

# Contents and operation of the education profile for the 2004 comprehensive performance assessment

These notes describe the operation of the education profile for comprehensive performance assessment (CPA) for 2004 and the indicators that are used, along with details of the data sources and the periods that they cover.

Ofsted will be collecting the data to be used in the model and LEAs will be asked to verify the data to be used in their CPA education assessment for 2004. We will send these data to LEAs no later than **11 October**. LEAs will have until **19 October 2004** to check these data and notify us of any errors or discrepancies. Please note that it will not be possible to deal with any queries after this date. Once this data validation process is complete, the final profile for each LEA will be passed to the Audit Commission for inclusion in the overall model for each council's CPA. The education results will be released in December 2004, in conjunction with the Audit Commission's release of the overall CPA results.

## **Background**

The education profile has been agreed by the CPA development group, led by the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) and comprising representatives from local authorities, Confed, the DfES, Ofsted, and the Audit Commission, as well as a consultation exercise involving all LEAs.

CPA for 2004 is based on the models used in 2002 and 2003. Following consultation, we have made some refinements, with changes kept to a minimum to ensure stability in line with the overall approach to CPA in 2004. In deciding upon changes we have used the same principles as the previous two years (attached at Annex A). The impact of the agreed changes for 2004 has been to make minimal changes to the detail of the model and the performance indicators used in the model, with some indicators removed due to technical reasons, and replacement ones added.

Changes to the indicators included in the model fall into two categories. The first change has been prompted as a consequence of the new inspection frameworks for schools and LEAs. For example, the indicators using school inspection evidence have altered as a result of changes inspection judgements made by Ofsted.

The other change is a result of changes to the data used to measure participation rates in education and training of 16–17 year olds data. The latest data now use the post-2001 census population estimates so direct comparison with previous years is not possible. The data are more informative than in previous year's as it makes use of revised residence data; this has though altered the way these data are calculated. A detailed explanation of the changes to this year's model is Annex B.

As with the 2003 profile, where possible, we will use the same thresholds for performance as used in the 2002 model. This effective freezing of thresholds will mean that improvement/deterioration in LEA performance for most individual indicators would (in those circumstances where the aggregate improvement/deterioration in PIs permitted the 2002 threshold to be crossed)

result in a higher/lower education service CPA score. Where measures are the same as the last two years, promotion and demotion at the margins of star ratings will be as a result of changes in the performance of the affected LEA rather than a change in the performance of another LEA. The same approach will be used for indicators that were introduced in the 2003 profile and used again in the 2004 profile.

## Operation of the profile

The profile views education through three **perspectives**:

- current performance (that determines each authority's education star rating)
- indications of improvement
- capacity to make further improvement.

The two improvement perspectives are included with the proven indications of improvement – the 'track record' – based largely on performance indicators, and the capacity to make further improvement mainly relating to the outcomes of inspection.

These perspectives are assessed across five **aspects** of the education service:

- school improvement
- special educational needs
- social inclusion
- lifelong learning
- strategic management.

This combination of perspectives and aspects means that the education profile for an LEA has the potential for 15 scores to be shown in a matrix, one for each aspect against the performance and improvement perspectives. The scores for each indicator in a perspective are aggregated to give an overall assessment score for the performance and improvement perspectives. These are the assessment scores that determine the performance and improvement categories for the education element of a council's CPA.

## Components of the education profile

The profile includes a combination of performance indicators and inspection judgements which have been carefully chosen from existing indicators to ensure they are generally applicable and reflect differentiation in LEA performance.

There are 50 indicators used to feed into the 15 elements of the profile. Of these, 24 are performance indicators and 26 are based on inspection evidence. Of the latter, 4 are based on school inspection judgements and 22 are LEA inspection judgements (JRS). The scorecard demonstrates how the indicators populate a matrix reflecting the perspectives of current performance and improvement, and the aspects of education being covered. Attached as Annex C are two scorecards, the first shows the scorecard for 2004 for those LEAs inspected before January 2004. The second is for those LEAs inspected from January 2004.

## Operation of the education profile

### *How individual indicators are scored*

Each indicator is converted to a score on a five-point scale, **with 1 being the highest and 5 the lowest score**. For 2002, these scores were arrived at by ranking LEA performance on each indicator and then allocating a score to each based on this relative ranking, as set out in the table below:

**Table 1**

LEA rank order	Percentiles	Score	Inspection grade
1–15	10%	1	1 or 2
16–45	20%	2	3
46–105	40%	3	4
106–135	20%	4	5
136–150	10%	5	6 or 7

This year, as with last year, we are basing authorities' scores on how they performed against the standards set in 2002 or last year on each indicator, rather than on a relative ranking of LEAs. To do this, we have established the thresholds for each 1 to 5 score on the basis of 2002 or 2003 results and will measure LEA performance against these this year.

For example, if an LEA was ranked 16<sup>th</sup> in 2002 for secondary attendance, with an attendance rate of 92.32, it would have been awarded a score of 2 as it was outside the top 10% of LEAs. If the attendance rate of the LEA's secondary school pupils improved in 2004 and the 2002 threshold was crossed, the LEA would be awarded a score of 1.

However, where the indicators have changed since 2003, the 2004 data is not directly comparable and so, as with 2002 model, we will rank the LEAs and award a score of 1 to 5 using the 10:20:40:20:10 split in the relative ranking of LEAs. The following indicators have been added for 2004, and so apply in this case:

- percentage of schools graded good or very good for management and efficiency (1c 1)
- percentage of schools graded good or very good for climate (3c 3)
- percentage of schools graded good or very good inspection judgements for foundation stage (4a 2)
- percentage of schools graded good or very good overall (5c 3)
- participation rates in education and training by 16 and 17 year olds (4a 1).

Example: being ranked 50<sup>th</sup> would convert to 3 points, whereas 16<sup>th</sup> would convert to 2 points.

For inspection judgements, which are made initially on a seven-point scale, the inspection grades are converted to a five-point scale in the same way as last year (see table 1).

### *How overall star ratings and improvement ratings are determined*

Most of the indicators have the same weighting and this simplifies the calculation of average scores. The scores for each indicator are added together and then divided by the sum of the weights to give an average score. In the few instances where an indicator is not applicable to some LEAs, this indicator and its weighting will not be included in the arithmetic.

Some indicators in the model are weighted at less than 1, for example, for English and mathematics for pupils at the end of Key Stage 2, the scores for each subject are weighted 0.5 each. This is so that the performance, in this case, of the same group of pupils does not distort the overall score. Where applicable, the weightings are indicated on the detailed scorecard (Annex C).

Thus, in the current performance perspective for the school improvement aspect, the eight contributory elements to the score (schools causing concern; performance of primary pupils in maths and English; performance of secondary pupils (value-added Key Stages 2–3 and Key Stages 3–4); support to schools for raising standards in ICT; the effectiveness of the strategy for school improvement, and the context inspection grade minus the performance inspection grade) have an equal influence on the overall performance score.

## **Classifying performance and improvement for education**

The CPA for a council uses service scores on a four-point scale to feed into the overall categorisation. As with previous year's, we will use the star rating – 3 stars (for the highest performers) to 0 stars (for the lowest performers). Please note that there is no single categorisation (that is, combining performance and improvement) at the level of the education service assessment. The performance star rating feeds directly into the overall performance score used by the Audit Commission (so 3 stars = 4, 0 stars = 1).

As with individual indicators, authorities' scores will be based on how they performed against the star rating standards set in 2002. As with CPA 2003, they will measure this year's LEA performance against 2002 results.

The thresholds of the star ratings based on the average score for current performance are as follows:

- For 0 stars, an LEA must score more than 3.75 for current performance
- For 1 star, an LEA must score no more than 3.75 for current performance
- For 2 star 'lower', an LEA must score no more than 3.34 for current performance
- For 2 star 'upper', an LEA must score no more than 2.79 for current performance

For 3 stars, an LEA must score no more than 2.37 for current performance

As with last year, the **improvement categories** are derived in the same way. The model is designed to encompass a judgement about whether improvement is sufficient in relation to high performance, as well as the relative improvement made in relation to the improvement made by all LEAs. To this end, an average score of 3 is deemed to be the cut-off point between **proven** and **unproven** improvement, and **secure** and **not secure** capacity to improve.

Thus an overall average score of 3 or better for improvement would result in the LEA being categorised as having **proven improvement**. Similarly for capacity, a score of 3 or better would result in a categorisation of **secure capacity to improve**.

## **Contents of each cell**

The remaining pages examine each element of the education profile. They explain why particular indicators have been chosen, and refer to other indicators that have been considered but rejected, with an explanation for this decision. The source, range and period covered by the indicator are given.

Where references are made to Ofsted criteria for making inspection judgements, further information can be found in the LEA inspection area of the Ofsted website.

If you have any queries about the contents of this document, please address them to [cpaenquiries@ofsted.gov.uk](mailto:cpaenquiries@ofsted.gov.uk).

Aspect	1. School improvement
Perspective	<b>a. Current performance</b>
Comments on the element	This element has the largest number of indicators, reflecting in part the many indicators available through the education performance management framework. It gives a balance between the performance of schools and the inspection judgements on key aspects of performance from LEA inspection evidence.
What data?	<b>1a.1</b> Percentage of schools causing concern (excluding inadequate sixth forms)
Covering what?	The percentage of primary and secondary schools (excluding inadequate sixth forms) causing concern (that is, schools in special measures, schools with serious weaknesses and underachieving schools as defined by Ofsted) as at 31 <sup>st</sup> August 2004 are combined to give each LEA a ranked position.
Why used?	This indicator measures the effectiveness of an LEA in preventing schools from being designated as causing concern, and also its effectiveness in ensuring that the full range of powers available to an LEA are used to remove the designation from its schools.
For which year?	The data cover schools as designated as causing concern as at 31 <sup>st</sup> August 2004.
Source:	Ofsted school inspection data. This aggregate information for each LEA will be published on the Ofsted website at <a href="http://www.ofsted.gov.uk">www.ofsted.gov.uk</a> in late September/early October 2004.
Gathered by:	Ofsted.
Thresholds	$1 \leq 0.00 < 2 \leq 1.80 < 3 \leq 3.85 < 4 \leq 5.93 < 5$
What data?	<b>1a.2</b> and <b>1a.3</b> Primary attainment
Covering what?	The average points score for all pupils at the end of Key Stage 2 in maintained mainstream schools in the national tests for English and mathematics in 2003. The LEA figure for each subject is benchmarked against the thresholds shown below and given a score. The score for each subject is weighted at 0.5 in order to calculate overall aspect and perspective scores.
Why used?	This indicator gives a measure of the performance of pupils in an LEA's schools at the end of Key Stage 2.
For which year?	Validated 2003 data are used in the education profile. Validated 2004 data will not be available in time to be used in the 2004 CPA assessment.
Source:	Returns to the QCA.
Gathered by:	DfES and processed by Ofsted in the LEA statistical profile.
Thresholds	KS2 English: $1 \geq 27.78 > 2 \geq 27.32 > 3 \geq 26.64 > 4 \geq 26.08 > 5$ , KS2 Maths: $1 \geq 27.26 > 2 \geq 26.89 > 3 \geq 26.27 > 4 \geq 25.70 > 5$



