

# Comprehensive District Review Report



## Malden Public Schools

Review conducted October 24-27, 2016

---

Center for District and School Accountability

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and  
Secondary Education

### Organization of this Report

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Executive Summary.....  | 1  |
| Malden Public Schools Comprehensive District Review Overview..... | 5  |
| Leadership and Governance .....                                   | 18 |
| Curriculum and Instruction .....                                  | 31 |
| Assessment .....  | 44 |
| Human Resources and Professional Development.....                 | 52 |
| Student Support.....  | 58 |
| Financial and Asset Management.....                               | 71 |
| Appendix A: Review Team, Activities, Schedule, Site Visit .....   | 76 |
| Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures .....           | 78 |
| Appendix C: Instructional Inventory .....                         | 88 |

### Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

75 Pleasant Street, Malden, MA 02148-4906

Phone 781-338-3000 TTY: N.E.T. Replay 800-439-2370

[www.doe.mass.edu](http://www.doe.mass.edu)



This document was prepared by the  
Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Mitchell D. Chester, Ed. D.  
Commissioner  
**Published February 2017**

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, an affirmative action employer, is committed to ensuring that all of its programs and facilities are accessible to all members of the public. We do not discriminate on the basis of age, color, disability, national origin, race, religion, sex, gender identity, or sexual orientation. Inquiries regarding the Department's compliance with Title IX and other civil rights laws may be directed to the Human Resources Director, 75 Pleasant St., Malden, MA 02148-4906. Phone: 781-338-6105.

© 2017 Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

*Permission is hereby granted to copy any or all parts of this document for non-commercial educational purposes. Please credit the "Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education."*

This document printed on recycled paper

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
75 Pleasant Street, Malden, MA 02148-4906  
Phone 781-338-3000 TTY: N.E.T. Relay 800-439-2370  
[www.doe.mass.edu](http://www.doe.mass.edu)



## Executive Summary

---

Malden is one of the most diverse districts in Massachusetts. With its large and evenly distributed racial/ethnic subgroups, the district does not have one group that can claim majority status. In the 2016 school year, 31 percent of students were white; 20 percent, African-American; 22 percent, Hispanic/Latino; and 23 percent, Asian. Many students come to school every day with high programmatic and support needs. For example, English language learners make up 18.7 percent of enrollment, compared with 9.0 percent in the state. Fifty percent of Malden's students did not learn English as a first language, compared with nineteen percent in the state. Forty percent of students are economically disadvantaged, compared with twenty-seven percent statewide. Malden's students with disabilities make up 16 percent of enrollment, slightly below the state average of 17 percent. These demographics present both challenges and opportunities in how the district meets the learning needs of and provides support to all its students.

In July 2016, an interim superintendent replaced a leader who moved to another district after five years in Malden. The interim superintendent has made it clear that he is a candidate for the permanent position. He began by refocusing the district on a more deliberate and public teaching and learning agenda. He led district leaders on a retreat in August 2016 to establish teaching and learning goals and to agree on a set of districtwide instructional best practices. The leadership team also decided to emphasize six "focus indicators" during the educator evaluation process. At the time of the onsite in late October 2016, the interim superintendent planned to lead in November 2016 a school committee retreat to establish strategic goals and guidelines for the fiscal year 2018 budget development process.

The district has an early learning center for pre-kindergarten students, 5 large K-8 schools, and a high school. Two of the K-8 schools are Extended Learning Time (ELT) schools that have used ELT resources to hire additional staff and provide more planning time for teachers. A third K-8 school, an Innovation School focused on STEAM subjects (science, technology, engineering, arts, and mathematics) uses some of the district's curriculum and assessments and has its own professional development. The other two K-8 schools follow standard district policies and programs. The high school is organized into four houses, each with a house principal, guidance counselor, and school adjustment counselors (who are all licensed social workers). The high school also has an alternative program for high-risk students. The district's seven schools have traditionally operated as a system of schools rather than a school system; the interim superintendent has begun to address this by making district systems and practices more cohesive and coherent.

The district participates in the Five District Partnership (5DP) with Chelsea, Everett, Revere, and Winthrop. The 5DP was created to ensure that students who relocate within these neighboring districts have a stable education, with access to programs using shared curriculum guides and units, similar teaching methods, and common assessments. Malden's use of 5DP teaching materials is not consistent across schools.

