Comprehensive Performance Assessment - 2004 (v.14.07)

Oldham 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	2.31	2.88	2.69
Sum of Weights	18.00	9.00	13.00
Sum of the Weighted scores	41.50	25.94	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 - Oldham LEA (v.14.07)

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

1									
1.00 1.00		Label							Score 1
March Control Contro		1_A1	1 Percentaç	age of schools causing concern (excluding inadequate sixth forms)* 3.64	3	1_B1 0.5 Percentage of primary schools causing concern Trend (2002 to 2004)*	0.08 4	1_C1 1 Percentage of schools graded V or G for management and efficiency 73.83	5
AVERAGE SCORE Table 1 Miles 23 - respective processing in EAA employment 2 A S	Ξ	1_A2	0.5 2003 KS2	2 English Average Point Score* 26.27	4	1_B2 0.5 Percentage of secondary schools causing concern (excluding inadequate sixth forms) Trend	3.33 5	1_C2 1 JRS 1.4 - extend to which LEA targets resources on priorities 4	3
AVERAGE SCORE 2	nent	1_A3	0.5 2003 KS2	2 Mathematics Average Point Score* 26.53	3		-0.09 5		1
AVERAGE SCORE *	oven	1_A4	0.5 2003 KS2	2-KS3 VA* 99.00	4	1_B4 0.5 KS2 Mathematics Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*	0.08 3	1_C4 1 JRS 3.12 (JRS 3.11) - effectiveness & value for money of services supporting school 4	3
AVERAGE SCORE 2 100 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Impr								2
AVERAGE SCORE Table 1 Miles 23 - respective processing in EAA employment 2 A S	8	1_A7	1 JRS 2.1 -	- LEA's strategy for school improvement 2	1	1_B7 0.11 KS3 Science Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*	0.36 5		
AVERAGE SCORE * _ 220	ક	1_A8	1 JRS 1 (so	ocio-economic context of LEA) - JRS 2.3 (performance of schools)	1		1.06 2		
AVERAGE SCORE 2 239 AVERAGE SCORE 2 239 AVERAGE SCORE 2 239 AVERAGE SCORE 2 239 AVERAGE SCORE 3 239	S								
Column State Colu						1_B10 1 GCSE 5+ A*-C Percentage Trend (Schools <25% in 1999) (2001 to 2003)*	4.43 2		
Second Column C				AVERAGE SCORE ² = 2.42		AVERAGE SCORE ² =	2.99	AVERAGE SCORE ² = 2.80	
Label Weights Indicator Data Score Label Weights In	<u> </u>	Label	Mainte Indiana		Sooro 1	Label Meinbe Indicates	Data Sooro 1	Label Weights Indicator Data	Soom 1
Label Weights Indicator Data Score Label Weights In	€ _				1		3 2		2
Label Weights Indicator	2 2	2_7	. 0110 412	constitution of EEX in most ing statutely obligations in respect of OEX				z_or restrictions of zero stategy to serv	-
Second Column C	g g	2_A2	1 Percentag	age of pupils for whom a statement is issued for the first time within 18 weeks* 96.00	1				
Label Weights Indicator	e e a								
Second Column C	<u> </u>			N/EDAGE 200DE 2	_	WED 405 000DE 7	0.00	WED 405 000D5 2	
Company Comp	Š.			AVERAGE SCORE = 1.00)	AVERAGE SCORE = =	2.00	AVERAGE SCORE = 2.00	
Second S	·								
Second S		l ahal	Weights Indicator	r Data	Score 1	Label Waights Indicator	Data Score 1	Label Weights Indicator Data	Score 1
200 100	က								2
AVERAGE SCORE 2 = 2.50 AVERAGE SCORE 2 = 3.00 AVERAG	٦	_					0.68 1		3
AVERAGE SCORE 2 = 2.50 AVERAGE SCORE 2 = 3.00 AVERAG	.9				2		12.50 3		3
AVERAGE SCORE 2 = 2.50 AVERAGE SCORE 2 = 3.00 AVERAG	ä				4		-0.54 5		
AVERAGE SCORE 2 = 2.50 AVERAGE SCORE 2 = 3.00 AVERAG	<u> </u>	3_A5	1 JRS 5.4 -	- support for behaviour in school 4	3				
AVERAGE SCORE 2 = 2.60 AVERAGE SCORE 2 = 3.00 AVERAGE SCORE 2 = 3.00 Label Weights Indicator	<u>0</u>	3_A6	. 0.10 0.0		1				
AVERAGE SCORE 2 = 2.60 AVERAGE SCORE 2 = 3.00 AVERAGE SCORE 3 = 3.00 AVERAGE SCORE 3 = 3.00 AVERAGE SCORE 2 = 3.00 AVERAGE SCORE 2 = 3.00 AVERAGE SCORE 3 = 3.00 AVERAGE SCORE 4 = 3.00 AVERAGE SCORE 5 = 3.00 AVERAG	8		Traveller	r children					