Aspect	1. School improvement
Perspective	<b>a. Current performance – continued</b>
What data?	<b>1a.4 and 1a.5</b> Secondary attainment
Covering what?	Value added is the progress that schools help individual students make between different stages of education, relative to their starting points. Value-added measures are therefore intended to allow comparisons between schools with different pupil intakes. The two value-added measures for an LEA are based on the progress made by individual pupils between Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 3, and Key Stage 3 and GCSE/GNVQ. The score for each measure is weighted at 0.5 in order to calculate overall aspect and perspective scores.
Why used?	This indicator gives a measure, against national ranking, of the performance of 14- and 16-year-old pupils in an LEA's schools.
For which year?	Validated 2003 data are used in the education profile. Validated 2004 data will not be available in time to be used in the 2004 CPA assessment.
Source:	DfES attainment data.
Gathered by:	DfES and processed by Ofsted in the LEA statistical profile.
Thresholds	KS2-KS3 VA: $1 \geq 100.60 > 2 \geq 100.10 > 3 \geq 99.40 > 4 \geq 99.00 > 5$ , KS3-GCSE/GNVQ VA: $1 \geq 99.90 > 2 \geq 99.00 > 3 \geq 98.00 > 4 \geq 97.40 > 5$
What data?	<b>1a.6</b> JRS 14 'The extent to which the LEA supports schools in raising standards in curriculum use of ICT' (LEAs inspected before January 2004) JRS 3.3 'Support for information and communication technology' (LEAs inspected from January 2004)
Covering what?	Inspection judgement against Ofsted criteria in LEA organisational inspections.
Why used?	There are no national measures of pupil attainment in ICT so this inspection judgement is used as a proxy indicator of performance in ICT.
For which year?	The JRS grade from the most recent inspection of the LEA.
Source:	LEA inspections.
Gathered by:	Ofsted.
What data?	<b>1a.7</b> JRS 4 'The LEA's strategy for school improvement, including the EDP' (before January 2004) JRS 2.1 'The LEA's strategy for school improvement' (from January 2004)
Covering what?	Inspection judgement against Ofsted criteria in LEA organisational inspections.
Why used?	This judgement is made once the school improvement strategy has been inspected and the links between the strategy set out in the EDP and other corporate and service plans have been evaluated.
For which year?	The JRS grade from the most recent inspection of the LEA.
Source:	LEA inspections.
Gathered by:	Ofsted.
What data?	<b>1a.8</b> JRS 1 'The socio-economic context of the LEA' minus JRS 2 'The performance of schools (from attainment in reception to the end of Key Stage 4)' (before January 2004) JRS 1 "The socio-economic context of the LEA' minus JRS 2.3 'The performance of schools' (from January 2004)
Covering what?	Inspection judgements against Ofsted criteria in LEA organisational inspections.
Why used?	This measure recognises that socio-economic context has an impact on pupil performance. If the performance of schools is graded higher than the socio-economic context of the LEA it offers a crude measure of improved performance, and vice versa. The range from inspections is from +2 to -2, so this five-point scale is used to generate the LEA's score. Thus +2 scores 1, +1 scores 2 and so on.
For which year?	The JRS grades from the most recent inspection of the LEA.
Source:	LEA inspections.
Gathered by:	Ofsted.

Aspect	1. School improvement
Perspective	<b>b. Indications of improvement</b>
What data?	<b>1b.1</b> and <b>1b.2</b> The three-year trend in improvement in the percentage of schools causing concern – primary and secondary (excluding inadequate sixth forms) schools
Covering what?	The trend for improvement for the two categories is calculated for three years of data, from 2002 to 2004.
Why used?	The indicator measures the effectiveness of an LEA in monitoring and preventing schools from failing, and in challenging, supporting and intervening in schools expediently so that they are brought out of this designation within the national target times. A further rule is applied to this indicator. LEAs that currently have no schools causing concern automatically score a 1 for this improvement indicator. This avoids penalising LEAs that have no schools to remove and cannot register an improvement score.
For which year?	2002-04 data are used to compute the trend. The data are taken from the Ofsted database in September 2004.
Source:	Ofsted school inspection data. This aggregate information for each LEA is not published independently of CPA. Nevertheless local education authorities will be aware of the number of their schools currently in Ofsted cause for concern categories and will be able to validate data used in the education CPA profile.
Gathered by:	Ofsted.
Thresholds	Primary: $1 \leq -2.59 < 2 \leq -1.43 < 3 \leq 0.00 < 4 \leq 0.91 < 5$ Secondary: $1 \leq -5.00 < 2 \leq -1.92 < 3 \leq 0.00 < 4 \leq 2.76 < 5$
What data?	<b>1b.3</b> and <b>1b.4</b> The three-year trend in improvement in the APS for English and mathematics at Key Stage 2
Covering what?	The trend for improvement is calculated from three years of data, from 2001 to 2003.
Why used?	This indicator gives a measure, against national ranking, of the trend for improvement of 11-year-old pupils in an LEA's schools at the end of Key Stage 2.
For which year?	Validated data from 2001-03 are used in the education profile.
Source:	Returns to the QCA.
Gathered by:	DfES and processed by Ofsted in the LEA statistical profile.
Thresholds	KS2 English: $1 \geq 0.55 > 2 \geq 0.45 > 3 \geq 0.31 > 4 \geq 0.22 > 5$ , KS2 Maths: $1 \geq 0.30 > 2 \geq 0.17 > 3 \geq 0.05 > 4 \geq -0.02 > 5$

Aspect	1. School improvement
Perspective	<b>b. Indications of improvement – continued</b>
What data?	<b>1b.5, 1b.6 and 1b.7</b> The three-year trend in improvement in the APS for English, mathematics and science at Key Stage 3
Covering what?	The trend for improvement calculated from three years of data, from 2001 to 2003.
Why used?	This indicator gives a measure, against national ranking, of the trend for improvement of 14-year-old pupils in an LEA's schools at the end of Key Stage 3.
For which year?	Validated data for 2001-03 are used in the education profile.
Source:	DfES attainment data.
Gathered by:	DfES and processed by Ofsted in the LEA statistical profile.
Thresholds	KS3 English: $1 \geq 0.66 > 2 \geq 0.47 > 3 \geq 0.18 > 4 \geq 0.02 > 5$ , KS3 Maths: $1 \geq 0.72 > 2 \geq 0.59 > 3 \geq 0.43 > 4 \geq 0.34 > 5$ , KS3 Science: $1 \geq 1.09 > 2 \geq 0.92 > 3 \geq 0.74 > 4 \geq 0.64 > 5$
What data?	<b>1b.8</b> The three-year trend in improvement in the total APS for GCSE/GNVQ
Covering what?	The trend for improvement is calculated from three years of data, from 2001 to 2003.
Why used?	This indicator gives a measure, against national ranking, of the trend for improvement of 16-year-old pupils at GCSE/GNVQ in an LEA's schools at the end of Key Stage 4.
For which year?	Validated data for 2001-03 are used in the education profile. Value-added data were not used as no trend information is currently available.
Source:	DfES attainment data.
Gathered by:	DfES and processed by Ofsted in the LEA statistical profile.
Thresholds	$1 \geq 1.16 > 2 \geq 0.77 > 3 \geq 0.39 > 4 \geq -0.05 > 5$
What data?	<b>1b.9</b> JRS 5 'The progress on implementing the LEA's strategy for school improvement including the EDP' (before January 2004) JRS 2.2 'The progress on implementing the LEA's strategy for school improvement' (from January 2004)
Covering what?	Inspection judgement against Ofsted criteria in LEA organisational inspections.
Why used?	This judgement is included in the indicated improvement perspective as it reflects inspectors' findings about the progress made by an LEA and indicates the extent to which improvement is taking place.
For which year?	The JRS grade from the most recent inspection of the LEA.
Source:	LEA inspections.
Gathered by:	Ofsted.
What data?	<b>1b.10</b> The trend for improvement since 1999 for 15 year olds in schools with less than 25% achieving 5+ A*-C at GCSE/GNVQ
Covering what?	The rate of improvement of those schools within the LEA that were identified in 1999 as having low levels of achievement. This is a measure of the success of an LEA in challenging and supporting these schools to improve at GCSE/GNVQ.
Why used?	It is a national target set by the Secretary of State and measures the effectiveness of LEA support to these schools.
For which year?	The school baseline was set in 1999. 2001-03 data are used to compute the trend.
Source:	DfES attainment data.
Gathered by:	DfES.
Thresholds	$1 \geq 4.63 > 2 \geq 3.10 > 3 \geq 1.18 > 4 \geq -0.21 > 5$

Aspect	1 School improvement
Perspective	<b>c. Capacity to make further improvement</b>
	This element is based largely on inspection judgements that are linked to an LEA's capacity to make further improvement in exercising its school improvement functions.
What data?	<b>1c.1</b> The percentage of schools graded V or G for management and efficiency in school inspections
Covering what?	This indicator is a composite of mainstream school inspection grades and is published annually in the LEA statistical profile. Grades for schools that have been closed since their inspection(s) are removed from the calculation.
Why used?	An LEA with a high percentage of schools which are graded very good for their management and efficiency has a secure base upon which to build to make further improvement. An LEA with a low percentage of these schools may have greater potential to improve but its capacity to improve is not proven.
For which year?	The data are taken from the Ofsted database and cover all school inspections up to July 2004. Please note: Due to the change in the school inspection framework introduced September 2003, a different methodology has been used to calculate school level 'V, G, S, U' categories.
Source:	Returns made by school inspectors.
Gathered by:	Ofsted.
Thresholds	1 ≥ 90.00 > 2 ≥ 86.67 > 3 ≥ 81.16 > 4 ≥ 76.71 > 5
What data?	<b>1c.2</b> JRS 6 'The extent to which the LEA targets its resources to priorities' (before January 2004) JRS 1.4 'The extent to which the LEA targets its resources to priorities' (after January 2004)
Covering what?	Inspection judgement against Ofsted criteria in LEA organisational inspections.
Why used?	This judgement reflects the capacity of an LEA to direct its resources effectively towards national and local priorities. Well-targeted resources are key to making further improvement.
For which year?	The JRS grade from the most recent inspection of the LEA.
Source:	LEA inspections.
Gathered by:	Ofsted.
What data?	<b>1c.3</b> JRS 25 'The effectiveness of the performance management of services to support school improvement' (before January 2004) JRS 3.11 (JRS 3.10) 'The planning and provision of services supporting school improvement, particularly inspection and advisory and/or school effectiveness services (after January 2004)
Covering what?	Inspection judgement against Ofsted criteria in LEA organisational inspections.
Why used?	This judgement reflects the capacity of an LEA to link operations to strategy through a performance management framework. A strong performance management framework indicates good capacity to bring about further improvement.
For which year?	The JRS grade from the most recent inspection of the LEA.
Source:	LEA inspections.
Gathered by:	Ofsted.

