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

# Waltham Forest LEA



## **OVERALL RATING**

Current Performance	Indications of Improvement	Capacity to Sustain Improvement
1 star	Not Proven	Not Secure

### **SUMMARY INFORMATION**

	Current Performance	Indications of Improvement	Capacity to Sustain Improvement
Sum of the Weighted scores	61.00	28.06	45.00
Sum of Weights	18.00	9.00	13.00
Overall Average Score <sup>1</sup>	3.39	3.12	3.46
Category <sup>2</sup>	1 star	Not Proven	Not Secure

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 - Waltham Forest LEA (v.14.07)

Current	Performance	( A
---------	-------------	-----

Improvement ( B )

Capacity (C)

	Label Weights Indicator Data Score <sup>3</sup> 1. A1 1 Percentage of schools causing concern (excluding inadequate sixth forms)* 2.60 3	Label Weights Indicator Data Score <sup>7</sup> 1 B1 0.5 Percentage of primary schools causing concern Trend (2002 to 2004)* -1.41 3	Label Weights Indicator Data Score <sup>3</sup> 1 C1 1 Percentage of schools graded V or G for management and efficiency 76.71 4
School Improvement (1)	1_A1 1 Percentage of schools causing concern (excluding inadequate sixth forms)* 2.60 3   1_A2 0.5 2003 KS2 English Average Point Score* 26.08 4	1_B2 0.5 Percentage of secondary schools causing concern (excluding inadequate sixth forms) Trend -5.88 1	1_C1 1 Percentage of schools graded V or G for management and efficiency 76.71 4   1_C2 1 JRS 6 - allocation of resources to priorities 4 3
ent		(2002 to 2004)*	
Ē	1_A3 0.5 2003 KS2 Mathematics Average Point Score* 26.25 4	1_B3 0.5 KS2 English Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)* -0.04 5	1_C3 1 JRS 25 - performance management of services to support school improvement 5 4
Ň	1_A4 0.5 2003 KS2-KS3 VA* 99.80 3	1_B4 0.5 KS2 Mathematics Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)* 0.24 2	1_C4 1 JRS 27 - effectiveness of services to support school improvement 3 2
ž	1_A5 0.5 2003 KS3-GCSE VA* 101.30 1	1_B5 0.11 KS3 English Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)* 0.23 3	1_C5 1 EDP Grade 3 2
Ē	1_A6 1 JRS 14 - support to schools for raising standards in curriculum use of ICT 6 5	1_B6 0.11 KS3 Mathematics Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)* 0.53 3	
Ē	1_A7 1 JRS 4 - effectiveness of strategy for school improvement 3 2	1_B7 0.11 KS3 Science Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)* 0.15 5	
ğ	1_A8 1 JRS 1 (Context) - JRS 2 (Performance) 0 3	1_B8 0.67 GCSE Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)* 0.82 2	
20		1_B9 1 JRS 5 - progress in implementing strategy for school improvement 4 3	
0,		1_B10 1 GCSE 5+ A*-C Percentage Trend (Schools <25% in 1999) (2001 to 2003)* 0.88 4	
	AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> = 3.17	AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> = <u>3.01</u>	AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> = 3.00
Educational Needs (2)	Label Weights Indicator Data Score <sup>1</sup>	Label Weinke Indiana	Label Weinke Indiana
_ Ne	Label Weights Indicator Data Score'   2_A1 1 JRS 30 - effectiveness of LEA in meeting statutory obligations 5 4	Label Weights Indicator Data Score <sup>1</sup> 2 B1 1 JRS31 - effectiveness in exercising functions to support school improvement 6 5	Label Weights Indicator Data Score <sup>1</sup> 2 C1 1 JRS 29 - effectiveness of strategy for SEN 6 5
	2_A2 1 Percentage of pupils for whom a statement is issued for the first time within 18 weeks* 81.20 2		
n in in			
, te	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·
р р	AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> = 3.00	AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> = 5.00	AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> = 5.00
ш			
	Label Weights Indicator Data Score 1	Label Weights Indicator Data Score <sup>1</sup>	Label Weights Indicator Data Score <sup>1</sup>
3	Label Weights Indicator Data Score <sup>1</sup> 3 A1 0.5 2004 Primary Attendance Rate* 94.01 3	Label Weights Indicator Data Score <sup>1</sup> 3_B1 0.5 Primary Attendance Rate Trend (2002 to 2004)* 0.08 2	Label Weights Indicator Data Score <sup>1</sup> 3_C1 1 JRS 33 - overall effectiveness of the LEA in promoting social inclusion 4 3
Inclusion (3)			3_C1 I JRS 33 - overall electiveness of the LEA in promoting social inclusion 4 3
.9			
Ĩ	3_A3 1 2003 GCSE 1+ A*-G Percentage (children in public care)* 15.63 5		3_C3 1 Percentage of schools graded V or G for climate 83.78 5
2 L	3_A4 1 2003 GCSE 1+ A*-G Percentage* 93.92 4	3_B4 1 GCSE 1+ A*-G percentage Trend (2001 to 2003)* 0.13 3	
_	3_A5 1 JRS 39 - LEA support for behaviour 5 4		
Social I	3_A6 1 JRS 16 - support for EM and Traveller children 4 3		
Š			
	AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> = 3.70	AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> = 2.67	AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> = 3.67
Life Long Learning (4)	Label Weights Indicator Data Score <sup>1</sup>	Label Weights Indicator Data Score <sup>1</sup>	Label Weights Indicator Data Score <sup>1</sup>
500	A A1 1 16-17 year old participation rates in education and training 82.00 2	No Indications	4 C1 1 JRS 49 - effectiveness of the co-ordination of actions in support of priorities 4 3
<u>ي</u> . ۲	4_A2 1 Insp judgements for Percenatge V, G provision for foundation stage 37.21 5		
arr			
ĔĔ	AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> = 3.50	AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> = -	AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> = 3.00
5.	Label Weights Indicator Data Score <sup>1</sup>	Label Weights Indicator Data Score <sup>1</sup>	Label Weights Indicator Data Score <sup>1</sup>
ít of (5)	5_A1 1 JRS 52 - overall effectiveness of the LEA 5 4	No Indications	5_C1 1 JRS 51 - capacity of the LEA to improve 4 3
a la la	5_A2 1 JRS 45 - effectiveness of decision making 4 3		5_C2 1 JRS 7 - effectiveness of strategies to promote continuous improvement 4 3
atic	5_A3 0.5 JRS 34 - extent to which LEA meets its requirements (places) 4 3		5_C3 1 Percentage of schools graded V or G overall 44.44 5
nc ag	5_A4 0.5 JRS 36 - extent to which LEA meets its requirements (admissions) 5 4		
Management (5) Education (5)			
2 -	AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> = 3.50	AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> =	AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> = 3.67
	OVERALL AVERAGE SCORE <sup>3</sup> = 3.39	OVERALL AVERAGE SCORE <sup>3</sup> = 3.12	OVERALL AVERAGE SCORE <sup>3</sup> = 3.46
00.			

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 weights.

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

\* = Thresholds from the 2002/2003 model used to calculate scores

- = Not applicable

BOLD = changes to the model for 2004