

FIRST SCHEDULE... continued

2. The Programme

The operational outputs and outcomes of the programme are stated in the *Programme outputs and outcomes* table below.

Programme Outputs and Outcomes

Programme outcomes	Programme outputs (Deliverables)			Effectiveness of programme outcomes	
<i>What are the specific programme results that are planned?</i>	<i>What are the planned programme activities?</i>	<i>What is the scale and frequency of the programme activities?</i>	<i>What resources will be needed to carry out the programme activities?</i>	<i>What measures will be used to evaluate progress?</i>	<i>What evaluation of the measures will be carried out?</i>
1.Programme Outcome A <i>Lead Teams of personnel will lead change within their own, and across KC schools. (1)</i>	Activities Appoint School Coordinators (one per primary, two per College), and 62 Lead Teachers across the KC. An evidence-based professional development programme will be developed for implementation (Lead team PD Days, meetings , sessions etc within schools, Micro Conferences, Skills Weeks Facilitator will conduct classroom observations and provide feedback for teachers	Amount and Frequency 12 schools 12 Principals 62 Lead Teachers March 2010 From Term 3, 2010 From Term 2 2010	Resources and Budget Facilitator NZCER Other Professional Advisors Lead Teams within Schools(Expense part of \$87k in Prof Fees and Prof Costs as per budget)	Effectiveness indicators Development of learning communities within and across schools focused on improving student achievement outcomes Effective teaching practices beginning to be shared within and across schools Teachers are beginning to change teaching practice in response to assessment data and shared conversations	Evaluation of indicators School Milestone Reports including, informed comment on successes and issues in relation to indicators. Teacher feedback through ongoing reviews e.g. surveys, self assessment matrix <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the changes made to teacher practice • degree of collaboration within and across schools • effectiveness of evidenced based practice across KC Schools Teacher V Facilitator Interviews Classroom observation feedback notes of teachers by Facilitator or Lead Team

2.Programme Outcome B	Activities	Amount and Frequency	Resources and Budget	Effectiveness Indicators	Evaluation of indicators
<i>All KC schools to access and Ultra Fast Broadband. (1,2)</i>	Agreement between Norrcom and the KC for the provision of technical services for 2010 to 2012	April 2010	Nil	The number of schools (0 to 12) accessing and use ultra fast broadband internet via KC network	School Milestone Reports including, informed comment on successes and issues in relation to indicators.
	Agreement between Telecom and Kapiti and Paraparaumu Colleges.	Jan 2010	Nil	Improved capability to collect and collate assessment information within and across KC schools	Principal and teacher feedback through an end of year survey on the effectiveness of the KC network and access to ultra fast board band
	Installation of fibre optic cable and ultra fast broadband into Kapiti and Paraparaumu Colleges.	Feb 2010	\$12k per school. Not part of KC budget.	Teachers are beginning to change teaching practice in response to improved e-learning potential	Interview between management team representatives and 12 principals
	Agreements made between supplying Colleges and receiving Primaries.	Beginning March 2010 as roll out proceeds	Variable on usage total = \$24K. Not part of KC budget.		Technical Report on degree to which roll out of KC Network has been achieved
	Installation of upgraded wireless technology on existing Kapiti Wireless Network.	Jan 2010	\$16k Not part of KC budget.		
	Raumati Beach School, Paekakariki School, Waikanae School, Kenakena School, Kapanui School install required hardware	Beginning Feb 2010	Estimate \$1500 per school. Not part of KC budget.		
	Raumati Beach School, Paekakariki School, Waikanae School, Kenakena School, Kapanui School connected to KC Wireless Network	Beginning Feb 2010	Estimate \$1500 per school. Not part of KC budget		
	The KC Wireless network sustained and maintained	Beginning Feb 2010	\$3 per pupil to a total of \$19,152		

