA



OVERALL RATING

3 star	Proven	Secure
Current Performance	Indications of Improvement	Capacity to Sustain Improvement

SUMMARY INFORMATION

Category ²	3 star	Proven	Secure
Overall Average Score ¹	2.03	2.51	1.92
Sum of Weights	18.00	9.00	13.00
Sum of the Weighted scores	36.50	22.56	25.00
	Current Performance	Indications of Improvement	Capacity to Sustain Improvement

- 1. The Overall Average Score for each perspective is calculated using all indicators in the perspective across the 5 aspects. It multiplies each indicator's score by its associated weight (i.e. the weighted score), and then dividing the sum of the weighted scores by the sum of the weights (shown above). In a few instances where indicators are not applicable to some LEAs, the sum of the weighted scores and the sum of the weights are adjusted accordingly (i.e. the indicator(s) and its weight(s) are not included in the calculations). The overall average score is then compared to the category thresholds (see 2 below) and the final category determined. Further details on the indicators used can be found on the scorecard and the CPA Education Guidelines.
- 2. The Overall Average Score thresholds for the Current Performance star ratings are as follows:
 - 3 star is obtained if the overall average score is less than or equal to 2.37
 - 2 star (upper) is obtained if the overall average score is more than 2.37 but less than or equal to 2.79
 - 2 star (lower) is obtained if the overall average score is more than 2.79 but less than or equal to 3.34
 - 1 star is obtained if the overall average score is more than 3.34 but less than or equal to 3.75
 - star is obtained if the overall average score is greater than 3.75

The Overall average score thresholds for the improvement categories are as follows:

'Proven' and 'Secure' are obtained if the overall average scores are less than or equal to 3

'Not Proven' and 'Not Secure' are obtained if the overall average scores are greater than 3

Comprehensive Performance Assessment - Worcestershire LEA (v.14.07)

Current Performance (A) Improvement (B) Capacity (C)