As part of the site visit, the team observed 89 classes throughout the district: 19 at the high school, 34 in grades 5-8, and 36 in kindergarten through grade 4. The team observed 37 ELA classes, 32

mathematics classes, and 20 classes in other subject areas. Among the classes observed were two special education classes, four ELL or SEI classes, and one career-technical education class. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length. All review team members collected data using ESE's instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is presented in Appendix C.

In observed classes, the review team was impressed overall with the tone and positive learning environment in all schools. Students were valued, respectful, well behaved, and more often than not engaged in learning. The district's K-5 literacy program, supported at 4 out of 5 schools by Bay State Reading Institute, calls for differentiated instruction and collaborative, active learning in small groups. Reviewers observed both: in many K-5 ELA lessons more than one adult worked with groups of students on reading, writing, and other literacy activities. Cooperative learning and differentiation to meet students' learning needs were not consistently observed in lessons across schools.

In observed classes, review team members found that the quality and rigor of instruction was inconsistent across the district. Of particular concern was a wide variation in most characteristics of effective instruction between the K-8 schools and the high school. High-school lessons were less likely to: set high expectations; demonstrate student engagement; encourage critical thinking; provide students opportunities to take responsibility for their own learning either individually, in pairs or in groups; use differentiation to make content accessible for all learners; and use formative assessments to check for understanding and provide feedback to students.

## **Strengths**

The interim superintendent has initiated a process to articulate a strong educational vision and plan for improvement. In addition, he has instituted collaborative Instructional Focus Walks to monitor and improve instruction. Additional strengths are evident in the attentive curriculum and instructional leadership in K-5 literacy and in the K-12 English Language Learning (ELL) program as well as in program organization and leadership in special education. Each of these emphasizes the use of data to guide decision-making.

The district's participation in the 5DP provides collaborative opportunities to develop and use common standards-based curriculum maps and units, assessments, and professional development. Apart from academic support, the district is resolute in its attention to supporting students' social-emotional and behavioral needs. Consequently, it has allocated personnel and resources to programs for its most challenging students. These include the Pathways alternative program at the high school, a multi-tiered system of support for struggling students, and a number of specialized programs throughout the district. Finally, the district and the city have cultivated a strong and mutually trustful working relationship to plan and manage finances and maintain and plan for school building needs.

## Challenges and Areas for Growth

Of the 24 initiatives in the District Improvement Plan (DIP) in use since 2015, few have addressed improvements to teaching and learning and the DIP has not been widely known in the district. School improvement planning has been inconsistent and has not been aligned to the DIP. In addition, improvement planning has not typically informed decisions for resource allocation when planning the budget.

The tradition of school autonomy and the creation of two ELT schools and one Innovation School have contributed to resource inequities across schools---in staffing patterns, teacher planning time, and instructional materials. Resource inequities, in turn, have compromised the ability of the multi-tiered system of support to deliver what it promises to all students in need. Although the overall chronic absence rate in the district has improved in recent years, chronic absence at the high school needs improvement.

Prioritization of classroom resources has led to consolidations in content leadership roles. This has had a negative impact on consistency in curriculum and instruction and on the comprehensiveness of the assessment system. And although there are K-8 coaches for ELA and math to help teachers use data for improvement, the team found limited evidence that data-driven decision-making is common in all subjects. The district is also without dedicated human resources leadership and has eliminated the position of director of guidance. In most instances the district's educator evaluation system does not promote professional growth and development for both teachers and administrators because of an absence of substantive, actionable recommendations in evaluation documents. In a related challenge, professional development has not been systematically planned with firm links to district and school improvement goals.

## Recommendations

- District leaders should continue to develop an improvement planning process that guarantees consistent, commonly understood high-quality instruction delivered through a vertically and horizontally aligned and rigorous curriculum based on state frameworks.
- District leaders should improve the development and communication of district and school priorities to all stakeholders.
- Improvement planning and resource allocation should be inextricably linked.
- The district should ensure appropriate leadership for curriculum, instruction, and assessment at the school level to ensure the consistent development, alignment, and effective delivery of the curriculum.
- The district should develop specific strategies, timelines, and clear expectations for the collection, analysis, and use of data districtwide.

- District leadership should ensure that the educator evaluation system promotes growth-oriented collaborative supervision and evidence-based evaluation.
- District leaders, teachers, and staff should work collaboratively to improve practices and programs to ensure that all students have sufficient support to be successful in school and stay in school.