3.Programme Outcome C	Activities	Amount and Frequency	Resources and Budget	Effectiveness Indicators	Evaluation of indicators
<i>To identify and address the needs of the KC schools in relation to assessment practices. (1,2,3,4)</i>	<p>Design and implement a survey of current assessment practices across the KC.</p> <p>Collate survey results and compile database.</p> <p>Analyse practices across the KC.</p> <p>Individual KC school Action Plans developed approved by respective BOTs.</p> <p>Individual KC school Action Plans sent to Facilitator</p>	<p>Survey completed Term 2 2010</p> <p>Term 2 2010</p> <p>Term 2 2010</p> <p>An Action Plan from each of the 12 KC schools. Term 3, 2010</p>	<p>Survey Monkey</p> <p>Facilitator Expense part of \$87k in Prof Fees and Prof Costs as per budget)</p>	<p>All KC schools to have an approved Action Plan</p> <p>Appropriate assessment tools being used by the KC to gather meaningful and consistent achievement data.</p>	<p>Database of results of survey kept for analysis of trends over time with exiting survey in 2012.</p> <p>Analysis and findings from survey reported as part of Milestone Reports</p> <p>Individual School Action Plans supplied as appendix to part of Milestone</p>
4.Programme Outcome D	Activities	Amount and Frequency	Resources and Budget	Effectiveness Indicators	Evaluation of indicators
<i>To develop consistent assessment practice within and across KC schools to allow for valid comparisons of data to be made in order to raise student achievement</i>	<p>Develop procedures and protocols for data collection and analysis across the KC schools .</p> <p>Lead team PD Days</p> <p>PD days, meetings , sessions etc within schools</p> <p>Facilitator will conduct classroom observations and provide feedback for teachers</p>	<p>Term 2-4, 2010</p> <p>From Term2</p> <p>From Term 2</p> <p>From Term 2</p>	<p>Facilitator NZCER Other Professional Advisors Lead Teams within Schools(Expense part of \$87k in Prof Fees and Prof Costs as per budget)</p>	<p>Agreement reached on appropriate assessment tool procedures and protocol for gathering achievement data consistently across the KC. e.g use of asTTle, PAT STAR</p> <p>KC schools completing consistent assessments which allow for valid comparisons</p> <p>All KC schools will have completed data collection and entered data on KC LMS and NZCER website</p> <p>Teachers are beginning to change teaching practice in response to assessment data</p>	<p>Collection and analysis of data over time using agreed tools (e.g PAT STAR asTTle Me and My School, attendance data other) and protocols including Maori and Pasifika</p> <p>Teacher feedback through an end of year survey on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the changes made to teacher practice • effectiveness of evidenced based practice across KC Schools <p>Teacher V facilitator Interviews</p> <p>Classroom observation feedback notes of teachers by Facilitator or Lead Team</p>

5.Programme Outcome E	Activities	Amount and Frequency	Resources and Budget	Effectiveness Indicators	Evaluation of indicators
<p><i>All KC schools will begin to use and share longitudinal student (Year 7,8,9,10) achievement and engagements data in order to raise student achievement.</i></p>	Agreement in place between Norrcom and the KC for the provision of technical services for 2010 to 2012	March 2010	Donated Server	All KC schools will have completed data collection and entered data on KC LMS and NZCER website	Collection and analysis of data over time using agreed tools (e.g PAT STAR asTTLe Me and My School, attendance data other) and protocols including Maori and Pasifika
	Norrcom install server at Paraparaumu College	Feb 2010	LMS and MoE Interoperability tool @ \$3 per student to max of \$19,152	Technical aspects completed; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreement between Norrcom and KC. • Server installed at Paraparaumu College. • LMS Moodle installed. • Interoperability tool installed. 	
	Norrcom install KC LMS (Moodle)	March April 2010	Facilitator NZCER Other Professional Advisors	All participating schools to have agreed privacy and secured protocols	Principal and teacher feedback through an end of year survey on the effectiveness of the KC network and access to ultra fast board band
	Norrcom and MoE install interoperability tool which will be linked to all KC schools LMS/SMSs	May June 2010	Lead Teams within Schools (Expense part of \$87k in Prof Fees and Prof Costs as per budget)	Effective teaching practices beginning to be shared within and across schools	
	Privacy and security protocols agreed between participating schools developed	June 2010		Teachers are beginning to change teaching practice in response to assessment data and shared conversations	Interview between management team representatives and 12 principals
	Agreement in place with NZCER	March 2010		Improved student achievement outcomes	Technical Report on degree to which roll out of KC Network has been achieved
	Select assessment tools and implement agreed assessment in all KC Schools.	March 2010		Improved levels of student engagement	Teacher feedback through an end of year survey on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the changes made to teacher practice • effectiveness of evidenced based practice across KC Schools
	Transfer data from individual participating KC school sites	Data from each KC school entered for selected tools. Terms Two 2010			Teacher V Facilitator Interviews
	All participating KC schools complete Me and My School (NZCER) survey for Years 7,8,9,10 students.	Term 3 2010			Classroom observation feedback notes of teachers by Facilitator or Lead Team
	Analyse data and develop a Report of NZCER Survey findings.	Term 4 2010			
Develop recommendations for professional development, based on NZCER Survey	Term 4 2010				

