# **Comprehensive Performance Assessment - 2003**

# **Halton LEA**



Aspect	Current performance	Indications of improvement	Capacity to sustain improvement	
School Improvement	2.75	2.67	2.00	
SEN	4.00	3.00	4.00	
Social Inclusion	2.88	3.50	3.00	
Life Long Learning	4.00	-	3.00	
Strategic Management	3.33	-	3.00	
Average Score	3.18	2.95	2.64	
Category <sup>1</sup>	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 - Halton LEA (v.12.11)

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

	Label Indicator  1_A1 Percentage of schools causing concern (excluding inadequate sixth forms)	Data Score <sup>1</sup> 0.00 1	Label Indicator  1 B1 2001-2003 Percentage of primary schools causing concern Trend <sup>2 (0.5)</sup>	0.00 1	Label Indicator  1 C1 Percentage of schools graded V or G for management and efficiency <sup>3</sup>	Data Score 1 88.14 1
=			2001-2003 Percentage of secondary schools causing concern (excluding		1_C1 1 clocklage of schools graded v of C101 management and cinetatory	
School Improvement (1)	1_A2 2002 KS2 English Average Point Score <sup>2 (0.5), 3</sup>	26.92 3	1_B2 inadequate sixth forms) Trend <sup>2 (0.5)</sup>	-5.56 1	1_C2 JRS 6 - allocation of resources to priorities	4 3
<u>آ</u>	1_A3 2002 KS2 Mathematics Average Point Score <sup>2 (0.5), 3</sup>	26.68 3	1_B3 2000-2002 KS2 English Average Point Score Trend <sup>2 (0.5), 3</sup>	0.05 5	1_C3 JRS 25 - performance management of services to support school improvement	3 2
Ş.	1_A4 2002 KS2-KS3 VA <sup>2 (0.5)</sup> 1_A5 2002 KS3-GCSE VA <sup>2 (0.5)</sup>	99.10 4	1_B4 2000-2002 KS2 Mathematics Average Point Score Trend 2 (0.167).3	0.14 3	1_C4 JRS 27 - effectiveness of services to support school improvement	3 2 3
č	1_A5 2002 KS3-GCSE VA 2 (iv.5) 1_A6 JRS 14 - support to schools for raising standards in curriculum use of ICT	98.40 3 5 4	1_B5 2000-2002 KS3 English Average Point Score Trend <sup>2 (0.167), 3</sup> 1_B6 2000-2002 KS3 Mathematics Average Point Score Trend <sup>2 (0.167), 3</sup>	0.48 2 0.34 4	1_C5 EDP Grade	3 2
<u>=</u>	1_A7 JRS 4 - effectiveness of strategy for school improvement	4 3	1_B7 2000-2002 KS3 Science Average Point Score Trend 2 (0.167), 3	0.65 4		
<u> </u>	1_A8 JRS 1 (Context) - JRS 2 (Performance)	1 2	1_B8 2000-2002 GCSE Average Point Score Trend <sup>2 (0.5), 3</sup>	0.22 4		
š			1_B9 JRS 5 - progress in implementing strategy for school improvement	3 2		
S			1_B10 2000-2002 GCSE 5+ A*-C Percentage Trend (Schools <25% in 1999) 3			
	AVERAGE SCORE = 2.75		AVERAGE SCORE = 2.67		AVERAGE SCORE = 2.00	
<del>-</del>						
on	Label Indicator	Data Score 1	Label Indicator	Data Score 1	Label Indicator	Data Score 1
(2)	2_A1 JRS 30 - effectiveness of LEA in meeting statutory obligations Percentage of pupils for whom a statement is issued for the first time within 18	4 3	2_B1 JRS31 - effectiveness in exercising functions to support school improvement	4 3	2_C1 JRS 29 - effectiveness of strategy for SEN	5 4