# Malden Public Schools Comprehensive District Review

## Overview

---

### **Purpose**

Conducted under Chapter 15, Section 55A of the Massachusetts General Laws, comprehensive district reviews support local school districts in establishing or strengthening a cycle of continuous improvement. Reviews consider carefully the effectiveness of systemwide functions, with reference to the six district standards used by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE): leadership and governance, curriculum and instruction, assessment, human resources and professional development, student support, and financial and asset management. Reviews identify systems and practices that may be impeding improvement as well as those most likely to be contributing to positive results.

Districts reviewed in the 2016-2017 school year include districts classified into Level 2, Level 3, or Level 4 of ESE's framework for district accountability and assistance. Review reports may be used by ESE and the district to establish priority for assistance and make resource allocation decisions.

### **Methodology**

Reviews collect evidence for each of the six district standards above. A district review team consisting of independent consultants with expertise in each of the district standards reviews documentation, data, and reports for two days before conducting a four-day district visit that includes visits to individual schools. The team conducts interviews and focus group sessions with such stakeholders as school committee members, teachers' association representatives, administrators, teachers, parents, and students. Team members also observe classroom instructional practice. Subsequent to the onsite review, the team meets for two days to develop findings and recommendations before submitting a draft report to ESE.

### **Site Visit**

The site visit to the Malden Public Schools was conducted from October 24-27, 2016. The site visit included 33 hours of interviews and focus groups with approximately 73 stakeholders, including school committee members, district administrators, school staff, students, and teachers' association representatives. The review team conducted three focus groups arranged by the district to include one teacher volunteer per K-8 school and one volunteer from each core content area in the high school. As a result, there were six elementary-grade teachers, five middle-grade teachers, and four high-school teachers.

A list of review team members, information about review activities, and the site visit schedule are found in Appendix A and Appendix B provides information about enrollment, student performance, and expenditures. The team observed classroom instructional practice in 89 classrooms in 6 of the district's 7

schools. (The team did not observe classes in the early learning center.) The review team collected data using an instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. This data is contained in Appendix C.

## District Profile

Malden has a mayor-council form of government and the mayor is the chair of the school committee. The nine members of the school committee (eight elected by ward) meet monthly.

The current superintendent is an interim and has been in the position since July 2016. The district leadership team, or “cabinet,” includes: the interim assistant superintendent for curriculum, instruction, and assessment; the assistant superintendent for special education and student services; and the business manager. The number of central office positions has been mostly stable over the past five years, but there have been substantial reductions in curriculum leadership personnel and changes in other leadership personnel. The district has seven principals leading seven schools---two K-8 principals are interim. There are 26 other administrators, including 13 assistant principals, the ELL and Title III director, the literacy and Title I director, the director of humanities, the director of STEM, the director of athletics and physical education, the nursing and health manager, the data and assessment manager, the instructional technology manager, and five program managers for special education. In the 2015-2016 school year, there were 458.3 teachers in the district.

In the 2015-2016 school year, 6,570 students were enrolled in the district’s 7 schools:

**Table 1: Malden Public Schools  
Schools, Type, Grades Served, and Enrollment\*, 2015-2016**

| School Name                  | School Type      | Grades Served | Enrollment   |
|------------------------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Malden Early Learning Center | EES              | Pre-K         | 288          |
| Beebe School                 | ESMS             | K-8           | 891          |
| Ferryway School              | ESMS             | K-8           | 925          |
| Forestdale School            | ESMS             | K-8           | 594          |
| Linden School                | ESMS             | K-8           | 892          |
| Salemwood School             | ESMS             | K-8           | 1,158        |
| Malden High School           | HS               | 9-12          | 1,822        |
| <b>Totals</b>                | <b>7 schools</b> | <b>PK-12</b>  | <b>6,570</b> |
| *As of October 1, 2015       |                  |               |              |



Between 2012 and 2016 overall student enrollment decreased by two students. Enrollment figures by race/ethnicity and high needs populations (i.e., students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged students, and English language learners (ELLs) and former ELLs) as compared with the state are provided in Tables B1a and B1b in Appendix B.

Total in-district per-pupil expenditures were the same as the median in-district per pupil expenditures for 35 PK-12 districts of similar size (5,000-7,999 students) in fiscal year 2015: \$12,947 (see [District Analysis and Review Tool Detail: Staffing & Finance](#)). Actual net school spending has been above what is required by the Chapter 70 state education aid program, as shown in Table B6 in Appendix B.

## Student Performance

**Malden is a Level 3 district because Malden High is in Level 3 for being among the lowest performing 20 percent of high schools.**

- Malden High has persistently low graduation rates for students with disabilities and has low assessment participation (less than 95 percent) for students with disabilities.

