# **Comprehensive Performance Assessment - 2004 (v.14.07)**

## Walsall LEA



#### **OVERALL RATING**

2 star (upper)	Proven	Secure
Current Performance	Indications of Improvement	Capacity to Sustain Improvement

### **SUMMARY INFORMATION**

Category <sup>2</sup>	2 star (upper)	Proven	Secure
Overall Average Score <sup>1</sup>	2.56	2.27	2.69
Sum of Weights	18.00	9.00	13.00
Sum of the Weighted scores	46.00	20.39	35.00
	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 - Walsall LEA (v.14.07)

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

	Label Weights Indicator Data Score <sup>1</sup>	Label Weights Indicator Data Score <sup>1</sup>	Label Weights Indicator Data Score 1
	1_A1 1 Percentage of schools causing concern (excluding inadequate sixth forms)* 1.79 2	1_B1 0.5 Percentage of primary schools causing concern Trend (2002 to 2004)* -3.18 1	1_C1 1 Percentage of schools graded V or G for management and efficiency 77.78 4
Ξ	1_A2	1_B2 0.5 Percentage of secondary schools causing concern (excluding inadequate sixth forms) Trend -5.00 1 (2002 to 2004)*	1_C2 1 JRS 1.4 - extend to which LEA targets resources on priorities 4 3
School Improvement (1)	1_A3	1_B3	1_C3 1 JRS 3.11 (JRS 3.10) - planning and provision of services supporting school 3 2 improvement
ove.	1_A4	1_B4 0.5 KS2 Mathematics Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)* 0.17 2	1_C4 1 JRS 3.12 (JRS 3.11) - effectiveness & value for money of services supporting school 3 2 improvement
Ē	1_A5	1_B5	1_C5 1 EDP Grade 4 3
=			
8	1_A7 1 JRS 2.1 - LEA's strategy for school improvement 2 1	1_B7	
- 5	1_A8 1 JRS 1 (socio-economic context of LEA) - JRS 2.3 (performance of schools) 1 2	1_B8	
0)		1_B9 1 JRS 2.2 - progress on implementing the LEA's strategy for school improvement 3 2	
		1_B10 1 GCSE 5+ A*-C Percentage Trend (Schools <25% in 1999) (2001 to 2003)* 5.58 1	
	AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> = 2.17	AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> = 2.08	AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> = 2.80
Special Educational Needs (2)			
₽_	Label         Weights         Indicator         Data         Score '           2_A1         1         JRS 4.2 - effectiveness of LEA in meeting statutory obligations in respect of SEN         3         2	Label         Weights         Indicator         Data         Score <sup>7</sup> 2_B1         1         JRS 4.3 - effectiveness of LEA in exercising its SEN functions to support school         3         2	Label         Weights         Indicator         Data         Score <sup>1</sup> 2_C1         1         JRS 4.1 - effectiveness of LEA's strategy for SEN         3         2
2 g	2_A1 1 JRS 4.2 - effectiveness of LEA in meeting statutory obligations in respect of SEN 3 2	improvement 2_B1 1 JKS 4.3 - effectiveness of LEA in exercising its SEN functions to support school 3 2	2_C1 1 JRS 4.1 - effectiveness of LEA's strategy for SEN 3 2
큠용	2_A2 1 Percentage of pupils for whom a statement is issued for the first time within 18 weeks* 26.40 5	improvement	
щĕ	20.40 5		
<u> </u>			
9	AVERAGE SCORE $^2 = 3.50$	AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> = 2.00	AVERAGE SCORE $^2 = 2.00$
Š	Well to E Gook = Gook	/\vertice 666/\vertice - 2.66	Welvide Gooke = 2.00
	Label Weights Indicator Data Score 1	Label Weights Indicator Data Score 1	Label Weights Indicator Data Score 1
9	3_A1 0.5 2004 Primary Attendance Rate* 93.82 3	3_B1 0.5 Primary Attendance Rate Trend (2002 to 2004)* 0.37 1	3_C1 1 JRS 5.1 - overall effectiveness of LEA's strategy for promoting social inclusion 3 2
~	3_A2	3_B2	3_C2 1 JRS 5.7 - effectiveness of LEA in promoting racial equality 4 3
<u>.</u>	3_A3 1 2003 GCSE 1+ A*-G Percentage (children in public care)* 92.31 1	3_B3 1 Percentage of pupils receiving alternative tuition reintegrated into schools* 22.94 2	3_C3 1 Percentage of schools graded V or G for climate 87.96 4
S	3_A4 1 2003 GCSE 1+ A*-G Percentage* 94.13 4	3_B4 1 GCSE 1+ A*-G percentage Trend (2001 to 2003)* -0.85 5	5_65 1 Felcentage of schools graded viol Child climate
Inclusion (3)		3_B4 1 GCSE 1F A *G percentage Heria (2001 to 2003) *-0.65 5	
<u>:</u>	3_A6 1 JRS 3.5 - support for raising the achievement of minority ethnic pupils, including 3 2 Traveller children		
Social	Havelier Children		
٠,	AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> = 2.60	AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> = 2.67	AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> = 3.00
	AVERAGE SCORE = 2.00	AVERAGE 300NE = 2.07	AVERAGE SCORE = 3.00
Learning t)			
Ξ	Label Weights Indicator Data Score 1	Label Weights Indicator Data Score 1	Label Weights Indicator Data Score <sup>1</sup>
ea	4_A1 1 16-17 year old participation rates in education and training 77.00 3	No Indications	4_C1 1 JRS 1.8 - effectiveness of partnerships and collaboration between agencies in 3 2
ੂੰ ≎			support of priorities
ٽ ٽي	4_A2 1 Insp judgements for Percenatge V, G provision for foundation stage 50.00 4		
Long L (4)	3		3
Life	AVERAGE SCORE $^2 = 3.50$	AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> =	AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> = 2.00
it of	Label Weights Indicator Data Score 1	Label Weights Indicator Data Score <sup>1</sup>	Label Weights Indicator Data Score <sup>1</sup>
ē _	5 A1 1 JRS 0.2 - overall effectiveness of the LEA 3 2	No Indications	5_C1 1 JRS 0.3 - LEA's capacity for further improvement and to address recommendations 2 1
en (5)			of the inspection
ag on	5_A2 1 JRS 1.3 - effectiveness of LEA decision-making 3 2		5_C2 1 JRS 1.5 - extent to which LEA has in place effective strategies to promote continuous 3 2
ati a			improvement, including Best Value
Σö	5_A3 0.5 JRS 2.9 - effectiveness of LEA in relation to the provision of school places 4 3		5_C3 1 Percentage of schools graded V or G overall 56.48 5
윤교	5_A4 0.5 JRS 2.10 - effectiveness of LEA in relation to admissions to schools 2 1		
ate _			
Strategic Management Education (5)	AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> = 2.00	AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> =	AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> = 2.67
Ø			
		,	2
	OVERALL AVERAGE SCORE <sup>3</sup> = 2.56	OVERALL AVERAGE SCORE <sup>3</sup> = 2.27	OVERALL AVERAGE SCORE <sup>3</sup> = 2.69

#### 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