Aspect	1 School improvement
Perspective	<b>c. Capacity to make further improvement – continued</b>
What data?	<b>1c.4</b> JRS 27 'The effectiveness of services to support school improvement' (before January 2004) JRS 3.12 (JRS 3.11) 'The effectiveness and value for money of services supporting school improvement, particularly inspection and advisory and/or school effectiveness services' (after January 2004)
Covering what?	Inspection judgement against Ofsted criteria in LEA organisational inspections.
Why used?	This judgement reflects the capacity of an LEA to monitor, challenge and support its schools. Effective school improvement services indicate a good capacity to bring about further improvement.
For which year?	The JRS grade from the most recent inspection of the LEA.
Source:	LEA inspections.
Gathered by:	Ofsted.
What data?	<b>1c.5</b> Ofsted grade for EDP2
Covering what?	This is the grade awarded by Ofsted when all EDP2s were evaluated in spring 2002. It is used as the basis for JRS 4 on inspection. Although an inspection team cannot alter the EDP2 grade, the grade for JRS 4 may vary, according to the team's findings. See 1a.5.
Why used?	The quality of the EDP is a measure of the capacity of an LEA to make further improvement. It is a plan, rather than an outcome, and so indicates capacity rather than performance.
For which year?	2002, unless subsequently resubmitted and regraded.
Source:	Ofsted evaluation 2002.
Gathered by:	DfES letter to LEAs.
Contact:	DfES.

Aspect	2 Special educational needs
Perspective	<b>a. Current performance</b>
Comments on the element	Definitions of quality in this complex area are often related directly to local policies within the national framework for SEN. Beyond inspection judgements, it has not been possible to find many effective indicators of performance that are recognised nationally.
What data?	<b>2a.1</b> JRS 30 'The effectiveness of the LEA in meeting its statutory obligations for SEN' (before January 2004) JRS 4.2 'The effectiveness of the LEA in meeting its statutory obligations in respect of SEN' (after January 2004)
Covering what?	Inspection judgement against Ofsted criteria in LEA organisational inspections.
Why used?	This judgement reflects the LEA's performance in discharging its statutory duties with regard to SEN.
For which year?	The JRS grade from the most recent inspection of the LEA.
Source:	LEA inspections.
Gathered by:	Ofsted.
What data?	<b>2a.2</b> Percentage of statements of special educational need issued by the authority in a financial year and prepared within 18 weeks including those affected by 'exceptions to the rule' under the SEN Code of Practice (BVPI 43b).
Covering what?	This is the national BVP indicator that measures the proportion of statements of educational need that are processed within the national target of 18 weeks.
Why used?	It is a measure of the speed of response to the needs of an individual child and is an aspect of performance on which LEAs can have a direct impact. The indicator chosen measures the percentage of all the statements issued without discounting statements that are delayed as a result of other agencies (statutory exceptions). This is because it is an absolute measure of the service offered and inspection shows that, while LEAs are not directly responsible for delays caused by other agencies, those that have created good partnerships are able to significantly reduce the time taken to process statements.
For which year?	Financial year 2003-04.
Source:	Best Value Performance indicator.
Gathered by:	Audit Commission.
Thresholds	1 ≥ 88.00 > 2 ≥ 75.00 > 3 ≥ 52.00 > 4 ≥ 33.50 > 5

Aspect	2. Special educational needs
Perspective	<b>b. Indications of improvement</b>
What data?	<b>2b.1</b> JRS 31 'The effectiveness of the LEA in exercising its SEN functions to support school improvement' (before January 2004) JRS 4.3 'The effectiveness of the LEA in exercising its SEN functions to support school improvement' (after January 2004)
Covering what?	Inspection judgement against Ofsted criteria in LEA organisational inspections.
Why used?	This judgement is used as it reflects a growing capacity to support school improvement through SEN functions.
For which year?	The JRS grade from the most recent inspection of the LEA.
Source:	LEA inspections.
Gathered by:	Ofsted.

Aspect	2. Special educational needs
Perspective	<b>c. Capacity to make further improvement</b>
What data?	<b>2c.1</b> JRS 29 'The effectiveness of the LEA's strategy for SEN' (before January 2004) JRS 4.1 'The effectiveness of the LEA's strategy for SEN' (after January 2004)
Covering what?	Inspection judgement against Ofsted criteria in LEA organisational inspections.
Why used?	This judgement reflects the effectiveness of the development and implementation of policies and strategies for SEN and indicates a good, or otherwise, capacity to continue to make improvements in provision.
For which year?	The JRS grade from the most recent inspection of the LEA.
Source:	LEA inspections.
Gathered by:	Ofsted.

Aspect	3 Social inclusion
Perspective	<b>a. Current performance</b>
Comments on the element	
What data?	<b>3a.1 and 3a.2</b> Attendance rate in 2004 in maintained primary and secondary schools
Covering what?	Attendance in maintained primary schools (0.5) and secondary schools (0.5) in 2004 (weighting in brackets).
Why used?	Measures the effectiveness of the education system in promoting attendance at school.
For which year?	Academic year 2003/04.
Source:	DfES return.
Gathered by:	DfES and processed by Ofsted in the LEA statistical profile.
Thresholds	Primary: 1 ≥ 94.92 > 2 ≥ 94.48 > 3 ≥ 93.54 > 4 ≥ 93.02 > 5 Secondary: 1 ≥ 92.33 > 2 ≥ 91.88 > 3 ≥ 90.63 > 4 ≥ 89.32 > 5
What data?	<b>3a.3</b> Percentage of Year 11 children in public care gaining 1 or more A*–G grades at GCSE/GNVQ
Covering what?	The percentage of Year 11 children (during the school year September 2001 to July 2002), who were in public care continuously for the 12 months prior to 30 September 2002, who attained one or more GCSE passes at grade A*–G.
Why used?	Measures the effectiveness of the LEA in promoting inclusion for this group of vulnerable young people.
For which year?	September 2001 to August 2002 (latest data available).
Source:	Ofsted Form 4 2003.
Gathered by:	Ofsted.
Thresholds	1 ≥ 73.33 > 2 ≥ 59.57 > 3 ≥ 40.00 > 4 ≥ 25.00 > 5
What data?	<b>3a.4</b> Percentage of 15-year-old pupils gaining 1 or more grades A*–G at GCSE/GNVQ
Covering what?	The percentage of 15-year-old pupils (at the start of the school year) that gained at least one pass at GCSE/GNVQ in maintained mainstream schools in 2003.
Why used?	Measures the education system's ability to retain as many young people as possible within the examination system.
For which year?	Validated data for 2003 are used in the education profile.
Source:	DfES attainment data.
Gathered by:	DfES and processed by Ofsted in the LEA statistical profile.
Thresholds	1 ≥ 97.68 > 2 ≥ 96.92 > 3 ≥ 95.22 > 4 ≥ 93.47 > 5
What data?	<b>3a.5</b> JRS 39 'The extent to which the LEA meets its statutory requirements and achieves value for money in relation to behaviour at school' (before January 2004) JRS 5.4 'Support for behaviour in school' (after January 2004)
Covering what?	Inspection judgement against Ofsted criteria in LEA organisational inspections.
Why used?	This judgement reflects the effectiveness of the LEA's policies and strategies for supporting schools in relation to the management of pupil behaviour.
For which year?	The JRS grade from the most recent inspection of the LEA.
Source:	LEA inspections.
Gathered by:	Ofsted.



Aspect	3 Social inclusion
Perspective	<b>a. Current performance</b>
What data?	<b>3a.6</b> JRS 16 'LEA support for raising standards of achievement for ethnic minority and Traveller children' (before January 2004) JRS 3.5 'Support for raising the achievement of minority ethnic pupils, including gypsy/traveller children' (after January 2004)
Covering what?	Inspection judgement against Ofsted criteria in LEA organisational inspections.
Why used?	This judgement reflects the effectiveness of the LEA's support for raising standards of achievement for ethnic minority and Traveller children.
For which year?	The JRS grade from the most recent inspection of the LEA.
Source:	LEA inspections.
Gathered by:	Ofsted.
Aspect	3. Social inclusion
Perspective	<b>b. Indications of improvement</b>
What data?	<b>3b.1</b> and <b>3b.2</b> Trend for the rate of attendance in maintained mainstream schools 2002–2004
Covering what?	The trend for attendance between 2002 and 2004, calculated from three years of data, with primary and secondary attendance trends each given 0.5 weighting.
Why used?	This measures changes in the rate of attendance over a three-year period.
For which years?	Academic years 2001/02, 2002/03 and 2003/04.
Source:	DfES returns.
Gathered by:	DfES and processed by Ofsted in the LEA statistical profile.
Thresholds	Primary: $1 \geq 0.10 > 2 \geq -0.05 > 3 \geq -0.18 > 4 \geq -0.27 > 5$ Secondary: $1 \geq 0.38 > 2 \geq 0.11 > 3 \geq -0.17 > 4 \geq -0.32 > 5$
What data?	<b>3b.3</b> Percentage of pupils receiving alternative tuition reintegrated into schools
Covering what?	These data are collected from the Ofsted Form 4 2003 returns made by LEAs. It covers the percentage of pupils receiving alternative tuition (including those educated at home) that have been reintegrated during the last year.
Why used?	The measure indicates the effectiveness of LEA interventions and strategies to re-integrate pupils receiving alternative tuition in mainstream settings and arrangements.
For which year?	September 2001–September 2002 (latest data available).
Source:	Ofsted Form 4 2003.
Gathered by:	Ofsted.
Thresholds	$1 \geq 23.61 > 2 \geq 15.58 > 3 \geq 6.40 > 4 \geq 2.53 > 5$
What data?	<b>3b.4</b> The three-year trend for pupils achieving at least 1 A*–G grade at GCSE/GNVQ
Covering what?	15-year-old pupils (at the start of the school year) at maintained mainstream schools.
Why used?	This measures changes over time in the percentage of pupils that complete their statutory education and leave with a GCSE/GNVQ qualification.
For which year?	Validated data for 2001-03 are used in the education profile.
Source:	DfES attainment data.
Gathered by:	DfES and processed by Ofsted in the LEA statistical profile.
Thresholds	$1 \geq 0.79 > 2 \geq 0.39 > 3 \geq -0.07 > 4 \geq -0.47 > 5$