**Table 2: Malden Public Schools  
District and School PPI, Percentile, and Level 2013–2016**

| School          | Group      | Annual PPI |      |      |      | Cumulative PPI | School Percentile | Accountability Level |
|-----------------|------------|------------|------|------|------|----------------|-------------------|----------------------|
|                 |            | 2013       | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |                |                   |                      |
| Malden ELC      | All        | --         | --   | --   | --   | --             | --                | --                   |
|                 | High Needs | --         | --   | --   | --   | --             | --                | --                   |
| Beebe ESMS      | All        | 65         | 75   | 0    | 80   | 76             | 61                | 2                    |
|                 | High Needs | 60         | 70   | 70   | 70   | 69             |                   |                      |
| Ferryway ESMS   | All        | 60         | 0    | 0    | 83   | 79             | 52                | 2                    |
|                 | High Needs | 60         | 0    | 0    | 75   | 72             |                   |                      |
| Forestdale ESMS | All        | 55         | 40   | 80   | 55   | 60             | 42                | 2                    |
|                 | High Needs | 55         | 35   | 80   | 45   | 55             |                   |                      |
| Linden ESMS     | All        | 75         | 65   | 80   | 50   | 65             | 76                | 2                    |
|                 | High Needs | 80         | 55   | 0    | 55   | 59             |                   |                      |
| Malden ELC      | All        | --         | --   | --   | --   | --             | --                | --                   |
|                 | High Needs | --         | --   | --   | --   | --             |                   |                      |
| Salemwood ESMS  | All        | 90         | 50   | 70   | 55   | 62             | 46                | 2                    |
|                 | High Needs | 90         | 60   | 0    | 60   | 64             |                   |                      |
| Malden High     | All        | 46         | 96   | 93   | 68   | 79             | 20                | 3                    |
|                 | High Needs | 46         | 93   | 93   | 39   | 67             |                   |                      |
| District        | All        | 57         | 54   | 61   | 57   | 57             | --                | 3                    |
|                 | High Needs | 57         | 50   | 64   | 46   | 54             |                   |                      |

Between 2015 and 2016, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations improved by 5 percentage points in ELA and by 1 percentage point in math.

- The percentage of high needs students meeting or exceeding expectations improved by 4 percentage points in ELA and did not improve in math.
- The percentage of economically disadvantaged students meeting or exceeding expectations improved by 5 percentage points in ELA and did not improve in math.

- The percentage of ELL and former ELL students meeting or exceeding expectations improved by 2 percentage points in the ELA and by 3 percentage points in math.
- The percentage of students with disabilities meeting or exceeding expectations improved by 1 percentage point in ELA and did not improve in math.

**Table 3: Malden Public Schools  
ELA and Math Meeting or Exceeding Expectations (Grades 3-8) 2015-2016**

| Group                       | ELA  |      |        | Math |      |        |
|-----------------------------|------|------|--------|------|------|--------|
|                             | 2015 | 2016 | Change | 2015 | 2016 | Change |
| All students                | 44%  | 49%  | 5      | 44%  | 45%  | 1      |
| High Needs                  | 36%  | 40%  | 4      | 37%  | 37%  | 0      |
| Economically Disadvantaged  | 39%  | 44%  | 5      | 39%  | 39%  | 0      |
| ELL and former ELL students | 32%  | 34%  | 2      | 37%  | 40%  | 3      |
| Students with disabilities  | 9%   | 10%  | 1      | 8%   | 8%   | 0      |

Between 2013 and 2016, the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in science declined by 5 percentage points for all students, by 9 percentage points for high needs students, and by 1 and 2 percentage points for ELL and former ELL students and students with disabilities, respectively. In 2016 the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in science was 15 percentage points below the state rate for the district as a whole and 13 percentage points below the state rate for students with disabilities. In 2016 the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in science was 4 percentage points below the 2016 state rate for high needs students and 2 percentage points for economically disadvantaged students.

