

**Crosswalk of Findings and Recommendation Found in the
1995 and 2013 Curriculum Management Audit Reports
Kenosha Unified School District**

2013 Audit Findings/Recommendations	1995 Audit Findings/Recommendations
Standard I	
<p>1.1: Evidence of planning was found in the Kenosha Unified School District, but planning processes, plans, implementation strategies, action steps, and communication protocols are inadequate to provide a clear focus and guide district initiatives, program direction, and system operations. The Transformation Plan as a strategic document lacks sufficient clarity to focus district decision making.</p>	<p>1.3: District planning is disordered and effectiveness is limited</p>
<p>1.2: Although efforts to define curricula to guide instruction are evident, the lack of a centrally defined and adopted curriculum has resulted in a fragmented instructional program that lacks sufficient coordination and consistency to focus instruction, assessment, professional development, and deployment of resources.</p>	
<p>1.3: Board Policies lack content and sufficient specificity to provide the adequate quality control needed for effective management of curriculum and other district functions.</p>	<p>1.1: Board policy is inadequate to ensure quality curriculum control</p>
<p>1.4: The organizational chart does not meet audit criteria for determining sound general management of the school district. Job descriptions are inadequate in quality to communicate complete and current roles and responsibilities in relationship to the delivery of curriculum, instruction and assessment.</p>	<p>1.5: The administrative structure is deficient and interferes with effective management.</p> <p>1.6: Job Descriptions are Inadequate to Drive Instructional Improvement.</p>
<p>1.5: The Teacher appraisal process is not linked to district instructional priorities, does not support the professional growth of teachers, and rarely informs professional development and retention and non-retention decisions.</p>	<p>1.7: Teacher Evaluation Processes Lack Credibility and Instructional Leadership is Not Effective</p>
<p>1.6: The board of education has not engaged in establishing clear instructional focus for the school district. Dissension among members of the board is impeding its ability to focus board efforts on addressing district needs.</p>	<p>1.2: Board and administrative relationships hamper overall educational process</p>
	<p>1.4: Organizational initiatives are disjointed and interfere with effective management (Effectiveness audit lacked sufficient evidence to support findings and conclusions)</p>

Standard 2	
2.1: Kenosha Unified School District lacks a documented planning process and a comprehensive management plan that provides coordinated direction of the design, delivery, and evaluation of the curriculum.	3.7: Articulation and coordination of the curriculum is limited and disconnected
2.2: The scope of the written curriculum is inadequate at all instructional levels to provide a cohesive framework of goals and objectives for students learning.	2.1: Scope and coverage of curriculum guides is inadequate
2.3: The quality of all Kenosha Unified School District curriculum guides is inadequate to direct delivery of the written, taught, and tested curriculum.	2.2: Quality of curriculum guides is inadequate to direct instruction
2.4: Curriculum guides are inadequate to support effective instruction and student success on state assessments; they lack feasibility and alignment with Common Core Standards in the match of content, context, and cognition.	
2.5: Two supplemental programs used in the Kenosha Unified School District schools align sufficiently with Wisconsin Common Core State Standards to support students' master of the intended learning; two other program reviewed did not reveal adequate alignment in the audit sampling.	
	2.3: Curriculum was idiosyncratic and unevenly implemented (Inconsistent offering of courses across schools)
	2.4: Curriculum coordinators were ineffectively utilized and support for curriculum design was limited
Standard 3	
3.1: The lack of consistency among district programs and initiatives inhibits the district's ability to establish clear direction and focus on improving student achievement.	3.2: Linkage between written, taught, and test curriculum is uneven and inadequate
3.2: The district provides an array of professional development opportunities, but the absence of a professional development plan limits the district's ability to guide system-wide improvement of instructional practices over time. Professional development efforts are not consistently evaluated in terms of desired student achievement.	3.1: Staff development policy, planning, and execution is unfocused and inadequate to support district program initiatives
3.3: A deep analysis of district practices, policies, and pedagogy has not been initiated to address aspects of the organizational culture that perpetuate inequalities in student access to comparable programs,	3.3: Grouping practices inhibit equity and effective instruction 3.4: Equity in program delivery and district operations is inadequate and ineffective