Aspect	3. Social inclusion
Perspective	<b>c. Capacity to make further improvement</b>
What data?	<b>3c.1</b> JRS 33 'The overall effectiveness of the LEA in promoting social inclusion' (before January 2004) JRS 5.1 'The overall effectiveness of the LEA's strategy for promoting social inclusion' (after January 2004)
Covering what?	Inspection judgement against Ofsted criteria in LEA organisational inspections.
Why used?	This judgement is used as it summarises an inspection team's findings about the overall effectiveness of the LEA, in this aspect of its work.
For which year?	The JRS grade from the most recent inspection of the LEA.
Source:	LEA inspections.
Gathered by:	Ofsted.
What data?	<b>3c.2</b> JRS 42 'The effectiveness of the LEA in combating racism' (before January 2004) JRS 5.7 'The effectiveness of the LEA in promoting racial equality' (after January 2004)
Covering what?	Inspection judgement against Ofsted criteria in LEA organisational inspections.
Why used?	This judgement evaluates effectiveness against statutory duties and guidance and takes account of local circumstances and policies to promote racial equality.
For which year?	The JRS grade from the most recent inspection of the LEA.
Source:	LEA inspections.
Gathered by:	Ofsted.
What data?	<b>3c.3</b> The national ranking for the percentage of schools graded V or G for climate in school inspections
Covering what?	This indicator is a composite of maintained mainstream school inspection grades and is published annually in the LEA statistical profile. Grades from schools that have been closed since their inspection(s) are removed from the calculation.
Why used?	An LEA with a high percentage of schools which are graded very good for their climate, which combines judgements about behaviour, personal and social development and citizenship has a secure base upon which to build to make further improvement. An LEA with a low percentage of these schools may have greater potential to improve, but its capacity to improve is not proven.
For which year?	The data are taken from the Ofsted database and cover all school inspections up to July 2004. Please note: Due to the change in the school inspection framework introduced September 2003, a different methodology has been used to calculate school level 'V, G, S, U' categories.
Source:	Returns made by school inspectors.
Gathered by:	Ofsted.
Thresholds	1 ≥ 96.27 > 2 ≥ 94.37 > 3 ≥ 90.16 > 4 ≥ 85.56 > 5

Aspect	4. Lifelong learning
Perspective	<b>a. Current performance</b>
Comments on the element	
What data?	<b>4a.1</b> Participation in full-time education and training by 16 and 17 year olds.
Covering what?	The percentage of 16 and 17 year olds participating in full-time education and training.
Why used?	This indicates the overall success of the education system in encouraging young people to stay in education and in making provision for them. Data are not published for individual inner London LEAs due to the considerable number of pupils that attend school in a borough other than the one in which they reside. However, the inner London participation estimate is very close to the national estimate, and each inner London LEA has been given the same figure, the overall inner London estimate.
For which year?	2001.
Source:	DfES return, Annual Schools' Census, LSC's individualised student records, Higher Education Statistics Agency student record, trainee database system, Regional and Head Office Management Information System, ONS/GAD population estimates/projections.
Gathered by:	DfES/LSC, collated by DfES. Published at <a href="http://www.dfes.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/SBU/b000450/index.shtml">http://www.dfes.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/SBU/b000450/index.shtml</a>
Thresholds	1 ≥ 84.00 > 2 ≥ 80.00 > 3 ≥ 75.00 > 4 ≥ 72.00 > 5
What data?	<b>4a.2</b> The percentage of schools with G or V inspection judgements for the foundation stage
Covering what?	This indicator covers all schools with inspection grades for the foundation stage, calculated specifically for CPA. This indicator has been refined from last year's model.
Why used?	An LEA with a high percentage of schools and nursery schools which are graded good or very good for the foundation stage is performing well.
For which year?	The data are taken from the Ofsted database and cover all school and nursery school inspections from September 1998 to July 2004. Also, only the most recent inspection data for each school, as well as schools open as of September 2004 are taken into account. Please note: Due to the change in the school inspection framework introduced September 2003, a different methodology has been used to calculate school level 'V, G, S, U' categories.
Source:	Returns made by school inspectors.
Gathered by:	Ofsted.
Thresholds	1 ≥ 68.18 > 2 ≥ 59.42 > 3 ≥ 52.04 > 4 ≥ 45.10 > 5

Aspect	4. Lifelong learning
Perspective	<b>b. Indications of improvement</b>
Comments on the element	There are no indicators in this element.

Aspect	4. Lifelong learning
Perspective	<b>c. Capacity to make further improvement</b>
Comments on the element	
What data?	<b>4c.1</b> JRS 49 'The effectiveness of the co-ordination of actions in support of priorities involving collaboration between several agencies' (before January 2004) JRS 1.8 'The effectiveness of partnerships and collaboration between agencies in support of priorities' (after January 2004)
Covering what?	Inspection judgement against Ofsted criteria in LEA organisational inspections.
Why used?	This judgement evaluates the effectiveness of the LEA in its key strategic partnerships, including local further education providers, training establishments and the local Learning and Skills Council, the EYDCP and early years providers.
For which year?	The JRS grade from the most recent inspection of the LEA.
Source:	LEA inspections.
Gathered by:	Ofsted.

Aspect	5. Strategic management
Perspective	<b>a. Current performance</b>
Comments on the element	The strategic management aspect is based largely on inspection judgements, as these are the most valid indicators of performance and capacity to make further improvement.
What data?	<b>5a.1</b> JRS 52 'The overall effectiveness of the LEA' (before January 2004) JRS 0.2 'The overall effectiveness of the LEA' (after January 2004)
Covering what?	Inspection judgement against Ofsted criteria in LEA organisational inspections.
Why used?	This judgement is the summative judgement of the overall effectiveness of the LEA and takes account of the findings against the other 51 inspection criteria.
For which year?	The JRS grade from the most recent inspection of the LEA.
Source:	LEA inspections.
Gathered by:	Ofsted.
What data?	<b>5a.2</b> JRS 45 'The speed, transparency and effectiveness of decision- making (particularly financial decision-making)' (before January 2004) JRS 1.3 'The effectiveness of LEA decision-making' (after January 2004)
Covering what?	Inspection judgement against Ofsted criteria in LEA organisational inspections.
Why used?	This judgement evaluates the effectiveness of corporate decision-making and is used as a performance measure as it reports on the speed and transparency of decisions made by members and executive officers.
For which year?	The JRS grade from the most recent inspection of the LEA.
Source:	LEA inspections.
Gathered by:	Ofsted.
What data?	<b>5a.3</b> and <b>5a.4</b> JRS 36 and JRS 34 'School places and admissions' (before January 2004) JRS 2.9 and JRS 2.10 'School places and admissions' (after January 2004)
Covering what?	The effectiveness of the LEA, in relation to the provision of school places (JRS 34/JRS 2.9) and in relation to admissions to schools (JRS 36/JRS 2.10) – inspection judgements against Ofsted criteria in LEA organisational inspections. Each indicator is weighted at 0.5 when used to calculate overall aspect or perspective scores.
Why used?	These judgements evaluate effectiveness in making good provision to ensure that there are sufficient, appropriate, places in schools and that arrangements for admissions operate smoothly.
For which year?	The JRS grades from the most recent inspection of the LEA.
Source:	LEA inspections.
Gathered by:	Ofsted.

Aspect	5. Strategic management
Perspective	<b>b. Indications of improvement</b>
Comments on the element	There are no indicators in this element.

Aspect	5. Strategic management
Perspective	<b>c. Capacity to make further improvement</b>
Comments on the element	Three indicators are used to reflect the capacity to make further improvement in strategic management.
What data?	<b>5c.1</b> JRS 51 'The capacity of the LEA to make further improvement' (before January 2004) JRS 0.3 'The LEA's capacity for further improvement and to address the recommendations of the inspection' (after January 2004)
Covering what?	Inspection judgement against Ofsted criteria in LEA organisational inspections.
Why used?	This judgement evaluates the LEA's capacity to make further improvement and to respond to the recommendations made in its last inspection report. In making this judgement, inspectors consider their findings about capacity in the LEA services and functions, and the structures in place in the LEA to secure continuous improvement.
For which year?	The JRS grade from the most recent inspection of the LEA.
Source:	LEA inspections.
Gathered by:	Ofsted.
What data?	<b>5c.2</b> JRS 7 'The extent to which the LEA has in place effective strategies to promote continuous improvement, including best value' (before January 2004) JRS 1.5 'The extend to which the LEA has in place effective strategies to promote continuous improvement, including best value' (after January 2004)
Covering what?	Inspection judgement against Ofsted criteria in LEA organisational inspections.
Why used?	This judgement evaluates the LEA's capacity to improve by inspecting its mechanisms to promote continuous improvement.
For which year?	The JRS grade from the most recent inspection of the LEA.
Source:	LEA inspections.
Gathered by:	Ofsted.
What data?	<b>5c.3</b> The national ranking for the percentage of schools graded V or G overall in school inspections
Covering what?	This indicator is a composite of maintained mainstream school inspection grades and is published annually in the LEA statistical profile. Grades for schools that have been closed since their inspection(s) are removed from the calculation.
Why used?	An LEA with a high percentage of schools which are graded very good or good overall has a secure base upon which to build to make further improvement. An LEA with a low percentage of these schools may have greater potential to improve, but its capacity to improve is not proven.
For which year?	The data are taken from the Ofsted database and cover all school inspections up to July 2004. Please note: Due to the change in the school inspection framework introduced September 2003, a different methodology has been used to calculate school level 'V, G, S, U' categories.
Source:	Returns made by school inspectors.
Gathered by:	Ofsted.
Thresholds	1 ≥ 83.33 > 2 ≥ 77.55 > 3 ≥ 67.77 > 4 ≥ 57.30 > 5

## **Annex A**

### **Education CPA aims and principles**

**Aim:** to publish robust, up-to-date and comprehensive information for authorities and the public on the current performance of education services in each locality, and the capacity of authorities to improve those services.

#### **Principles governing methodology:**

Must promote high standards by incentivising authorities to improve services

Must be fair and agreed by stakeholders as such

Must be readily understood by professionals and the public

Must be capable of registering verifiable improvement year on year in consistent ways

Must also be capable of modification to allow for changes in policy/new indicators

#### **Objectives which follow from principles:**

Indicators should offer robust, valid and reliable measures of performance

Indicators should be relevant and effective in securing improved services

Indicators should be in public domain or already known to the LEA concerned

The treatment of contextual factors (including any decision to disregard them) must be transparent

Methodology for determining category of performance should be criterion-referenced

Meaning of categories should be intuitively clear to the 'lay' reader

## Annex B

### Changes to the 2004 Education CPA

The changes fall into three categories:

- I. School inspection data. The education CPA methodology used four composite indicators in 2002 and 2003. These were:
  - The percentage of schools graded good or very good for management and efficiency;
  - The percentage of schools graded good or very good for climate;
  - The percentage of schools with good or very good inspections for the foundation stage; &
  - The percentage of schools graded good or very good overall.

Each composite indicator was constructed using the data from a number of school inspection judgements. A new framework for school inspections was introduced in September 2003. This has resulted in some changes to the type of inspection judgements collected by Ofsted. As a result of the new framework, it is not possible to use school inspection data collected after the new framework was introduced in the same way as inspection data before the new framework for creating the composite indicators. Consequently, a minor change in the construction of the composite indicators is necessary to accommodate this.

