Corporate Performance Assessment - Comparative Scores 2002 \& 2003

| Aspect | Current Performance |  | Indications of Improvement |  | Capacity to Sustain Improvement |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2002 | 2003 | 2002 | 2003 | 2002 | 2003 |
| School Improvement | 2.0 | 2.42 | 2.3 | 2.57 | 2.4 | 2.0 |
| SEN | 1.5 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 4.0 |
| Social Inclusion | 2.8 | 2.5 | 3.2 | 1.5 | 3.5 | 2.67 |
| Life Long Learning | - | 3.5 | - | - | - | 1.0 |
| Strategic Management | 1.8 | 1.83 | 2.0 | - | 2.5 | 2.33 |
| Average Score | 2.0 | 2.53 | 2.5 | 2.35 | 2.7 | 2.31 |
| Rank | (10) | - | (24) | - | (73) | - |
| Category | *** | ** Upper | *** | Proven | *** | Secure |


| Summary of changes to indicators (excluding weightings) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Current Performance | Improvement | Capacity |
| School Improvement | - 3 removed <br> - 5 added <br> - 3 maintained performance <br> - 1 reduced performance | - 3 removed <br> - 1 improved performance <br> - 2 maintained performance <br> - 4 reduced performance | - 1 improved performance <br> - 4 maintained performance |
| Special Educational Needs | - 1 removed <br> - 1 added <br> - 1 maintained performance | - 2 removed <br> - 1 maintained performance | - 1 removed <br> - 1 maintained performance |
| Social Inclusion | - 3 removed <br> - 1 added <br> - 2 improved performance <br> - 2 maintained performance <br> - 1 reduced performance | - 2 removed <br> - 3 improved performance <br> - 1 no score recorded | - 1 added <br> - 2 improved performance |
| Life Long Learning | - 2 added (new category) | - No indicators | - 1 added (new category) |
| Strategic Management of Education | - 4 maintained performance | - 2 removed | - 2 maintained performance <br> - 1 no score recorded |
| OVERALL | - 7 removed <br> - 8 added <br> - 2 improved performance <br> - 10 maintained performance <br> - 2 reduced performance | - 9 removed <br> - 0 added <br> - 4 improved performance <br> - 3 maintained performance <br> - 4 reduced performance | - 1 removed <br> - 2 added <br> - 3 improved performance <br> - 7 maintained performance <br> - 0 reduced performance |

In the following tables a change of ' +1 ' indicates that the LEA has improved, whilst a score of ' -1 ' indicates that performance has deteriorated. A ' 0 ' indicates no change between 2002 and 2003. Some rows have been shaded to indicate that no comparison is possible as the criteria have changed.

| SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT |  | Scores |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2002 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Change | CURRENT PERFORMANCE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Ave | Wt | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Ave | Wt |
| N/A | Percentage of schools causing concern |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N/A | \% Schools in special measures | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -1 | 2001 KS2 English Average Point Score |  | 27.3 |  |  |  |  | 0.5 |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 27.1 \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | 0.5 |
| 0 | 2001 KS2 Maths Average Point Score |  | 26.9 |  |  |  |  | 0.5 |  | 27.0 |  |  |  |  | 0.5 |
| N/A | 2002 KS2-KS3 VA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} 100 . \\ 9 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 0.5 |
| N/A | 2002 KS3-GCSE VA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 98 |  |  |  | 0.5 |
| N/A | 2001 KS3 English Average Point Score |  | 33.9 |  |  |  |  | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N/A | 2001 KS3 Maths Average Point Score |  | 35.9 |  |  |  |  | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N/A | 2001 GCSE 5+ A*-C Percentage |  | 54.1 |  |  |  |  | 0.67 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N/A | JRS 14 - support to schools for raising standards in curriculum use of ICT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |
| 0 | JRS4 - Effectiveness of strategy for school improvement |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | JRS 1 (Context) - JRS 2 (Performance) |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | AVERAGE POINT SCORE |  |  |  |  |  | 2.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.42 |  |
| Change | IMPROVEMENT | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Ave | Wt | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Ave | Wt |
| N/A | 2001-2002 \% of primary schools causing concern trend |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -1.76 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.5 |
| N/A | 2001-2002 \% of secondary schools causing concern trend |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -3.57 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.5 |
| -2 | 1999-2001/2000-2002 KS2 English average point score trend |  |  | 0.3 |  |  |  | 0.5 |  |  |  |  | -0.09 |  | 0.5 |
| -1 | 1999-2001/2000-2002 KS2 mathematics average point score trend |  |  | 0.1 |  |  |  | 0.5 |  |  |  | -0.01 |  |  | 0.5 |
| -2 | 1999-2001/2000-2002 KS3 English average point score trend | 0.7 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.17 |  |  | 0.36 |  |  |  | 0.17 |
| -2 | 1999-2001/2000-2002 KS3 mathematics average point score trend |  | 0.6 |  |  |  |  | 0.17 |  |  |  | 0.38 |  |  | 0.17 |
| N/A | 2000-2002 KS3 science average point score trend |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.66 |  |  | 0.17 |
| 0 | 1999-2001/2000-2002 GCSE average point score trend |  |  | 0.7 |  |  |  | 0.67 |  |  | 0.59 |  |  |  | 0.50 |
| 0 | JRS 5 - progress in implementing strategy for school improvement |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| +1 | 1999-2001/2000-2002 GCSE 5+ A*-C percentage trend |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 7.74 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | AVERAGE POINT SCORE |  |  |  |  |  | 2.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.57 |  |


| SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT |  | Scores |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2002 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Change | CAPACITY | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Ave | Wt | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Ave | Wt |
| +2 | Percentage of schools graded V or G for management and efficiency |  |  |  | 69.7 |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} - \\ 83.5 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | JRS 6 - allocation of resources to priorities |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | JRS 25 - performance management of services to support school improvement |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | JRS 27 - effectiveness of services to support school improvement |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | EDP Grade | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | AVERAGE POINT SCORE |  |  |  |  |  | 2.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.00 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SPECIAL | EDUCATIONAL NEEDS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2002 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2003 |  |  |  |
| Change | CURRENT PERFORMANCE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Ave | Wt | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Ave | Wt |
| N/A | Percentage of statemented pupils placed in mainstream schools | 75.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | JRS 30 - effectiveness of LEA in meeting statutory obligations |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| N/A | Percentage of pupils for whom a statement is issued for the first time within 18 weeks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 42 |  |  |  |
|  | AVERAGE POINT SCORE |  |  |  |  |  | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.00 |  |
| Change | IMPROVEMENT | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Ave | Wt | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Ave | Wt |
| N/A | Percentage of statemented pupils in mainstream schools 1999-2001 trend | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N/A | Percentage of statements that have been reviewed and discontinued |  |  | 0.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | JRS 31 - effectiveness in exercising functions to support school improvement |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | AVERAGE POINT SCORE |  |  |  |  |  | 2.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.00 |  |
| Change | CAPACITY | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Ave | $\overline{W t}$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Ave | Wt |
| 0 | JRS 29 - effectiveness of strategy for SEN |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |
| N/A | Percentage of schools graded V or G for climate | 96.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | AVERAGE POINT SCORE |  |  |  |  |  | 2.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.00 |  |

APPENDIX I

| SOCIAL INCLUSION |  | Scores |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2002 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Change | CURRENT PERFORMANCE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Ave | Wt | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Ave | Wt |
| N/A | Percentage of EY settings on year 2 Ofsted inspection cycle |  |  | 9.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| +1 | 2001/2003 Primary attendance rate |  |  | 94.0 |  |  |  | 0.5 |  | 94.5 |  |  |  |  | 0.5 |
| +1 | 2001/2003 secondary attendance rate |  | 91.7 |  |  |  |  | 0.5 | 92.6 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.5 |
| -1 | 2001/2002 GCSE 1+ A*-G percentage (children in public care) | 81.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 63.6 \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 2001/2002 GCSE 1+ A*-G percentage |  |  | 96.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 96.5 \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |
| N/A | Staying on rates post 16 for education and training |  |  |  | 78.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N/A | Youth service participation rate per 1,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N/A | JRS 39 LEA support for behaviour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | JRS 16 - support for EM and traveller children |  |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | AVERAGE POINT SCORE |  |  |  |  |  | 2.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.5 |  |
| Change | IMPROVEMENT | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Ave | Wt | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Ave | Wt |
| N/A | Percentage of EY/Childcare settings taking part on a QA scheme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| +4 | 1999-2001/2001-2003 primary attendance rate trend |  |  |  |  | -0.4 |  | 0.5 | 0.23 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.5 |
| +3 | 1999-2001/2001-2003 secondary attendance rate trend |  |  |  | -0.3 |  |  | 0.5 | 0.46 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.5 |
| N/A | Percentage of pupils receiving alternative tuition reintegrated into schools |  | 20.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| +1 | 2001/2000-2002 GCSE 1+ A*-G percentage trend |  |  | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.44 |  |  |  |  |  |
| N/A | Staying on rates post 16 for education and training trend |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | AVERAGE POINT SCORE |  |  |  |  |  | 3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.50 |  |
| Change | CAPACITY | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Ave | Wt | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Ave | Wt |
| 0 | JRS 33 - overall effectiveness of the LEA in promoting social inclusion |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | JRS 42 - effectiveness of the LEA in combating racism |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| N/A | Percentage of schools graded G or V for climate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 97.9 \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | AVERAGE POINT SCORE |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.67 |  |


| LIFE LONG LEARNING | Scores |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2002 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Change CURRENT PERFORMANCE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Ave | Wt | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Ave | Wt |
| N/A$16-17$ year olds participation rates in education and <br> training |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 76.0 |  |  |  |  |
| N/AInspection judgements for \% V, G provision for <br> foundation stage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 50.0 |  |  |  |
| AVERAGE POINT SCORE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 |  |
| Change CAPACITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N/A JRS 49 - effectiveness of coordination of actions in <br> support of priorities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVERAGE POINT SCORE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0 |  |

APPENDIX I

| STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT OF EDUCATION |  | Scores |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2002 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Change | CURRENT PERFORMANCE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Ave | Wt | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Ave | Wt |
| 0 | JRS 52 - overall effectiveness of the LEA |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | JRS 45 - effectiveness of decision making |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | JRS 34 - extent to which LEA meets its requirements (places) |  | 3 |  |  |  |  | 0.5 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  | 0.5 |
| 0 | JRS 34 - extent to which LEA meets its requirements (admissions) | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.5 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.5 |
|  | AVERAGE POINT SCORE |  |  |  |  |  | 1.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.83 |  |
| Change | IMPROVEMENT | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Ave | Wt | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Ave | Wt |
| N/A | JRS 50 - progress made by the LEA since last inspection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N/A | Percentage of all schools graded V or G overall |  | 75.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | AVERAGE POINT SCORE |  |  |  |  |  | 2.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Change | CAPACITY | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Ave | Wt | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Ave | Wt |
| 0 | JRS 51 - capacity of the LEA to improve |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | JRS 7 - effectiveness of strategies to promote continuous improvement |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| N/A | Percentage of all schools graded V or G overall |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 79.5 \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | AVERAGE POINT SCORE |  |  |  |  |  | 2.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.33 |  |