**Table 4: Malden Public Schools  
Science Percent Proficient or Advanced by Subgroup 2013–2016**

| Group                       |          | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 4-Year Trend | Above/Below State (2016) |
|-----------------------------|----------|------|------|------|------|--------------|--------------------------|
| All students                | District | 44%  | 45%  | 44%  | 39%  | -5%          | -15                      |
|                             | State    | 53%  | 55%  | 54%  | 54%  | 1            |                          |
| High Needs                  | District | 36%  | 37%  | 33%  | 27%  | -9%          | -4                       |
|                             | State    | 31%  | 33%  | 31%  | 31%  | 0            |                          |
| Economically Disadvantaged  | District | --   | --   | 39%  | 30%  | --           | -2                       |
|                             | State    | --   | --   | 34%  | 32%  | --           |                          |
| ELL and former ELL students | District | 21%  | 26%  | 27%  | 20%  | -1%          | 1                        |
|                             | State    | 19%  | 18%  | 19%  | 19%  | 0            |                          |
| Students with disabilities  | District | 10%  | 8%   | 10%  | 8%   | -2%          | -13                      |
|                             | State    | 21%  | 21%  | 22%  | 21%  | 0            |                          |

**The district did not reach its 2016 Composite Performance Index (CPI) targets in ELA, math, and science for any group except economically disadvantaged students in ELA.**

**Table 5: Malden Public Schools  
2016 CPI and Targets by Subgroup**

| Group                                   | ELA      |             |                             | Math     |             |                             | Science  |             |              |
|---|----------|-------------|-----------------------------|----------|-------------|-----------------------------|----------|-------------|--------------|
|   | 2016 CPI | 2016 Target | Rating                      | 2016 CPI | 2016 Target | Rating                      | 2016 CPI | 2016 Target | Rating       |
| All students                            | 82.6     | 89.5        | Improved<br>Below<br>Target | 77.7     | 85.8        | Improved<br>Below<br>Target | 70.8     | 83.0        | Declined     |
| High Needs                              | 77.0     | 86.6        | Improved<br>Below<br>Target | 71.9     | 83.0        | Improved<br>Below<br>Target | 63.7     | 80.1        | Declined     |
| Economically Disadvantaged <sup>1</sup> | 78.7     | 79.6        | On Target                   | 74.1     | 75.7        | Improved<br>Below<br>Target | 65.9     | 74.1        | Declined     |
| ELLs                                    | 73.9     | 79.4        | Improved<br>Below<br>Target | 73.7     | 80.6        | Improved<br>Below<br>Target | 57.1     | 73.1        | Declined     |
| Students with disabilities              | 58.5     | 76.4        | Improved<br>Below<br>Target | 49.0     | 71.8        | Improved<br>Below<br>Target | 50.8     | 72.8        | No<br>Change |

**In 2016, students' growth in ELA and math was moderate compared to their academic peers statewide and on target for all students, high needs students, economically disadvantaged students, and English language learners. Growth for students with disabilities was below target in ELA and math.**

**Table 6: Malden Public Schools  
2016 Median ELA and Math SGP by Subgroup**

| Group        | 2016 Median ELA SGP |              |              | 2016 Median Math SGP |              |              |
|--------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------|
|              | District            | CPI Rating   | Growth Level | District             | CPI Rating   | Growth Level |
| All students | 51.0                | On Target    | Moderate     | 53.0                 | On Target    | Moderate     |
| High Needs   | 51.0                | On Target    | Moderate     | 51.0                 | On Target    | Moderate     |
| Econ. Disad. | 51.0                | On Target    | Moderate     | 52.0                 | On Target    | Moderate     |
| ELLs         | 56.0                | On Target    | Moderate     | 58.0                 | On Target    | Moderate     |
| SWD          | 38.0                | Below Target | Low          | 43.0                 | Below Target | Moderate     |

<sup>1</sup> The economically disadvantaged subgroup does not have a CPI target and rating because 2015 is the first year that a CPI was calculated for the economically disadvantaged group; this CPI will serve as a baseline for future years' CPI targets.

Between 2013 and 2016, the district's out-of-school and in-school suspension rates declined and were less than half the state rate for all students and for each subgroup that makes up the high needs population.

**Table 7: Malden Public Schools  
Out-of-School and In-School Suspension Rates by Subgroup 2013–2016**

| Group                       | Type of Suspension | 2013  | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | State 2016 |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|-------|------|------|------|------------|
| High Needs                  | ISS                | 1.9%  | 1.7% | 3.5% | 0.7% | 2.9%       |
|                             | OSS                | 3.4%  | 3.0% | 2.1% | 0.4% | 4.9%       |
| Economically disadvantaged* | ISS                | 1.9%  | 1.7% | 3.6% | 0.8% | 3.2%       |
|                             | OSS                | 3.4%  | 3.2% | 2.3% | 0.5% | 5.6%       |
| ELLs                        | ISS                | 0.7%  | 0.5% | 2.5% | 0.3% | 1.9%       |
|                             | OSS                | 1.9%  | 1.8% | 1.5% | 0.1% | 4.0%       |
| Students with disabilities  | ISS                | 8.2%  | 7.7% | 5.0% | 0.7% | 3.5%       |
|                             | OSS                | 10.0% | 9.1% | 3.0% | 0.9% | 5.9%       |
| All Students                | ISS                | 1.4%  | 1.3% | 3.1% | 0.7% | 1.9%       |
|                             | OSS                | 2.6%  | 2.3% | 1.7% | 0.3% | 2.9%       |