- II. LEA inspection data. Similarly, the LEA inspection framework (and judgements made) was revised from January 2004. Two changes impact on education CPA:
  - Old JRS 25 – ‘the effectiveness of the performance management of services to support school improvement’. The closest comparison is to be used, which judges the planning and provision of services supporting school improvement, particularly inspection and advisory and/or school effectiveness services.
  - Old JRS 27 – ‘the effectiveness of services to school improvement’. The closest comparison is to be used, which judges the effectiveness and value for money of services supporting school improvement, particularly inspection and advisory and/or school effectiveness services.

Re-numbering of JRS was also effected.



- III. Participation in education and training of young people aged 16 and 17 data. Two changes have been made to the way these data are calculated from those used in CPA previously. The first change is the use of post-2001 census population estimates to produce the percentages. The second change is availability of data by the LEA of residence of 16 and 17 year-olds, and not just by the LEA of the school attended. This is the first year in which we have pupil level information for students in maintained schools derived from PLASC (pupil level annual schools census) data. Again, this is a technical change, and one which will improve the methodology as it is a better and more informative performance indicator.

The paragraphs below explain the changes in more detail.

## Changes to school related composites

### ***Combining old and new composite judgements***

1. The 2004 CPA education profile uses four composite indicators. These are:
  - (1C1) - The percentage of schools graded good or very good for management and efficiency
  - (3C3) - The percentage of schools graded good or very good for climate
  - (4A2) - The percentage of schools with good or very good inspections for the foundation stage
  - (5C3) - The percentage of schools graded good or very good overall
2. For 2004, the data will be drawn from school inspection judgements from September 1998 up to July 2004, using the **most recent** inspection data for each open school in each authority.
3. A new framework for school inspections was introduced in September 2003. This has resulted in some changes to the type of inspection evidence collected by Ofsted. As a result it is not possible to use school inspection evidence collected after September 2003 in the same way as previously for creating the composite indicators. This is because the range of inspection judgements used for the pre-September 2003 composite performance indicators does not match precisely the range of post-September 2003 inspection judgements. In order to ensure fair comparison between all LEAs, it is therefore necessary to use broadly comparable judgements drawn from post-September 2003 inspections to develop new composite performance indicators. Therefore, we have differentiated between pre- and post- September 2003 school inspection evidence for these indicators as follows.

### *Pre – September 2003 framework inspection evidence*

4. Each composite indicator is constructed using the data from a number of school inspection judgements (set out in Table A). For example, the foundation stage indicator (4A2) is created using six judgements, each graded on a 1-7 scale. These judgements are combined into a single score using a statistical process, which then converts that score into the relevant category of V (very good), G (good), S (satisfactory) or U (unsatisfactory)

### *Post – September 2003 framework inspection evidence*

5. Two different methodological changes are necessary to produce the composite indicators.

### *The foundation stage indicator (4A2)*

6. For the foundation stage indicator, the six judgments that were used previously to create the school level 'V, G, S, U' categories have now been reduced to five (set out in Table B). The same statistical process (see paragraph 4 above) is used to create a single, school-level score, which

that process then converts into the relevant category of V, G, S or U.

*The management and efficiency, climate and overall composites*

7. The composite score, graded 1-7, is produced by the inspection team qualitatively based on a set of judgements together with other evidence (Please see Table B). This superseded the use of statistical methods to calculate the composite score pre September 2003.
8. The composite score is then converted into the relevant category of 'V G S U' as follows:

Score	Category
1 or 2	V
3	G
4	S
5, 6 or 7	U

*How these composites feed into the 2004 CPA model*

9. The total number of schools falling into V or G categories under each framework (Pre and post September 2003 frameworks) are combined as follows

	<b>Total no of schools with V G S U categories</b>	<b>Count V</b>	<b>Count G</b>	<b>% V</b>	<b>% G</b>	<b>Total %</b>
Pre-Sept 2003	100	30	40	-	-	-
Post-Sept 2003	25	10	5	-	-	-
<b>Combined for 2004 CPA model</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>68%*</b>

\* Figure used in the scorecard

10. Because of the changes to the data, performance in 2004 is not comparable to the previous year's data. It is therefore not possible to allocate scores using the criteria-referencing approach adopted in 2003 (which used the basis of how LEAs performed against the standards set in 2002 for each indicator). The composite indicators will be norm-referenced, as opposed to being criteria-referenced. Whereas the categories of performance (V, G, S, U) for each of the three composites have remained consistent, the methodology to allocate these categories to each of the composites has changed significantly (quantative composites derived from statistical methods have been replaced by qualitative composites produced by the inspection team). This methodological change to these indicators therefore makes it necessary for them to be norm-referenced, as opposed to criteria-referenced. This means that scores of 1-5 will be bases on 10:20:40:20:10 split in relative rankings.

**Table A – Inspection Judgements used from pre-September 2003 framework**

<b>Composite</b>	<b>Inspection Judgements used</b>
Management and Efficiency (1C1)	7A The leadership and management of the head teacher and key staff 7B Effectiveness of the governing body in fulfilling its responsibilities 7C Monitoring and evaluation of the school's performance and taking effective action 7D Strategic use of resources, including specific grant and other funding 7E The extent to which the principles of best value are applied 1E Value for money provided by the school
School's Climate (3C3)	2C Attitudes to the school 2D Behaviour, including the incidence of exclusions 2E Personal development and relationships 2F Attendance 4C Provision for personal, including SMSC, development 5A Procedures for child protection and for ensuring pupils' welfare
Overall (5C3)	This composite is a combination of the following composites: Standards Achieved Quality of Education Management & Efficiency
Foundation Stage Indicator (4A2)	Inspection judgments for the foundation element (i.e. under 5's/pre KS1) from the following areas: 2A Standards of work seen 2B How well pupils achieve 3A Teaching 3B Learning 4A The quality and range of learning opportunities 4B Appropriate statutory curriculum in place

**Table B – Inspection Judgements used from post-September 2003 framework**

The inspection team used a set of judgements, listed below, together with other evidence to produce the composite.

<b>Pre September 2003 Composite</b>	<b>Post September 2003 Inspection Judgements - Composite</b>	<b>Supplementary evidence used by inspection team to produce composite</b>
Management and Efficiency (1C1)	1E Leadership and management of the school	8A The governance of the school 8B The leadership of the headteacher 8C The leadership of other key staff 8D The effectiveness of management
School's Climate (3C3)	1F Pupils' attitudes, values and other personal qualities	3J Attendance 3L Attitudes 3M Behaviour, including the extent of exclusions 3N Pupils' spiritual, moral, social and cultural development
Overall (5C3)	1H The overall effectiveness of the school	1G How inclusive the school is 1J How the school's effectiveness has changed since its last inspection 1M Value for money provided by the school
Foundation Stage Indicator (4A2)	Inspection judgements for the foundation element (i.e under 5's/pre KS1) from the following areas:  3A Pupils' achievement 3B Standards of work seen 4A Teaching 4B Learning 5A Breadth of curricular opportunities	

## **Changes to participation in education and training of young people aged 16 and 17**

11. The DfES – which produces these data – has made two changes to the way these data are calculated. The first change is the use of post-2001 census population estimates to produce the percentages. The second change is availability of data by the LEA of residence of 16 and 17 year-olds and not just by the LEA of the school attended. This residence data is now available, because this is the first year in which we have pupil level annual schools census (PLASC).
  
12. As this performance indicator (PI) already uses residence-based information for those 16 and 17 year olds in Further Education, and in Learning Skills Council-funded Work Based Learning, the change to use information on young people who attend maintained schools by their LEA of residence will make this PI a more accurate reflection of the participation in education and training of 16 and 17 year olds who live in a borough and thus of an LEA's performance in encouraging pupils to stay on in education or training.
  
13. Both changes mean that the data used in education CPA 2004 will not be comparable with previous years' data, and scores of 1-5 will be based on the 10:20:40:20:10 split in relative rankings.

## Changes to Judgement Recording Statement scores

14. As a consequence of the new LEA inspection framework (from January 2004), JRSs have been re-numbered and revised as shown in table C below.

Table C

CPA Indicator	JRS used for LEAs inspected before January 2004	JRS used for LEAs inspected from January 2004
1_A6	<b>JRS 14</b> - support to schools for raising standards in curriculum use of ICT	<b>JRS 3.3</b> - support for information and communication technology
1_A7	<b>JRS 4</b> - effectiveness of strategy for school improvement	<b>JRS 2.1</b> - LEA's strategy for school improvement
1_A8	<b>JRS 1</b> (Context) - <b>JRS 2</b> (Performance)	<b>JRS 1</b> (socio-economic context of LEA) - <b>JRS 2.3</b> (performance of schools)
2_A1	<b>JRS 30</b> - effectiveness of LEA in meeting statutory obligations	<b>JRS 4.2</b> - effectiveness of LEA in meeting statutory obligations in respect of SEN
3_A5	<b>JRS 39</b> - LEA support for behaviour	<b>JRS 5.4</b> - support for behaviour in school
3_A6	<b>JRS 16</b> - support for EM and Traveller children	<b>JRS 3.5</b> - support for raising the achievement of minority ethnic pupils, including Traveller children
5_A1	<b>JRS 52</b> - overall effectiveness of the LEA	<b>JRS 0.2</b> - overall effectiveness of the LEA
5_A2	<b>JRS 45</b> - effectiveness of decision making	<b>JRS 1.3</b> - effectiveness of LEA decision-making
5_A3	<b>JRS 34</b> - extent to which LEA meets its requirements (places)	<b>JRS 2.9</b> - effectiveness of LEA in relation to the provision of school places
5_A4	<b>JRS 36</b> - extent to which LEA meets its requirements (admissions)	<b>JRS 2.10</b> - effectiveness of LEA in relation to admissions to schools
1_B9	<b>JRS 5</b> - progress in implementing strategy for school improvement	<b>JRS 2.2</b> - progress on implementing the LEA's strategy for school improvement
2_B1	<b>JRS31</b> - effectiveness in exercising functions to support school improvement	<b>JRS 4.3</b> - effectiveness of LEA in exercising its SEN functions to support school improvement
1_C2	<b>JRS 6</b> - allocation of resources to priorities	<b>JRS 1.4</b> - extend to which LEA targets resources on priorities
1_C3	<b>JRS 25</b> - performance management of services to support school improvement	<b>JRS 3.10</b> ( <i>JRS 3.11</i> ) - planning and provision of services supporting school improvement
1_C4	<b>JRS 27</b> - effectiveness of services to support school improvement	<b>JRS 3.11</b> ( <i>JRS 3.12</i> ) - effectiveness & value for money of services supporting school improvement
2_C1	<b>JRS 29</b> - effectiveness of strategy for SEN	<b>JRS 4.1</b> - effectiveness of LEA's strategy for SEN
3_C1	<b>JRS 33</b> - overall effectiveness of the LEA in promoting social inclusion	<b>JRS 5.1</b> - overall effectiveness of LEA's strategy for promoting social inclusion
3_C2	<b>JRS 42</b> - effectiveness of the LEA in combating racism	<b>JRS 5.7</b> - effectiveness of LEA in promoting racial equality
4_C1	<b>JRS 49</b> - effectiveness of the co-ordination of actions in support of priorities	<b>JRS 1.8</b> - effectiveness of partnerships and collaboration between agencies in support of priorities
5_C1	<b>JRS 51</b> - capacity of the LEA to improve	<b>JRS 0.3</b> - LEA's capacity for further improvement and to address recommendations of the inspection
5_C2	<b>JRS 7</b> - effectiveness of strategies to promote continuous improvement	<b>JRS 1.5</b> - extent to which LEA has in place effective strategies to promote continuous improvement, including Best Value