Label Weights Indicator 4.A1 1 16-17 year old participation rates in education and training AVERAGE SCORE 2 = 3.50 AVERAGE SCORE 2 = 3.50 Label Weights Indicator AVERAGE SCORE 2 = 3.50 AVERAGE	S			AVED 405 000 DE 2	_	WED105 000D5 7	0.00	N/FD105 000D5 2	
AVERAGE SCORE 2 3.50 AVERAGE SCORE 2 3.50 AVERAGE SCORE 2 3.50 AVERAGE SCORE 2 3.50 AVERAGE SCORE 2 5.78 AVERAGE SCORE 3 5.78		AVERAGE SCORE ² = 2.60 AVERAGE SCORE ² = 3.00				3.00	AVERAGE SCORE = 2.67		
AVERAGE SCORE 2 = 3.50 AVERAGE SCORE 2 = 3.50 AVERAGE SCORE 2 = 3.50 AVERAGE SCORE 2 = - AVERAGE SCORE 3 = -	<u> </u>								
AVERAGE SCORE 2 = 3.50 AVERAGE SCORE 2 = 3.50 AVERAGE SCORE 2 = 3.50 AVERAGE SCORE 2 = - AVERAGE SCORE 3 = -		Label	Weights Indicator	r Data	Score 1	Label Weights Indicator	Data Score 1	Label Weights Indicator Data	Score 1
AVERAGE SCORE 2 = 3.50 AVERAGE SCORE 2 = 3.50 AVERAGE SCORE 2 = 3.50 AVERAGE SCORE 2 = - AVERAGE SCORE 3 = -	ea	4_A1	1 16-17 yea	ear old participation rates in education and training 73.00) 4	No Indications			2
AVERAGE SCORE = 3.50	4							support of priorities	
AVERAGE SCORE = 3.50		4_A2	1 Insp judg	gements for Percenatge V, G provision for foundation stage 52.78	3				
Label Weights Indicator Label Weights Indicator Data Score	בַ בַ			AVERACE SCORE 2 - 2 FO		AVEDAGE SCORE 2 -		AVERAGE SCORE 2 - 2 00	
Label Weights Indicator 5_A1 1 JRS 0.2 - overall effectiveness of LEA decision-making 5_A2 1 JRS 1.3 - effectiveness of LEA in relation to the provision of school places 5_A3 0.5 JRS 2.9 - effectiveness of LEA in relation to admissions to schools AVERAGE SCORE 2 = 1.67 AVERAGE SCORE 2 = 1.67 Label Weights Indicator No Indicatiors Data Score 1 Label Weights Indicator 5_C1 1 JRS 0.3 - LEA's capacity for further improvement and to address recommendations of the inspection 5_C2 1 JRS 1.5 - extent to which LEA has in place effective strategies to promote continuous improvement, including Best Value 5_C3 1 Percentage of schools graded V or G overall 5_C3 1 Percentage of schools graded V or G overall AVERAGE SCORE 2 = 3.				AVERAGE SCORE = 3.50		AVERAGE SCORE =L	-	AVERAGE SCORE = 2.00	
Label Weights Indicator Label Weights Indicator SAT 1 JRS 0.2 overall effectiveness of the LEA 3 3 2 SAZ 1 JRS 0.3 - effectiveness of LEA decision-making 3 2 SAZ 1 JRS 0.3 - effectiveness of LEA in relation to the provision of school places 2 1 SAZ 1 SRS 2.9 - effectiveness of LEA in relation to admissions to schools 2 1 AVERAGE SCORE 2 1.67 AVERAGE SCORE 2 1.67 AVERAGE SCORE 2 2 3									
		Label			Score 1	Label Weights Indicator	Data Score 1	Label Weights Indicator Data	Score 1
	E (c				2			5_C1 1 JRS 0.3 - LEA's capacity for further improvement and to address recommendations 3	2
) (e	E AC	4 100:-		0				2
	<u> </u>	5_A2	1 JRS 1.3 -	- effectiveness of LEA decision-making 3	2				3
	cat	5 A3	0.5 JRS 2 9 -	- effectiveness of LEA in relation to the provision of school places	1				4
	υğ				1				·
	நெய்								
	E .	AVERAGE SCORE ² = 1.67			AVERAGE SCORE ² =	-	AVERAGE SCORE ² = 3.00		
OVERALL AVERAGE SCORE 3 = 2.31 OVERALL AVERAGE SCORE 3 = 2.88 OVERALL AVERAGE SCORE						THE STATE OF THE S			
OVERALL AVERAGE SCORE 3 = 2.31 OVERALL AVERAGE SCORE 3 = 2.88 OVERALL AVERAGE SCORE	ľ								
				OVERALL AVERAGE SCORE 3	= 2.31	OVERALL AVERAGE SCOR	$E^3 = 2.88$	OVERALL AVERAGE SCORE 3 =	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.
- * = Thresholds from the 2002/2003 model used to calculate scores
- = Not applicable

BOLD = changes to the model for 2004