\*Low income students' suspensions used for 2013 and 2014

Between 2012 and 2015, the district's four-year cohort graduation rate improved by 2.6 percentage points for all students and by 3.0 to 9.1 percentage points for high needs students, low income students, students with disabilities, and English language learners. The district did not reach the four-year cohort graduation target for all students or for any of the subgroups that make up the high needs population.<sup>2</sup>

**Table 8: Malden Public Schools  
Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates 2012-2015**

| Group        | Number Included (2015) | Cohort Year Ending |      |      |      | Change 2012-2015  |                | Change 2014-2015  |                | State (2015) |
|--------------|------------------------|--------------------|------|------|------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------|
|              |                        | 2012               | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | Percentage Points | Percent Change | Percentage Points | Percent Change |              |
| High needs   | 407                    | 72.9               | 75.8 | 77.7 | 75.9 | 3.0               | 4.1%           | -1.8              | -2.3%          | 78.5         |
| Low income   | 379                    | 73.5               | 76.1 | 80.5 | 78.4 | 4.9               | 6.7%           | -2.1              | -2.6%          | 78.2         |
| ELLs         | 101                    | 60.0               | 73.6 | 71.4 | 64.4 | 4.4               | 7.3%           | -7                | -9.8%          | 64.0         |
| SWD          | 77                     | 46.7               | 53.7 | 44.8 | 55.8 | 9.1               | 19.5%          | 11                | 24.6%          | 69.9         |
| All students | 514                    | 77.2               | 77.7 | 79.9 | 79.8 | 2.6               | 3.4%           | -0.1              | -0.1%          | 87.3         |

<sup>2</sup> The four-year cohort graduation rate target is 80 percent for each group and refers to the 2015 graduation rate. Low-income students did not receive a 2016 accountability rating because of the change to the economically disadvantaged measure.

Between 2011 and 2014, the district's five-year cohort graduation rate improved by 1.9 percentage points for all students, and by 2.0 to 3.8 percentage points for high needs students, low income students, and English language learners. The district's five-year cohort graduation rate declined by 3.2 percentage points for students with disabilities. The district did not reach the five-year cohort graduation target for all students or for any of the subgroups that make up the high needs population.<sup>3</sup>

**Table 9: Malden Public Schools  
Five-Year Cohort Graduation Rates 2011-2014**

| Group        | Number Included (2014) | Cohort Year Ending |      |      |      | Change 2011-2014  |                | Change 2013-2014  |                | State (2014) |
|--------------|------------------------|--------------------|------|------|------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------|
|              |                        | 2011               | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | Percentage Points | Percent Change | Percentage Points | Percent Change |              |
| High needs   | 363                    | 79.3               | 82.7 | 80.6 | 81.5 | 2.2               | 2.8%           | 0.9               | 1.1%           | 80.3         |
| Low income   | 339                    | 79.7               | 83.0 | 80.9 | 83.5 | 3.8               | 4.8%           | 2.6               | 3.2%           | 79.6         |
| ELLs         | 84                     | 74.2               | 80.0 | 80.6 | 76.2 | 2                 | 2.7%           | -4.4              | -5.5%          | 69.8         |
| SWD          | 67                     | 58.4               | 60.0 | 59.7 | 55.2 | -3.2              | -5.5%          | -4.5              | -7.5%          | 73.5         |
| All students | 468                    | 81.4               | 85.1 | 82.1 | 83.3 | 1.9               | 2.3%           | 1.2               | 1.5%           | 88.5         |

In 2015, the district's drop-out rates for all students and students with disabilities were higher than the 2015 state rates, and the drop-out rates for economically disadvantaged students and English language learners were lower than the 2015 state rates. In 2015 high needs students had the same drop-out rate as their state peers.