For 1\_C3 and 1\_C4, the JRS in italics are the Spring 2004 equivalents

# ANNEX C

# 2004 EDUCATION CPA PROFILE FOR PRE-JAN 2004 INSPECTIONS

## 2004 Comprehensive Performance Assessment - An Anonymous LEA

### Current Performance ( A )

### Improvement ( B )

### Capacity ( C )

	Current Performance ( A )	Improvement ( B )	Capacity ( C )																																																																														
<b>School Improvement (1)</b>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Label</th> <th>Weights</th> <th>Indicator</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1_A1</td> <td>1</td> <td>Percentage of schools causing concern (excluding inadequate sixth forms)*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_A2</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>2003 KS2 English Average Point Score*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_A3</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>2003 KS2 Mathematics Average Point Score*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_A4</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>2003 KS2-KS3 VA*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_A5</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>2003 KS3-GCSE VA*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_A6</td> <td>1</td> <td>JRS 14 - support to schools for raising standards in curriculum use of ICT</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_A7</td> <td>1</td> <td>JRS 4 - effectiveness of strategy for school improvement</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_A8</td> <td>1</td> <td>JRS 1 (Context) - JRS 2 (Performance)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Label	Weights	Indicator	1_A1	1	Percentage of schools causing concern (excluding inadequate sixth forms)*	1_A2	0.5	2003 KS2 English Average Point Score*	1_A3	0.5	2003 KS2 Mathematics Average Point Score*	1_A4	0.5	2003 KS2-KS3 VA*	1_A5	0.5	2003 KS3-GCSE VA*	1_A6	1	JRS 14 - support to schools for raising standards in curriculum use of ICT	1_A7	1	JRS 4 - effectiveness of strategy for school improvement	1_A8	1	JRS 1 (Context) - JRS 2 (Performance)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Label</th> <th>Weights</th> <th>Indicator</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1_B1</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>Percentage of primary schools causing concern Trend (2002 to 2004)*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_B2</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>Percentage of secondary schools causing concern (excluding inadequate sixth forms) Trend (2002 to 2004)*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_B3</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>KS2 English Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_B4</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>KS2 Mathematics Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_B5</td> <td>0.11</td> <td>KS3 English Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_B6</td> <td>0.11</td> <td>KS3 Mathematics Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_B7</td> <td>0.11</td> <td>KS3 Science Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_B8</td> <td>0.67</td> <td>GCSE Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_B9</td> <td>1</td> <td>JRS 5 - progress in implementing strategy for school improvement</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_B10</td> <td>1</td> <td>GCSE 5+ A*-C Percentage Trend (Schools &lt;25% in 1999) (2001 to 2003)*</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Label	Weights	Indicator	1_B1	0.5	Percentage of primary schools causing concern Trend (2002 to 2004)*	1_B2	0.5	Percentage of secondary schools causing concern (excluding inadequate sixth forms) Trend (2002 to 2004)*	1_B3	0.5	KS2 English Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*	1_B4	0.5	KS2 Mathematics Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*	1_B5	0.11	KS3 English Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*	1_B6	0.11	KS3 Mathematics Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*	1_B7	0.11	KS3 Science Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*	1_B8	0.67	GCSE Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*	1_B9	1	JRS 5 - progress in implementing strategy for school improvement	1_B10	1	GCSE 5+ A*-C Percentage Trend (Schools <25% in 1999) (2001 to 2003)*	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Label</th> <th>Weights</th> <th>Indicator</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1_C1</td> <td>1</td> <td>Percentage of schools graded V or G for management and efficiency</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_C2</td> <td>1</td> <td>JRS 6 - allocation of resources to priorities</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_C3</td> <td>1</td> <td>JRS 25 - performance management of services to support school improvement</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_C4</td> <td>1</td> <td>JRS 27 - effectiveness of services to support school improvement</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_C5</td> <td>1</td> <td>EDP Grade</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Label	Weights	Indicator	1_C1	1	Percentage of schools graded V or G for management and efficiency	1_C2	1	JRS 6 - allocation of resources to priorities	1_C3	1	JRS 25 - performance management of services to support school improvement	1_C4	1	JRS 27 - effectiveness of services to support school improvement	1_C5	1	EDP Grade
Label	Weights	Indicator																																																																															
1_A1	1	Percentage of schools causing concern (excluding inadequate sixth forms)*																																																																															
1_A2	0.5	2003 KS2 English Average Point Score*																																																																															
1_A3	0.5	2003 KS2 Mathematics Average Point Score*																																																																															
1_A4	0.5	2003 KS2-KS3 VA*																																																																															
1_A5	0.5	2003 KS3-GCSE VA*																																																																															
1_A6	1	JRS 14 - support to schools for raising standards in curriculum use of ICT																																																																															
1_A7	1	JRS 4 - effectiveness of strategy for school improvement																																																																															
1_A8	1	JRS 1 (Context) - JRS 2 (Performance)																																																																															
Label	Weights	Indicator																																																																															
1_B1	0.5	Percentage of primary schools causing concern Trend (2002 to 2004)*																																																																															
1_B2	0.5	Percentage of secondary schools causing concern (excluding inadequate sixth forms) Trend (2002 to 2004)*																																																																															
1_B3	0.5	KS2 English Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*																																																																															
1_B4	0.5	KS2 Mathematics Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*																																																																															
1_B5	0.11	KS3 English Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*																																																																															
1_B6	0.11	KS3 Mathematics Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*																																																																															
1_B7	0.11	KS3 Science Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*																																																																															
1_B8	0.67	GCSE Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*																																																																															
1_B9	1	JRS 5 - progress in implementing strategy for school improvement																																																																															
1_B10	1	GCSE 5+ A*-C Percentage Trend (Schools <25% in 1999) (2001 to 2003)*																																																																															
Label	Weights	Indicator																																																																															
1_C1	1	Percentage of schools graded V or G for management and efficiency																																																																															
1_C2	1	JRS 6 - allocation of resources to priorities																																																																															
1_C3	1	JRS 25 - performance management of services to support school improvement																																																																															
1_C4	1	JRS 27 - effectiveness of services to support school improvement																																																																															
1_C5	1	EDP Grade																																																																															
<b>Special Educational Needs (2)</b>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Label</th> <th>Weights</th> <th>Indicator</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2_A1</td> <td>1</td> <td>JRS 30 - effectiveness of LEA in meeting statutory obligations</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2_A2</td> <td>1</td> <td>Percentage of pupils for whom a statement is issued for the first time within 18 weeks*</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Label	Weights	Indicator	2_A1	1	JRS 30 - effectiveness of LEA in meeting statutory obligations	2_A2	1	Percentage of pupils for whom a statement is issued for the first time within 18 weeks*	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Label</th> <th>Weights</th> <th>Indicator</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2_B1</td> <td>1</td> <td>JRS31 - effectiveness in exercising functions to support school improvement</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Label	Weights	Indicator	2_B1	1	JRS31 - effectiveness in exercising functions to support school improvement	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Label</th> <th>Weights</th> <th>Indicator</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2_C1</td> <td>1</td> <td>JRS 29 - effectiveness of strategy for SEN</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Label	Weights	Indicator	2_C1	1	JRS 29 - effectiveness of strategy for SEN																																																									
Label	Weights	Indicator																																																																															
2_A1	1	JRS 30 - effectiveness of LEA in meeting statutory obligations																																																																															
2_A2	1	Percentage of pupils for whom a statement is issued for the first time within 18 weeks*																																																																															
Label	Weights	Indicator																																																																															
2_B1	1	JRS31 - effectiveness in exercising functions to support school improvement																																																																															
Label	Weights	Indicator																																																																															
2_C1	1	JRS 29 - effectiveness of strategy for SEN																																																																															
<b>Social Inclusion (3)</b>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Label</th> <th>Weights</th> <th>Indicator</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3_A1</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>2004 Primary Attendance Rate*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3_A2</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>2004 Secondary Attendance Rate*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3_A3</td> <td>1</td> <td>2003 GCSE 1+ A*-G Percentage (children in public care)*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3_A4</td> <td>1</td> <td>2003 GCSE 1+ A*-G Percentage*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3_A5</td> <td>1</td> <td>JRS 39 - LEA support for behaviour</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3_A6</td> <td>1</td> <td>JRS 16 - support for EM and Traveller children</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Label	Weights	Indicator	3_A1	0.5	2004 Primary Attendance Rate*	3_A2	0.5	2004 Secondary Attendance Rate*	3_A3	1	2003 GCSE 1+ A*-G Percentage (children in public care)*	3_A4	1	2003 GCSE 1+ A*-G Percentage*	3_A5	1	JRS 39 - LEA support for behaviour	3_A6	1	JRS 16 - support for EM and Traveller children	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Label</th> <th>Weights</th> <th>Indicator</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3_B1</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>Primary Attendance Rate Trend (2002 to 2004)*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3_B2</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>Secondary Attendance Rate Trend (2002 to 2004)*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3_B3</td> <td>1</td> <td>Percentage of pupils receiving alternative tuition reintegrated into schools*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3_B4</td> <td>1</td> <td>GCSE 1+ A*-G percentage Trend (2001 to 2003)*</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Label	Weights	Indicator	3_B1	0.5	Primary Attendance Rate Trend (2002 to 2004)*	3_B2	0.5	Secondary Attendance Rate Trend (2002 to 2004)*	3_B3	1	Percentage of pupils receiving alternative tuition reintegrated into schools*	3_B4	1	GCSE 1+ A*-G percentage Trend (2001 to 2003)*	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Label</th> <th>Weights</th> <th>Indicator</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3_C1</td> <td>1</td> <td>JRS 33 - overall effectiveness of the LEA in promoting social inclusion</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3_C2</td> <td>1</td> <td>JRS 42 - effectiveness of the LEA in combating racism</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3_C3</td> <td>1</td> <td>Percentage of schools graded V or G for climate</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Label	Weights	Indicator	3_C1	1	JRS 33 - overall effectiveness of the LEA in promoting social inclusion	3_C2	1	JRS 42 - effectiveness of the LEA in combating racism	3_C3	1	Percentage of schools graded V or G for climate																														
Label	Weights	Indicator																																																																															
3_A1	0.5	2004 Primary Attendance Rate*																																																																															
3_A2	0.5	2004 Secondary Attendance Rate*																																																																															
3_A3	1	2003 GCSE 1+ A*-G Percentage (children in public care)*																																																																															
3_A4	1	2003 GCSE 1+ A*-G Percentage*																																																																															
3_A5	1	JRS 39 - LEA support for behaviour																																																																															
3_A6	1	JRS 16 - support for EM and Traveller children																																																																															
Label	Weights	Indicator																																																																															
3_B1	0.5	Primary Attendance Rate Trend (2002 to 2004)*																																																																															
3_B2	0.5	Secondary Attendance Rate Trend (2002 to 2004)*																																																																															
3_B3	1	Percentage of pupils receiving alternative tuition reintegrated into schools*																																																																															
3_B4	1	GCSE 1+ A*-G percentage Trend (2001 to 2003)*																																																																															
Label	Weights	Indicator																																																																															
3_C1	1	JRS 33 - overall effectiveness of the LEA in promoting social inclusion																																																																															
3_C2	1	JRS 42 - effectiveness of the LEA in combating racism																																																																															
3_C3	1	Percentage of schools graded V or G for climate																																																																															
<b>Life Long Learning (4)</b>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Label</th> <th>Weights</th> <th>Indicator</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4_A1</td> <td>1</td> <td>16-17 year old participation rates in education and training</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4_A2</td> <td>1</td> <td>Insp judgements for Percentatge V, G provision for foundation stage</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Label	Weights	Indicator	4_A1	1	16-17 year old participation rates in education and training	4_A2	1	Insp judgements for Percentatge V, G provision for foundation stage	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Label</th> <th>Weights</th> <th>Indicator</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3">No Indicators</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Label	Weights	Indicator	No Indicators			<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Label</th> <th>Weights</th> <th>Indicator</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4_C1</td> <td>1</td> <td>JRS 49 - effectiveness of the co-ordination of actions in support of priorities</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Label	Weights	Indicator	4_C1	1	JRS 49 - effectiveness of the co-ordination of actions in support of priorities																																																									
Label	Weights	Indicator																																																																															
4_A1	1	16-17 year old participation rates in education and training																																																																															
4_A2	1	Insp judgements for Percentatge V, G provision for foundation stage																																																																															
Label	Weights	Indicator																																																																															
No Indicators																																																																																	
Label	Weights	Indicator																																																																															
4_C1	1	JRS 49 - effectiveness of the co-ordination of actions in support of priorities																																																																															
<b>Strategic Management of Education (5)</b>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Label</th> <th>Weights</th> <th>Indicator</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>5_A1</td> <td>1</td> <td>JRS 52 - overall effectiveness of the LEA</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5_A2</td> <td>1</td> <td>JRS 45 - effectiveness of decision making</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5_A3</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>JRS 34 - extent to which LEA meets its requirements (places)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5_A4</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>JRS 36 - extent to which LEA meets its requirements (admissions)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Label	Weights	Indicator	5_A1	1	JRS 52 - overall effectiveness of the LEA	5_A2	1	JRS 45 - effectiveness of decision making	5_A3	0.5	JRS 34 - extent to which LEA meets its requirements (places)	5_A4	0.5	JRS 36 - extent to which LEA meets its requirements (admissions)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Label</th> <th>Weights</th> <th>Indicator</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3">No Indicators</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Label	Weights	Indicator	No Indicators			<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Label</th> <th>Weights</th> <th>Indicator</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>5_C1</td> <td>1</td> <td>JRS 51 - capacity of the LEA to improve</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5_C2</td> <td>1</td> <td>JRS 7 - effectiveness of strategies to promote continuous improvement</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5_C3</td> <td>1</td> <td>Percentage of schools graded V or G overall</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Label	Weights	Indicator	5_C1	1	JRS 51 - capacity of the LEA to improve	5_C2	1	JRS 7 - effectiveness of strategies to promote continuous improvement	5_C3	1	Percentage of schools graded V or G overall																																													
Label	Weights	Indicator																																																																															
5_A1	1	JRS 52 - overall effectiveness of the LEA																																																																															
5_A2	1	JRS 45 - effectiveness of decision making																																																																															
5_A3	0.5	JRS 34 - extent to which LEA meets its requirements (places)																																																																															
5_A4	0.5	JRS 36 - extent to which LEA meets its requirements (admissions)																																																																															
Label	Weights	Indicator																																																																															
No Indicators																																																																																	
Label	Weights	Indicator																																																																															
5_C1	1	JRS 51 - capacity of the LEA to improve																																																																															
5_C2	1	JRS 7 - effectiveness of strategies to promote continuous improvement																																																																															
5_C3	1	Percentage of schools graded V or G overall																																																																															