services, and learning opportunities.	
3.4: The district's technology plan meets audit criteria, but instructional technology is not being integrated as prescribed by the Transformation Plan to promote technology and media literacy.	
3.5: Teaching strategies observed during classroom visits and student work samples were not consistent with expectations expressed by district leadership and stated in the district's Transformation Plan. Monitoring of instruction by building principals lacks sufficient focus to improve curriculum delivery.	3.5: Instruction time is uneven and minimal across schools 3.6: Use of consistent curriculum and teaching practices varies widely
Standard 4	
4.1: The district lacks a comprehensive planning approach to student assessment and program evaluation to provide direction for producing expected learning results.	
4.2: The scope of formal assessment is inadequate for core and non-core K-12 courses to guide curriculum and instructional decision making.	4.1: System assessment and feedback structures are inadequate in scope
4.3: Student performance on state assessments has remained lower than the state average in almost all grade levels over the past four years, and substantial achievement gaps exist among ethnic and subgroup populations, which, based on trend analyses, are likely to persist barring intervention.	4.2: Student test results are uneven and indicative of ineffective instructional quality
4.4: Formative and summative data are not available to evaluate all courses taught, and data use for key functions such as planning, curriculum management, professional development, program evaluation, budgeting, and facility management is not in place to improve the design and delivery of services that impact student achievement.	4.3: Use of feedback and assessment data is ineffective
4.5: Evaluation processes have not been established to guide the district in adopting, implementing, and analyzing instructional programs for cost-benefits or for their effectiveness in meeting the system's desired outcomes for student achievement.	
Standard 5	
5.1: The district's budget process does not meet the audit's standards of adequacy to be designated as a curriculum-driven budget. Allocation of budgetary resources is not driven by strategic priorities or an assessment of program effectiveness.	5.1: The Financial Status of the System is weak and uneven over time 5.2: Budget Planning is not data-driven or program based
5.2: The majority of district facilities are well maintained and adequate	5.3: District facilities are mixed in quality and unevenly maintained

to support the district's educational programs. There is no formal, multi-year plan in place to inform and guide planning and funding of facility improvement projects.	5.5: District maintenance is sound, but backlogs are substantial
	5.4: Educational staffing is adequate, but support and cost effectiveness are inadequate
Recommendations	
1: Develop a comprehensive, multi-year implementation plan that addresses the findings and recommendations contained in the Curriculum Audit report. Align district decision and actions toward closing gaps identified in the audit findings.	
2: Ensure clarity through consistent district planning. Develop cohesive written plan documents that meet audit criteria and are communicated to all stakeholders. Use system performance data to identify gaps between the current status and desired outcomes.	
3: Review, revise, adopt, and implement board policies to provide for a sound system of curriculum management and control.	1: Develop, Adopt, and Implement a Comprehensive Set of Board Policies to Direct Curriculum Management and Ensure Quality Control
4: Revise, adopt, and implement a table of organization and job descriptions that provide for control of district functions and lead to intended student outcomes.	
5: Develop and implement a curriculum management system that establishes an aligned curriculum available to all students and supports attainment of student proficiency.	5: Design and Implement a Broad Effort to Develop and Revise Curriculum Guides Which Include a Comprehensive Set of Learner Expectations 6: Design and Implement a Broad Effort to Develop and Revise Curriculum Guides to Ensure Quality and Internal Consistency
6: Develop and implement a comprehensive plan for student assessment and program evaluation that requires data use at district and site levels to close the achievement gaps persistent among ethnic populations and subgroups, to raise the level of achievement for all students, and to provide feedback for decision regarding curriculum management and program adoption, implementation, continuation, expansion, modification, or termination. Align student and program assessment with the curriculum management system and support long-range planning.	9: Establish and Implement a Comprehensive Program and Student Assessment Process to Ensure Use of Meaningful Data in Decision Making
7: Design and implement a comprehensive professional development process that provides for coordination with the curriculum management plan and for the use of student achievement data in the evaluation of the effectiveness of professional development efforts.	8: Revise Policy and Planning to Provide for Rational Design, Control, and Evaluation of Staff Development to Maximize Human Resources and Effective Delivery of Instruction

<p>8: Design and implement a comprehensive, curriculum-driven budget development process that emphasizes cost-benefit analyses that links resources to instructional priorities.</p>	<p>10: Design and Implement a Comprehensive Program-Driven Budgeting Process</p>
	<p>2: Restructure Administrative Organization to Optimize and Facilitate Productivity and Resolve Board-Superintendent Conflicts</p>
	<p>3: Restructure Implementation and Broaden Community Involvement in Strategic Planning to Sustain and Build Constancy of purpose and Shared Commitment to District Goals</p>
	<p>4: Redirect the Primary Focus of Evaluation to Continuous Improvement in the Delivery, Articulation and Coordination of the Curriculum</p>
	<p>7: Establish and Implement Equitable and Effective Curriculum and Instructional Practices</p>
	<p>11: Implement Cost Effective and Efficient Operations and Provide Appropriate Facilities and Grade Level Configuration</p>