**Table 10: Malden Public Schools  
Drop-out Rates by Subgroup 2012-2015<sup>4</sup>**

|                           | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | State 2015 |
|---------------------------|------|------|------|------|------------|
| High Needs                | 2.5% | 2.4% | 2.6% | 3.4% | 3.4%       |
| Econ. Disad. <sup>5</sup> | 2.2% | 2.3% | 2.5% | 2.9% | 3.3%       |
| ELLs                      | 5.4% | 2.6% | 3.8% | 4.1% | 5.7%       |
| SWD                       | 2.7% | 2.3% | 4.3% | 4.4% | 3.5%       |
| All students              | 2.2% | 2.7% | 2.2% | 2.6% | 1.9%       |

<sup>3</sup> The five-year cohort graduation rate target is 85 percent for each group and refers to the 2014 graduation rate. Low-income students did not receive a 2016 accountability rating because of the change to the economically disadvantaged measure.

<sup>4</sup> Low income drop-out rate used for 2012, 2013, and 2014 economically disadvantaged rate.

<sup>5</sup> Low income students drop-out rates used for 2012, 2013, and 2014 economically disadvantaged rates.

## Grade and School Results

Between 2013 and 2016, ELA CPI for all students improved by 1.5 points, from 81.1 in 2013 to 82.6 in 2016, and improved in the 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, and 10<sup>th</sup> grades.

- ELA CPI improved by 3.5 points in the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade, by 10.6 points in the 4<sup>th</sup> grade, by 1.1 points in the 6<sup>th</sup> grade, and by 1.8 points in the 10<sup>th</sup> grade.
  - ELA CPI in the 10<sup>th</sup> grade was 94.4 in 2016, 2.3 points below the 2016 state CPI of 96.7.
- ELA CPI declined by 1.3 points in the 5<sup>th</sup> grade, by 1.5 points in the 7<sup>th</sup> grade, and by 0.6 points in the 8<sup>th</sup> grade.

**Table 11: Malden Public Schools  
ELA Composite Performance Index (CPI) by Grade 2013–2016**

| Grade | Number | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | State | 4-Year Trend | 2-Year Trend |
|-------|--------|------|------|------|------|-------|--------------|--------------|
| 3     | 531    | 74.7 | 72.4 | 75.9 | 78.2 | --    | 3.5          | 2.3          |
| 4     | 445    | 67.0 | 68.0 | 70.4 | 77.6 | --    | 10.6         | 7.2          |
| 5     | 442    | 78.7 | 76.2 | 78.9 | 77.4 | --    | -1.3         | -1.5         |
| 6     | 460    | 80.9 | 80.3 | 78.3 | 82.0 | --    | 1.1          | 3.7          |
| 7     | 423    | 86.4 | 85.5 | 82.4 | 84.9 | --    | -1.5         | 2.5          |
| 8     | 424    | 88.1 | 85.9 | 85.4 | 87.5 | --    | -0.6         | 2.1          |
| 10    | 417    | 92.6 | 94.3 | 95.8 | 94.4 | 96.7  | 1.8          | -1.4         |
| All   | 3,224  | 81.1 | 80.6 | 80.6 | 82.6 | --    | 1.5          | 2.0          |

The percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations in ELA ranged from 35 to 46 percent in the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade, from 45 to 61 percent in the 4<sup>th</sup> grade, from 33 to 60 percent in the 5<sup>th</sup> grade, from 46 to 68 percent in the 6<sup>th</sup> grade, from 37 to 73 percent in the 7<sup>th</sup> grade, and from 25 to 66 percent in the 8<sup>th</sup> grade. The percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in ELA was 89 percent in the 10<sup>th</sup> grade.

**Table 12: Malden Public Schools  
ELA Meeting or Exceeding Expectations by School and Grade 2015-2016<sup>6</sup>**

| School          | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 10  | Total |
|-----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| Malden ELC      | --  | --  | --  | --  | --  | --  | --  | --    |
| Beebe ESMS      | 35% | 45% | 60% | 54% | 61% | 63% | --  | 51%   |
| Ferryway ESMS   | 45% | 61% | 39% | 46% | 65% | 59% | --  | 52%   |
| Forestdale ESMS | 35% | 58% | 35% | 68% | 37% | 25% | --  | 43%   |
| Linden ESMS     | 46% | 53% | 53% | 57% | 73% | 66% | --  | 57%   |
| Salemwood ESMS  | 35% | 58% | 33% | 47% | 40% | 38% | --  | 42%   |
| Malden High     | --  | --  | --  | --  | --  | --  | 89% | 89%   |
| District        | 40  | 54  | 42  | 52  | 56  | 51  | 87% | --    |

<sup>6</sup> 10<sup>th</sup> grade results are MCAS and refer to the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced.