#### 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](http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/lea)

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

- = Not applicable

**BOLD** = changes to the model for 2004



# 2004 EDUCATION CPA PROFILE FOR 2004 INSPECTIONS

## 2004 Comprehensive Performance Assessment - An Anonymous LEA

### Current Performance ( A )

### Improvement ( B )

### Capacity ( C )

	Current Performance ( A )	Improvement ( B )	Capacity ( C )																																																																														
School Improvement (1)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Label</th> <th>Weights</th> <th>Indicator</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1_A1</td> <td>1</td> <td>Percentage of schools causing concern (excluding inadequate sixth forms)*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_A2</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>2003 KS2 English Average Point Score*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_A3</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>2003 KS2 Mathematics Average Point Score*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_A4</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>2003 KS2-KS3 VA*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_A5</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>2003 KS3-GCSE VA*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_A6</td> <td>1</td> <td><b>JRS 3.3 - support for information and communication technology</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_A7</td> <td>1</td> <td><b>JRS 2.1 - LEA's strategy for school improvement</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_A8</td> <td>1</td> <td><b>JRS 1 (socio-economic context of LEA) - JRS 2.3 (performance of schools)</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Label	Weights	Indicator	1_A1	1	Percentage of schools causing concern (excluding inadequate sixth forms)*	1_A2	0.5	2003 KS2 English Average Point Score*	1_A3	0.5	2003 KS2 Mathematics Average Point Score*	1_A4	0.5	2003 KS2-KS3 VA*	1_A5	0.5	2003 KS3-GCSE VA*	1_A6	1	<b>JRS 3.3 - support for information and communication technology</b>	1_A7	1	<b>JRS 2.1 - LEA's strategy for school improvement</b>	1_A8	1	<b>JRS 1 (socio-economic context of LEA) - JRS 2.3 (performance of schools)</b>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Label</th> <th>Weights</th> <th>Indicator</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1_B1</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>Percentage of primary schools causing concern Trend (2002 to 2004)*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_B2</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>Percentage of secondary schools causing concern (excluding inadequate sixth forms) Trend (2002 to 2004)*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_B3</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>KS2 English Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_B4</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>KS2 Mathematics Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_B5</td> <td>0.11</td> <td>KS3 English Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_B6</td> <td>0.11</td> <td>KS3 Mathematics Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_B7</td> <td>0.11</td> <td>KS3 Science Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_B8</td> <td>0.67</td> <td>GCSE Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_B9</td> <td>1</td> <td><b>JRS 2.2 - progress on implementing the LEA's strategy for school improvement</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_B10</td> <td>1</td> <td>GCSE 5+ A*-C Percentage Trend (Schools &lt;25% in 1999) (2001 to 2003)*</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Label	Weights	Indicator	1_B1	0.5	Percentage of primary schools causing concern Trend (2002 to 2004)*	1_B2	0.5	Percentage of secondary schools causing concern (excluding inadequate sixth forms) Trend (2002 to 2004)*	1_B3	0.5	KS2 English Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*	1_B4	0.5	KS2 Mathematics Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*	1_B5	0.11	KS3 English Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*	1_B6	0.11	KS3 Mathematics Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*	1_B7	0.11	KS3 Science Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*	1_B8	0.67	GCSE Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*	1_B9	1	<b>JRS 2.2 - progress on implementing the LEA's strategy for school improvement</b>	1_B10	1	GCSE 5+ A*-C Percentage Trend (Schools <25% in 1999) (2001 to 2003)*	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Label</th> <th>Weights</th> <th>Indicator</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1_C1</td> <td>1</td> <td>Percentage of schools graded V or G for management and efficiency</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_C2</td> <td>1</td> <td><b>JRS 1.4 - extend to which LEA targets resources on priorities</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_C3</td> <td>1</td> <td><b>JRS 3.11 (JRS 3.10) - planning and provision of services supporting school improvement</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_C4</td> <td>1</td> <td><b>JRS 3.12 (JRS 3.11) - effectiveness &amp; value for money of services supporting school improvement</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1_C5</td> <td>1</td> <td>EDP Grade</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Label	Weights	Indicator	1_C1	1	Percentage of schools graded V or G for management and efficiency	1_C2	1	<b>JRS 1.4 - extend to which LEA targets resources on priorities</b>	1_C3	1	<b>JRS 3.11 (JRS 3.10) - planning and provision of services supporting school improvement</b>	1_C4	1	<b>JRS 3.12 (JRS 3.11) - effectiveness &amp; value for money of services supporting school improvement</b>	1_C5	1	EDP Grade
Label	Weights	Indicator																																																																															
1_A1	1	Percentage of schools causing concern (excluding inadequate sixth forms)*																																																																															
1_A2	0.5	2003 KS2 English Average Point Score*																																																																															
1_A3	0.5	2003 KS2 Mathematics Average Point Score*																																																																															
1_A4	0.5	2003 KS2-KS3 VA*																																																																															
1_A5	0.5	2003 KS3-GCSE VA*																																																																															
1_A6	1	<b>JRS 3.3 - support for information and communication technology</b>																																																																															
1_A7	1	<b>JRS 2.1 - LEA's strategy for school improvement</b>																																																																															
1_A8	1	<b>JRS 1 (socio-economic context of LEA) - JRS 2.3 (performance of schools)</b>																																																																															
Label	Weights	Indicator																																																																															
1_B1	0.5	Percentage of primary schools causing concern Trend (2002 to 2004)*																																																																															
1_B2	0.5	Percentage of secondary schools causing concern (excluding inadequate sixth forms) Trend (2002 to 2004)*																																																																															
1_B3	0.5	KS2 English Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*																																																																															
1_B4	0.5	KS2 Mathematics Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*																																																																															
1_B5	0.11	KS3 English Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*																																																																															
1_B6	0.11	KS3 Mathematics Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*																																																																															
1_B7	0.11	KS3 Science Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*																																																																															
1_B8	0.67	GCSE Average Point Score Trend (2001 to 2003)*																																																																															
1_B9	1	<b>JRS 2.2 - progress on implementing the LEA's strategy for school improvement</b>																																																																															
1_B10	1	GCSE 5+ A*-C Percentage Trend (Schools <25% in 1999) (2001 to 2003)*																																																																															
Label	Weights	Indicator																																																																															
1_C1	1	Percentage of schools graded V or G for management and efficiency																																																																															
1_C2	1	<b>JRS 1.4 - extend to which LEA targets resources on priorities</b>																																																																															
1_C3	1	<b>JRS 3.11 (JRS 3.10) - planning and provision of services supporting school improvement</b>																																																																															
1_C4	1	<b>JRS 3.12 (JRS 3.11) - effectiveness &amp; value for money of services supporting school improvement</b>																																																																															
1_C5	1	EDP Grade																																																																															
Special Educational Needs (2)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Label</th> <th>Weights</th> <th>Indicator</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2_A1</td> <td>1</td> <td><b>JRS 4.2 - effectiveness of LEA in meeting statutory obligations in respect of SEN</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2_A2</td> <td>1</td> <td>Percentage of pupils for whom a statement is issued for the first time within 18 weeks*</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Label	Weights	Indicator	2_A1	1	<b>JRS 4.2 - effectiveness of LEA in meeting statutory obligations in respect of SEN</b>	2_A2	1	Percentage of pupils for whom a statement is issued for the first time within 18 weeks*	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Label</th> <th>Weights</th> <th>Indicator</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2_B1</td> <td>1</td> <td><b>JRS 4.3 - effectiveness of LEA in exercising its SEN functions to support school improvement</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Label	Weights	Indicator	2_B1	1	<b>JRS 4.3 - effectiveness of LEA in exercising its SEN functions to support school improvement</b>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Label</th> <th>Weights</th> <th>Indicator</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2_C1</td> <td>1</td> <td><b>JRS 4.1 - effectiveness of LEA's strategy for SEN</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Label	Weights	Indicator	2_C1	1	<b>JRS 4.1 - effectiveness of LEA's strategy for SEN</b>																																																									
Label	Weights	Indicator																																																																															
2_A1	1	<b>JRS 4.2 - effectiveness of LEA in meeting statutory obligations in respect of SEN</b>																																																																															
2_A2	1	Percentage of pupils for whom a statement is issued for the first time within 18 weeks*																																																																															
Label	Weights	Indicator																																																																															
2_B1	1	<b>JRS 4.3 - effectiveness of LEA in exercising its SEN functions to support school improvement</b>																																																																															
Label	Weights	Indicator																																																																															