	Label	Weights Indicator	Data Score 1	Label Weights Indicator Data Score Label Weights Indicator	Data Score 1
	1_A1	1 Percentage of schools causing concern (excluding inadequate sixth forms)*	4.00 4	1_B1 0.5 Percentage of primary schools causing concern Trend (2002 to 2004)* -0.77 3 1_C1 1 Percentage of	schools graded V or G for management and efficiency 79.44 4
Ξ	1_A2	0.5 2003 KS2 English Average Point Score*	26.99 3	1_B2 0.5 Percentage of secondary schools causing concern (excluding inadequate sixth forms) Trend 0.86 4 1_C2 1 JRS 1.4 - exter (2002 to 2004)*	nd to which LEA targets resources on priorities 3 2
nent	1_A3	0.5 2003 KS2 Mathematics Average Point Score*	26.54 3		3.10) - planning and provision of services supporting school 2 1
oven	1_A4	0.5 2003 KS2-KS3 VA*	100.40 2		3.11) - effectiveness & value for money of services supporting school 2 1
school Improvement (1)	1_A5 1_A6	2003 KS3-GCSE VA* JRS 3.3 - support for information and communication technology	99.00 2	1_B5 0.11 KS3 English Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)* 0.37 3 1_C5 1 EDP Grade 1_B6 0.11 KS3 Mathematics Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)* 0.48 3	3 2
<u>8</u>	1_A7	JRS 2.1 - LEA's strategy for school improvement	2 1	1_B7	
Š	1_A8	JRS 1 (socio-economic context of LEA) - JRS 2.3 (performance of schools)	0 3	1_B8	
S				1_B9 1 JRS 2.2 - progress on implementing the LEA's strategy for school improvement 2 1	
				1_B10 1 GCSE 5+ A*-C Percentage Trend (Schools <25% in 1999) (2001 to 2003)* -1.39 5	
		AVERAGE SCORE ² =	2.33	AVERAGE SCORE ² = 3.11	AVERAGE SCORE ² = 2.00
Special Educational Needs (2)		Webda to Barrio	Data Score 1	Label Weights Indicator Data Score Label Weights Indicator	Data Score ¹
ê Ç	2_A1	Weights Indicator 1 JRS 4.2 - effectiveness of LEA in meeting statutory obligations in respect of SEN	2 1		tiveness of LEA's strategy for SEN 2 1
2 2	2_7	the 42 chocardiose of EEA in modeling districtly obligations in respect of GEN	- '	improvement	To look of EET o strategy for SER
5 S	2_A2	1 Percentage of pupils for whom a statement is issued for the first time within 18 weeks*	74.10 3		
a B					
- G		AVERAGE SCORE ² =	0.00	AVEDAGE COOPE 2	AVERAGE SCORE ² = 1.00
Sp		AVERAGE SCORE =	2.00	AVERAGE SCORE ² = 1.00	AVERAGE SCORE = 1.00
	Label	Weights Indicator	Data Score 1	Label Weights Indicator Data Score 1 Label Weights Indicator	Data Score 1
(3)	3_A1	0.5 2004 Primary Attendance Rate*	94.73 2		all effectiveness of LEA's strategy for promoting social inclusion 2 1
٠	3_A2	0.5 2004 Secondary Attendance Rate*	92.53 1		tiveness of LEA in promoting racial equality 4 3
Inclusion	3_A3	1 2003 GCSE 1+ A*-G Percentage (children in public care)*	50.00 3	3_B3 1 Percentage of pupils receiving alternative tuition reintegrated into schools* 19.51 2 3_C3 1 Percentage of	schools graded V or G for climate 92.74 3
₹	3_A4	1 2003 GCSE 1+ A*-G Percentage*	97.14 2	3_B4 1 GCSE 1+ A*-G percentage Trend (2001 to 2003)* 0.29 3	
<u>ĕ</u>	3_A5	1 JRS 5.4 - support for behaviour in school	2 1		
<u>.a</u>	3_A6	JRS 3.5 - support for raising the achievement of minority ethnic pupils, including	3 2		
Social		Traveller children			
0)		AVERAGE SCORE ² =	1.00	AVERAGE SCORE ² = 2.00	AVERAGE SCORE ² = 2.33
		AVERAGE SCORE =	1.90	AVERAGE SCORE = 2.00	AVERAGE SCORE = 2.33
Learning l)					
Ē	Label	Weights Indicator	Data Score 1	Label Weights Indicator Data Score Label Weights Indicator	Data Score 1
ea	4_A1	1 16-17 year old participation rates in education and training	82.00 2		tiveness of partnerships and collaboration between agencies in 1 1
₽ (4.40	A Land Land Control of the Control o	57.74 3	support of pric	rities
Long L (4)	4_A2	1 Insp judgements for Percenatge V, G provision for foundation stage	57.74 3		
Ţ		AVERAGE SCORE ² =	2.50	AVERAGE SCORE ² = -	AVERAGE SCORE ² = 1.00
Life		AVERAGE GOOKE -	2.30	AVEIGNOE SOURCE -	AVERAGE GOOKE - 1.00
j _o					
		Weights Indicator	Data Score 1	Label Weights Indicator Data Score 1 Label Weights Indicator	Data Score 1
me Si	5_A1	1 JRS 0.2 - overall effectiveness of the LEA	2 1		s capacity for further improvement and to address recommendations 2 1
ge u (;	5_A2	1 JRS 1.3 - effectiveness of LEA decision-making	2 1	of the inspecti	on It to which LEA has in place effective strategies to promote continuous 3 2
ti a	5_A2	The 1.5 - enectiveness of LEA decision-making	2 1		including Best Value
Z a	5_A3	0.5 JRS 2.9 - effectiveness of LEA in relation to the provision of school places	3 2		schools graded V or G overall 75.61 3
등등	5_A4	0.5 JRS 2.10 - effectiveness of LEA in relation to admissions to schools	3 2		
Strategic Management Education (5)					
ra tr		AVERAGE SCORE ² =	1.33	AVERAGE SCORE ² =	AVERAGE SCORE ² = 2.00
S					
		OVERALL AVERAGE SCO	$RE^3 = 2.03$	OVERALL AVERAGE SCORE 3 = 2.51	OVERALL AVERAGE SCORE 3 = 1.92

Notes:

- 1. For JRS indicators scores are calculated so that; grades 1 and 2 equate to a score of 1; grade 3, 4 and 5 equate to scores of 2, 3 and 4 respectively; and grades 6 and 7 equate to a score of 5.
- For non-JRS indicators scores please consult CPA guidance.
- 2. The average score for each aspect within a perspective is calculated by multiplying each indicator's score in the aspect by its associated weight, added together (i.e the sum of the weighted scores) and then divided by the sum of the weights
- 3. The Overall Average Score for each perspective is calculated using all indicators in the perspective across the 5 aspects. It is not the aggregated average of the average scores FOR EACH ASPECT within the perspective shown above. It is calculated by multiplying each indicator's score by its associated weight (i.e. the weighted score), and then dividing the sum of the weighted scores by the sum of the weighted.

PLEASE NOTE: Where an indicator is not applicable, this indicator and its weighting are not included in the calculations in notes 2 and 3 above.

- 4. For more information on the indicators, please see the 'Contents and Operation of the Education Profile' at www.ofsted.gov.uk/lea
- 5. For indicators 1_C3 and 1_C4, the JRS scores in brackets are the Spring 2004 equivalents.
- \star = Thresholds from the 2002/2003 model used to calculate scores
- = Not applicable

BOLD = changes to the model for 2004