g s	2_A2 weeks <sup>3</sup>	13.33 5				
al E Nee						
Special Educational Needs (2)	AVED AGE OG	ODE 400	AVERAGE	2000	AVERAGE CO.	NDE 400
8	AVERAGE SCORE = 4.00		AVERAGE SCORE = 3.00		AVERAGE SCORE = 4.00	
_	Label Indicator	Data Score 1	Label Indicator	Data Score 1	Label Indicator	Data Score 1
9	3_A1 2003 Primary Attendance Rate <sup>2 (0.5), 3</sup>	94.18 3	3_B1 2001-2003 Primary Attendance Rate Trend <sup>2 (0.5), 3</sup>	0.22 1	3_C1 JRS 33 - overall effectiveness of the LEA in promoting social inclusion	5 4
io i	3_A2 2003 Secondary Attendance Rate <sup>2 (0.5), 3</sup>	89.95 4	3_B2 2001-2003 Secondary Attendance Rate Trend <sup>2 (0.5), 3</sup>	0.04 3	3_C2 JRS 42 - effectiveness of the LEA in combating racism	0
<u>sn</u>	3_A3 2002 GCSE 1+ A*-G Percentage (children in public care) 3	60.00 2	3_B3 Percentage of pupils receiving alternative tuition reintegrated into schools 3		3_C3 Percentage of schools graded V or G for climate 3	94.92 2
<u>2</u>	3_A4 2002 GCSE 1+ A*-G Percentage <sup>3</sup> 3_A5 JRS 39 - LEA support for behaviour	96.65 3 4 3	3_B4 2000-2002 GCSE 1+ A*-G percentage Trend <sup>3</sup>	-0.64 5		
<u>.e</u>	3_A6 JRS 16 - support for EM and Traveller children	0				
Social Inclusion (3)	o_no one to eappointed Elimana Haromol elimano.	Ü				
	AVERAGE SCORE = 2.88		AVERAGE SCORE = 3.50		AVERAGE SCORE = 3.00	
						- 1
ნ.⊕	Label Indicator	Data Score 1	Label Indicator	Data Score	Label Indicator	Data Score 1 4 3
j ë	4_A1 16-17 year old participation rates in education and training 4_A2 Insp judgements for Percenatge V, G provision for foundation stage	69.00 5 53.85 3			4_C1 JRS 49 - effectiveness of the co-ordination of actions in support of priorities	4 3
Life Long Learning (4)	#_/\text{\text{\$\frac{1}{2}}} \text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\frac{1}{2}\$}} \$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\texitt{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\text{\$\tex	55.55				
و د	AVERAGE SC	ORE = 4.00	AVERAGE S	SCORE =	AVERAGE SCO	ORE = 3.00
ŧ						
mer (s	Label Indicator	Data Score 1	Label Indicator	Data Score 1	Label Indicator	Data Score 1
n (f	5_A1 JRS 52 - overall effectiveness of the LEA	4 3			5_C1 JRS 51 - capacity of the LEA to improve	0
ana	5_A2 JRS 45 - effectiveness of decision making	5 4			5_C2 JRS 7 - effectiveness of strategies to promote continuous improvement	6 5
Σ̈́	5_A3 JRS 34 - extent to which LEA meets its requirements (places) <sup>2 (0.5)</sup> 5_A4 JRS 36 - extent to which LEA meets its requirements (admissions) <sup>2 (0.5)</sup>	3 2			5_C3 Percentage of schools graded V or G overall <sup>3</sup>	84.48 1
egi Ed	5_A4 JRS 36 - extent to which LEA meets its requirements (admissions) <sup>2 (0.5)</sup>	ა 4				
Strategic Management of Education (5)	AVERAGE SC	ORE = 3.33	AVERAGE S	SCORE =	AVERAGE SCC	ORE = 3.00
	OVERALL AVERAGE SC	ORE = 3.18	OVERALL AVERAGE S	SCORE = 2.95	OVERALL AVERAGE SCC	ORE = 2.64

- 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