2_C1	1	<b>JRS 4.1 - effectiveness of LEA's strategy for SEN</b>																																																																															
Social Inclusion (3)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Label</th> <th>Weights</th> <th>Indicator</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3_A1</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>2004 Primary Attendance Rate*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3_A2</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>2004 Secondary Attendance Rate*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3_A3</td> <td>1</td> <td>2003 GCSE 1+ A*-G Percentage (children in public care)*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3_A4</td> <td>1</td> <td>2003 GCSE 1+ A*-G Percentage*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3_A5</td> <td>1</td> <td><b>JRS 5.4 - support for behaviour in school</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3_A6</td> <td>1</td> <td><b>JRS 3.5 - support for raising the achievement of minority ethnic pupils, including Traveller children</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Label	Weights	Indicator	3_A1	0.5	2004 Primary Attendance Rate*	3_A2	0.5	2004 Secondary Attendance Rate*	3_A3	1	2003 GCSE 1+ A*-G Percentage (children in public care)*	3_A4	1	2003 GCSE 1+ A*-G Percentage*	3_A5	1	<b>JRS 5.4 - support for behaviour in school</b>	3_A6	1	<b>JRS 3.5 - support for raising the achievement of minority ethnic pupils, including Traveller children</b>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Label</th> <th>Weights</th> <th>Indicator</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3_B1</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>Primary Attendance Rate Trend (2002 to 2004)*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3_B2</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>Secondary Attendance Rate Trend (2002 to 2004)*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3_B3</td> <td>1</td> <td>Percentage of pupils receiving alternative tuition reintegrated into schools*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3_B4</td> <td>1</td> <td>GCSE 1+ A*-G percentage Trend (2001 to 2003)*</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Label	Weights	Indicator	3_B1	0.5	Primary Attendance Rate Trend (2002 to 2004)*	3_B2	0.5	Secondary Attendance Rate Trend (2002 to 2004)*	3_B3	1	Percentage of pupils receiving alternative tuition reintegrated into schools*	3_B4	1	GCSE 1+ A*-G percentage Trend (2001 to 2003)*	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Label</th> <th>Weights</th> <th>Indicator</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3_C1</td> <td>1</td> <td><b>JRS 5.1 - overall effectiveness of LEA's strategy for promoting social inclusion</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3_C2</td> <td>1</td> <td><b>JRS 5.7 - effectiveness of LEA in promoting racial equality</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3_C3</td> <td>1</td> <td><b>Percentage of schools graded V or G for climate</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Label	Weights	Indicator	3_C1	1	<b>JRS 5.1 - overall effectiveness of LEA's strategy for promoting social inclusion</b>	3_C2	1	<b>JRS 5.7 - effectiveness of LEA in promoting racial equality</b>	3_C3	1	<b>Percentage of schools graded V or G for climate</b>																														
Label	Weights	Indicator																																																																															
3_A1	0.5	2004 Primary Attendance Rate*																																																																															
3_A2	0.5	2004 Secondary Attendance Rate*																																																																															
3_A3	1	2003 GCSE 1+ A*-G Percentage (children in public care)*																																																																															
3_A4	1	2003 GCSE 1+ A*-G Percentage*																																																																															
3_A5	1	<b>JRS 5.4 - support for behaviour in school</b>																																																																															
3_A6	1	<b>JRS 3.5 - support for raising the achievement of minority ethnic pupils, including Traveller children</b>																																																																															
Label	Weights	Indicator																																																																															
3_B1	0.5	Primary Attendance Rate Trend (2002 to 2004)*																																																																															
3_B2	0.5	Secondary Attendance Rate Trend (2002 to 2004)*																																																																															
3_B3	1	Percentage of pupils receiving alternative tuition reintegrated into schools*																																																																															
3_B4	1	GCSE 1+ A*-G percentage Trend (2001 to 2003)*																																																																															
Label	Weights	Indicator																																																																															
3_C1	1	<b>JRS 5.1 - overall effectiveness of LEA's strategy for promoting social inclusion</b>																																																																															
3_C2	1	<b>JRS 5.7 - effectiveness of LEA in promoting racial equality</b>																																																																															
3_C3	1	<b>Percentage of schools graded V or G for climate</b>																																																																															
Life Long Learning (4)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Label</th> <th>Weights</th> <th>Indicator</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4_A1</td> <td>1</td> <td>16-17 year old participation rates in education and training</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4_A2</td> <td>1</td> <td>Insp judgements for Percenatge V, G provision for foundation stage</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Label	Weights	Indicator	4_A1	1	16-17 year old participation rates in education and training	4_A2	1	Insp judgements for Percenatge V, G provision for foundation stage	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Label</th> <th>Weights</th> <th>Indicator</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3">No Indicators</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Label	Weights	Indicator	No Indicators			<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Label</th> <th>Weights</th> <th>Indicator</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4_C1</td> <td>1</td> <td><b>JRS 1.8 - effectiveness of partnerships and collaboration between agencies in support of priorities</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Label	Weights	Indicator	4_C1	1	<b>JRS 1.8 - effectiveness of partnerships and collaboration between agencies in support of priorities</b>																																																									
Label	Weights	Indicator																																																																															
4_A1	1	16-17 year old participation rates in education and training																																																																															
4_A2	1	Insp judgements for Percenatge V, G provision for foundation stage																																																																															
Label	Weights	Indicator																																																																															
No Indicators																																																																																	
Label	Weights	Indicator																																																																															
4_C1	1	<b>JRS 1.8 - effectiveness of partnerships and collaboration between agencies in support of priorities</b>																																																																															
Strategic Management of Education (5)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Label</th> <th>Weights</th> <th>Indicator</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>5_A1</td> <td>1</td> <td><b>JRS 0.2 - overall effectiveness of the LEA</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>5_A2</td> <td>1</td> <td><b>JRS 1.3 - effectiveness of LEA decision-making</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>5_A3</td> <td>0.5</td> <td><b>JRS 2.9 - effectiveness of LEA in relation to the provision of school places</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>5_A4</td> <td>0.5</td> <td><b>JRS 2.10 - effectiveness of LEA in relation to admissions to schools</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Label	Weights	Indicator	5_A1	1	<b>JRS 0.2 - overall effectiveness of the LEA</b>	5_A2	1	<b>JRS 1.3 - effectiveness of LEA decision-making</b>	5_A3	0.5	<b>JRS 2.9 - effectiveness of LEA in relation to the provision of school places</b>	5_A4	0.5	<b>JRS 2.10 - effectiveness of LEA in relation to admissions to schools</b>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Label</th> <th>Weights</th> <th>Indicator</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3">No Indicators</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Label	Weights	Indicator	No Indicators			<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Label</th> <th>Weights</th> <th>Indicator</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>5_C1</td> <td>1</td> <td><b>JRS 0.3 - LEA's capacity for further improvement and to address recommendations of the inspection</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>5_C2</td> <td>1</td> <td><b>JRS 1.5 - extent to which LEA has in place effective strategies to promote continuous improvement, including Best Value</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>5_C3</td> <td>1</td> <td><b>Percentage of schools graded V or G overall</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Label	Weights	Indicator	5_C1	1	<b>JRS 0.3 - LEA's capacity for further improvement and to address recommendations of the inspection</b>	5_C2	1	<b>JRS 1.5 - extent to which LEA has in place effective strategies to promote continuous improvement, including Best Value</b>	5_C3	1	<b>Percentage of schools graded V or G overall</b>																																													
Label	Weights	Indicator																																																																															
5_A1	1	<b>JRS 0.2 - overall effectiveness of the LEA</b>																																																																															
5_A2	1	<b>JRS 1.3 - effectiveness of LEA decision-making</b>																																																																															
5_A3	0.5	<b>JRS 2.9 - effectiveness of LEA in relation to the provision of school places</b>																																																																															
5_A4	0.5	<b>JRS 2.10 - effectiveness of LEA in relation to admissions to schools</b>																																																																															
Label	Weights	Indicator																																																																															
No Indicators																																																																																	
Label	Weights	Indicator																																																																															
5_C1	1	<b>JRS 0.3 - LEA's capacity for further improvement and to address recommendations of the inspection</b>																																																																															
5_C2	1	<b>JRS 1.5 - extent to which LEA has in place effective strategies to promote continuous improvement, including Best Value</b>																																																																															
5_C3	1	<b>Percentage of schools graded V or G overall</b>																																																																															

#### 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](http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/lea)

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

- = Not applicable

**BOLD** = changes to the model for 2004

For indicators 1\_C3 and 1\_C4, the JRS scores in italics are the Spring 2004 equivalents.