Comprehensive Performance Assessment - 2003

The Medway Towns LEA



Aspect	Current performance	Indications of improvement	Capacity to sustain improvement	
School Improvement	2.92	2.53	2.20	
SEN	3.50	2.00	3.00	
Social Inclusion	3.00	2.00	2.33	
Life Long Learning	3.00	-	1.00	
Strategic Management	2.17	-	2.67	
Average Score	2.89	2.30	2.31	
Category ¹	2 star (lower)	Proven	Secure	

Notes:

- 1. Details of how categories are scored can be found in the CPA Education Guidelines.
- 2. The Average Score thresholds for the Performance star ratings are as follows:
 - 3 star is obtained if the Average Score is less than or equal to 2.37
 - 2 star (upper) is obtained if the Average Score is more than 2.37 but less than or equal to 2.79
 - 2 star (lower) is obtained if the Average Score is more than 2.79 but less than or equal to 3.34
 - 1 star is obtained if the Average Score is more than 3.34 but less than or equal to 3.75
 - star is obtained if the Average Score is greater than 3.75

Comprehensive Performance Assessment - The Medway Towns LEA (v.12.11)

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

	Label Indicator	Data Score 1	Label Indicator	Data Score 1	Label Indicator	Data Score 1
	1_A1 Percentage of schools causing concern (excluding inadequate sixth forms)	2.78 3	1_B1 2001-2003 Percentage of primary schools causing concern Trend ^{2 (0.5)}	-0.59 3	1_C1 Percentage of schools graded V or G for management and efficiency ³	85.71 2
£	1_A2 2002 KS2 English Average Point Score ^{2 (0.5), 3}	26.58 4	2001-2003 Percentage of secondary schools causing concern (excluding	250 4	4 CO IDCC - Hearting of accounts to admit	4 2
ť	1 A3 2002 KS2 English Average Point Score 2 (0.5), 3	26.58 4 26.52 3	1_B2 inadequate sixth forms) Trend ^{2 (0.5)} 1_B3 2000-2002 KS2 English Average Point Score Trend ^{2 (0.5), 3}	-2.50 1 0.03 5	1_C2 JRS 6 - allocation of resources to priorities	4 3 3 2
me	1 A4 2002 KS2-KS3 VA ^{2 (0.5)}	100.10 2	1_B4 2000-2002 KS2 Mathematics Average Point Score Trend ^{2 (0.5), 3}	0.03 5	1_C3 JRS 25 - performance management of services to support school improvement 1_C4 JRS 27 - effectiveness of services to support school improvement	3 2
Ve	1 A5 2002 KS3-GCSE VA 2 (0.5)	97.90 4	1_B5 2000-2002 KS3 English Average Point Score Trend ^{2 (0.167), 3}	0.15 3	1 C5 EDP Grade	3 2
pro	1_A6 JRS 14 - support to schools for raising standards in curriculum use of ICT	2 1	1_B6 2000-2002 KS3 Mathematics Average Point Score Trend ^{2 (0.167), 3}	0.10 5	1_CG EDF Glade	3 2
<u>E</u>	1_A7 JRS 4 - effectiveness of strategy for school improvement	5 4	1_B7 2000-2002 KS3 Science Average Point Score Trend ^{2 (0.167), 3}	0.28 5		
o	1_A8 JRS 1 (Context) - JRS 2 (Performance)	0 3	1_B8 2000-2002 GCSE Average Point Score Trend ^{2 (0.5), 3}	1.46 1		
School Improvement (1)			1_B9 JRS 5 - progress in implementing strategy for school improvement	3 2		
σ			1_B10 2000-2002 GCSE 5+ A*-C Percentage Trend (Schools <25% in 1999) 3	4.22 2		
	AVERAGE SCORE = 2.92		AVERAGE SCORE = 2.53		AVERAGE SCORE = 2.20	
	AVERAGE SCORE = 2.92		AVERAGE SCORE = 2.55		AVERAGE GOOKE - Z.ZU	
Special Educational Needs (2)	Label Indicator	Data Score 1	Label Indicator	Data Score 1	Label Indicator	Data Score 1