	<p>findings showing current level of student engagement in schools across the KC</p> <p>Explore methods of collating individual student attendance data via KC LMS (if technically possible)</p> <p>Develop recommendations, based on attendance data showing current level of student engagement in schools across the KC (if technically possible)</p> <p>Facilitator will conduct classroom observations and provide feedback for teachers</p>	<p>Term 4 2010</p> <p>Term 1 2011</p> <p>From Term 2</p>			
<p>6 .Programme Outcome F</p> <p><i>Develop relevant professional development programmes from data gathered from KC – Assessment practices and Student Engagement. (3,4)</i></p>	<p>Activities</p> <p>Collect data from the KC (Assessment/ Student Engagement) Analysis of data from assessment and student engagement survey will inform professional development programme planning</p> <p>An evidence-based professional development programme will be developed for implementation (Lead team PD Days, meetings , sessions etc within schools, Mini Conferences, Skills Weeks)</p> <p>Facilitator will conduct classroom observations and provide feedback for teachers</p>	<p>Amount and Frequency</p> <p>Term 2 & 4 2010</p> <p>From Term 2 2010</p> <p>From Term 2 2010</p>	<p>Resources and Budget</p> <p>Facilitator NZCER Other Professional Advisors Lead Teams within Schools (Expense part of \$87k in Prof Fees and Prof Costs as per budget)</p>	<p>Effectiveness Indicators</p> <p>Development of learning communities within and across schools focused on improving student achievement outcomes</p> <p>Effective teaching practices beginning to be shared within and across schools</p> <p>Teachers are beginning to change teaching practice in response to assessment data and shared conversations</p>	<p>Evaluation of indicators</p> <p>School Milestone Reports including, informed comment on successes and issues in relation to indicators.</p> <p>Teacher feedback through an end of year survey on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the changes made to teacher practice degree of collaboration within and across schools <p>effectiveness of evidenced based practice across KC Schools</p> <p>Teacher V Facilitator Interviews</p> <p>Classroom observation feedback notes of teachers Facilitator or Lead Team</p>

7.Programme Outcome J	Activities	Amount and Frequency	Resources and Budget	Effectiveness Indicators	Evaluation of indicators
<p><i>To investigate the possibility of e-portfolios for students in the KC. (1,2,4)</i></p>	Review and critique potential models of e-portfolios	Term 4 2010	Facilitator NZCER Other Professional Advisors Lead Teams within Schools (Expense part of \$87k in Prof Fees and Prof Costs as per budget)	Teachers classes schools are beginning to use e-portfolios	School Milestone Reports including, informed comment on successes and issues in relation to indicators
	Facilitator to source professional reading (research based) on the use of e-portfolios.	From Term 2 2010		Teachers are beginning to change teaching practice in response to e-learning potential	Teacher feedback through an end of year survey on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the changes made to teacher practice
	Facilitator to source effective models of e-portfolios for critiquing.	From Term 2 2010		Teacher V facilitator Interviews	
	Review survey analysis. An inventory of current e-portfolio practice across the KC schools.	Term 3 2010		Classroom observation feedback notes of teachers by Facilitator or Lead Team	
	A report will be provided of the identified best-practice models for review and discussion in the KC professional development programme	From Term 4 2010			
	Facilitator will conduct classroom observations and provide feedback for teachers	From Term 2 2010			