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

## **Merton 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>	2.69	2.38	2.38
Sum of Weights	18.00	8.00	13.00
Sum of the Weighted scores	48.50	19.00	31.00
	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 - Merton LEA (v.14.07)

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

ĺ					
			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)*	7.84 5	1_B1 0.5 Percentage of primary schools causing concern Trend (2002 to 2004)* 3.49 5 1_C1 1 Percentage of schools graded V or G for management and efficiency	84.00 3
£	1_A2	0.5 2003 KS2 English Average Point Score*	6.69 3	1_B2 0.5 Percentage of secondary schools causing concern (excluding inadequate sixth forms) Trend 6.25 5 1_C2 1 JRS 1.4 - extend to which LEA targets resources on priorities (2002 to 2004)*	4 3
school Improvement (1)	1_A3	0.5 2003 KS2 Mathematics Average Point Score*	6.15 4	1_B3 0.5 KS2 English Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)* 0.03 5 1_C3 1 JRS 3.11 (JRS 3.10) - planning and provision of services supporting school improvement	2 1
oven	1_A4	0.5 2003 KS2-KS3 VA*	9.60 3	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 sc improvement	hool 3 2
ğ.	1_A5		8.60 3	1_B5	3 2
=	1_A6	1 JRS 3.3 - support for information and communication technology	5 4	1_B6 0.11 KS3 Mathematics Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)* 0.68 2	
8	1_A7	JRS 2.1 - LEA's strategy for school improvement	2 1	1_B7 0.11 KS3 Science Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)* 0.35 5	
- <del>5</del>	1_A8	1 JRS 1 (socio-economic context of LEA) - JRS 2.3 (performance of schools)	-1 4	1_B8	
0)				1_B9 1 JRS 2.2 - progress on implementing the LEA's strategy for school improvement 2 1	
				1_B10	
		AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> =	.42	AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> = 3.00 AVERAGE SCOR	E <sup>2</sup> = 2.20
Special Educational Needs (2)	Labol	Weights Indicator	Data Score 1	Label Weights Indicator Data Score Label Weights Indicator	Data Score 1
를 _	2_A1	1 JRS 4.2 - effectiveness of LEA in meeting statutory obligations in respect of SEN	3 2	Label Weights Indicator Data Score Label Weights Indicator Label Weights Indic	4 3
2 2	2_711	the vize of the control of the contr		improvement	
등등	2_A2	1 Percentage of pupils for whom a statement is issued for the first time within 18 weeks*	6.10 3		
al E					
÷ 2				2	-2
Š		AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> =	2.50	AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> = 1.00 AVERAGE SCOR	E = 3.00
	l ahel	Weights Indicator	Data Score 1	Label Weights Indicator Data Score Label Weights Indicator	Data Score 1
(3)	3_A1		4.56 2	3,B1 0.5 Primary Attendance Rate Trend (2002 to 2004)* 0.46 1 3,C1 1 JRS 5.1 - overall effectiveness of LEA's strategy for promoting social inclusion	2 1
ū	3_A2		1.76 3	3 B2 0.5 Secondary Attendance Rate Trend (2002 to 2004)* 0.64 1 3 C2 1 JRS 5.7 - effectiveness of LEA in promoting racial equality	4 3
.0.	3_A3		8.18 2	3.B3 1 Percentage of pupils receiving alternative tuition reintegrated into schools* 34.09 1 3.C3 1 Percentage of schools graded V or G for climate	89.80 4
<u> </u>	3_A4		4.09 4	3_B4 1 GCSE 1+ A*-G percentage Trend (2001 to 2003)* -0.32 4	
Inclusion	3_A5	1 JRS 5.4 - support for behaviour in school	2 1		
=	3_A6	JRS 3.5 - support for raising the achievement of minority ethnic pupils, including	4 3		
Social		Traveller children			
ŭ					- 2
		AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> =	2.50	AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> = 2.00 AVERAGE SCOR	$E^2 = 2.67$
D D					
Learning )	Lahal	Weights Indicator	Data Score 1	Label Weights Indicator Data Score 1 Label Weights Indicator	Data Score 1
a	4_A1		6.00 3	No Indicators 4_C1 1 JRS 1.8 effectiveness of partnerships and collaboration between agencies in	3 2
ے ت	_			support of priorities	
Long L (4)	4_A2	1 Insp judgements for Percenatge V, G provision for foundation stage	7.89 3		
۲					- 2
Life		AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> =	5.00	AVERAGE SCORE 2 = - AVERAGE SCOR	$E^2 = 2.00$
ıt of	Label	Weights Indicator	Data Score 1	Label Weights Indicator Data Score Label Weights Indicator	Data Score 1
e (	5_A1	1 JRS 0.2 - overall effectiveness of the LEA	3 2	Laber Weights influence  No Indications  5_C1	
(5)				of the inspection	
on	5_A2	1 JRS 1.3 - effectiveness of LEA decision-making	2 1	5_C2 1 JRS 1.5 - extent to which LEA has in place effective strategies to promote continuous productions of the strategies and the strategies to promote continuous products and the strategies are strategies to promote continuous products and the strategies are strategies are strategies are strategies are strategies and the strategies are s	nuous 4 3
ati	F 42	05 10000 111111111111111111111111111111		improvement, including Best Value	60.20
2 3	5_A3	JRS 2.9 - effectiveness of LEA in relation to the provision of school places     JRS 2.10 - effectiveness of LEA in relation to admissions to schools	1 1 3 2	5_C3 1 Percentage of schools graded V or G overall	69.39 3
를 B	5_A4	U.5 JKS 2.10 - effectiveness of LEA in relation to admissions to schools	3 2		
Strategic Management Education (5)		AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> =	50	AVERAGE SCORE <sup>2</sup> = - AVERAGE SCOR	F 2 - 2 33
क्र		AVERAGE SCORE =	.00	AVERAGE SCORE	– 2.33
		OVERALL AVERAGE SCORI	3 - 269	OVERALL AVERAGE SCORE 3 = 2.38 OVERALL AVERAGE S	SCORE 3 - 2.38
		OVERALL AVERAGE SCORE	2.03	OVERALE AVERAGE OF THE AVERAGE OF TH	2.30

#### 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