atic 2)	2_A1 JRS 30 - effectiveness of LEA in meeting statutory obligations	3 2	2_B1 JRS31 - effectiveness in exercising functions to support school improvement	3 2	2_C1 JRS 29 - effectiveness of strategy for SEN	4 3
ls (;	Percentage of pupils for whom a statement is issued for the first time within 18 2 A2 weeks ³	30.70 5				
l Ec	2_12 110010	30.70 3				
čia Ž						
Spe	AVERAGE SC	ORE = 3.50	AVERAGE S	SCORE = 2.00	AVERAGE SO	CORE = 3.00
_	Label Indicator	Data Score 1	Label Indicator	Data Score 1	Label Indicator	Data Score 1
Inclusion (3)	3_A1 2003 Primary Attendance Rate ^{2 (0.5), 3}	94.12 3	3_B1 2001-2003 Primary Attendance Rate Trend ^{2 (0.5), 3}	0.06 2	3_C1 JRS 33 - overall effectiveness of the LEA in promoting social inclusion	3 2
ion	3_A2 2003 Secondary Attendance Rate ^{2 (0.5), 3}	91.74 3	3_B2 2001-2003 Secondary Attendance Rate Trend ^{2 (0.5), 3}	0.18 2	3_C2 JRS 42 - effectiveness of the LEA in combating racism	4 3
ns	3_A3 2002 GCSE 1+ A*-G Percentage (children in public care) 3	55.56 3	3_B3 Percentage of pupils receiving alternative tuition reintegrated into schools 3	14.37 3	3_C3 Percentage of schools graded V or G for climate 3	93.33 2
ncl	3_A4 2002 GCSE 1+ A*-G Percentage ³	97.33 2	3_B4 2000-2002 GCSE 1+ A*-G percentage Trend ³	0.98 1		
a	3_A5 JRS 39 - LEA support for behaviour	4 3				
Social	3_A6 JRS 16 - support for EM and Traveller children	5 4				
0)	AVERAGE SCORE = 3.00		AVERAGE SCORE = 2.00		AVERAGE SCORE = 2.33	
£ 4 .	Label Indicator	Data Score 1	Label Indicator	Data Score 1	Label Indicator	Data Score 1
ouo Bu	4_A1 16-17 year old participation rates in education and training	80.00 3			4_C1 JRS 49 - effectiveness of the co-ordination of actions in support of priorities	2 1
e L	4_A2 Insp judgements for Percenatge V, G provision for foundation stage	53.19 3				
Life Long Learning (4)	AVERAGE SC	ODE 0.00	AVERAGE	NOODE .	AVEDAGE OF	2005 400
-	AVERAGE SC	ORE = 3.00	AVERAGE S	SCORE =	AVERAGE SO	CORE = 1.00
ent						2
em (5)	Label Indicator	Data Score 1	Label Indicator	Data Score 1	Label Indicator	Data Score 1
age	5_A1 JRS 52 - overall effectiveness of the LEA 5_A2 JRS 45 - effectiveness of decision making	3 2			5_C1 JRS 51 - capacity of the LEA to improve 5_C2 JRS 7 - effectiveness of strategies to promote continuous improvement	3 2 4 3
lan ati	5_A2 JRS 45 - effectiveness of decision making 5_A3 JRS 34 - extent to which LEA meets its requirements (places) 2 (0.5)	4 3			5_C2 JRS 7 - effectiveness of strategies to promote continuous improvement 5_C3 Percentage of schools graded V or G overall ³	68.57 3
c N	5_A4 JRS 36 - extent to which LEA meets its requirements (admissions) ^{2 (0.5)}	3 2			5_53 1 creentage of serious graded v of e overall	00.57 5
egi f Ec						
itrat	Label Indicator Data Score		AVERAGE SCORE =		AVERAGE SCORE = 2.67	
S	-					
	OVERALL AVERAGE SC	ORE = 2.89	OVERALL AVERAGE S	SCORE = 2.30	OVERALL AVERAGE SO	CORE = 2.31

- 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. Variables given a weighting when calculating average. The weighting applied is given in brackets.
- 3. Thresholds from the 2002 model used to calculate scores
- 4. BOLD = changes to the model for 2003
- 5. For more information on the indicators, please see the 'Contents and Operation of the Education Profile' at www.ofsted.gov.uk/lea