**Between 2013 and 2016, ELA CPI improved by 1.5 to 2.7 points in 4 out of the 5 elementary-middle schools, and by 2.4 points at Malden High.**

- ELA CPI for high needs students improved by 0.5 to 2.6 points in 3 out of the 5 elementary-middle schools, and by 1.2 points at Malden High.
- ELA CPI for English language learners improved by 0.2 to 16.0 points in 5 out of the 5 elementary-middle schools, and by 11.4 points at Malden High.
- ELA CPI for students with disabilities improved by 0.8 to 6.6 points in 3 out of the 5 elementary-middle schools, and by 1.9 points at Malden High.

**Table 13: Malden Public Schools  
ELA Composite Performance Index (CPI) by School and Subgroup 2013-2016**

|                 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 4-Year Trend |
|-----------------|------|------|------|------|--------------|
| Malden ELC      | --   | --   | --   | --   | --           |
| High Needs      | --   | --   | --   | --   | --           |
| Econ Disad.     | --   | --   | --   | --   | --           |
| ELLs            | --   | --   | --   | --   | --           |
| SWD             | --   | --   | --   | --   | --           |
| Beebe ESMS      | 79.6 | 81.4 | 80.8 | 82.3 | 2.7          |
| High Needs      | 73.6 | 77.1 | 75.5 | 76.2 | 2.6          |
| Econ. Disad.    | --   | --   | 77.6 | 78.1 | --           |
| ELLs            | 68.8 | 76.2 | 75.9 | 76.8 | 8.0          |
| SWD             | 52.0 | 57.0 | 51.4 | 42.2 | -9.8         |
| Ferryway ESMS   | 84.2 | 0.0  | 77.5 | 83.3 | -0.9         |
| High Needs      | 81.9 | 0.0  | 73.6 | 79.2 | -2.7         |
| Econ. Disad.    | --   | --   | 76.3 | 80.4 | --           |
| ELLs            | 74.8 | 0.0  | 70.8 | 76.1 | 1.3          |
| SWD             | 63.1 | 0.0  | 43.6 | 51.6 | -11.5        |
| Forestdale ESMS | 78.2 | 73.5 | 77.6 | 79.7 | 1.5          |
| High Needs      | 72.1 | 66.4 | 72.8 | 72.1 | 0.0          |
| Econ. Disad.    | --   | --   | 74.2 | 76.6 | --           |
| ELLs            | 57.4 | 61.8 | 64.5 | 73.4 | 16.0         |
| SWD             | 57.9 | 51.3 | 64.6 | 58.7 | 0.8          |
| Linden ESMS     | 83.4 | 83.4 | 84.1 | 85.3 | 1.9          |
| High Needs      | 78.7 | 77.6 | 76.7 | 79.8 | 1.1          |
| Econ. Disad.    | --   | --   | 79.3 | 82.4 | --           |
| ELLs            | 73.9 | 73.2 | 75.0 | 74.1 | 0.2          |
| SWD             | 59.6 | 58.2 | 61.7 | 66.2 | 6.6          |
| Salemwood ESMS  | 76.1 | 76.8 | 74.1 | 77.6 | 1.5          |
| High Needs      | 73.1 | 74.2 | 69.9 | 73.6 | 0.5          |
| Econ. Disad.    | --   | --   | 71.7 | 75.2 | --           |
| ELLs            | 60.3 | 62.6 | 61.0 | 68.0 | 7.7          |
| SWD             | 55.7 | 61.7 | 53.2 | 56.5 | 0.8          |
| Malden High     | 93.0 | 95.2 | 96.7 | 95.4 | 2.4          |
| High Needs      | 90.7 | 93.2 | 94.3 | 91.9 | 1.2          |
| Econ. Disad.    | --   | --   | 95.4 | 92.9 | --           |
| ELLs            | 77.4 | 84.3 | 90.6 | 88.8 | 11.4         |
| SWD             | 80.6 | 78.3 | 83.1 | 82.5 | 1.9          |

**Between 2013 and 2016, math CPI improved by 1.9 points for all students, from 75.8 in 2013 to 77.7 in 2016. Math CPI also improved in the 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 10<sup>th</sup> grades.**

- Math CPI improved by 5.1 points in the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade, by 4.0 points in the 4<sup>th</sup> grade, by 6.5 points in the 7<sup>th</sup> grade, and by 2.8 points in the 10<sup>th</sup> grade.
  - Math CPI in the 10<sup>th</sup> grade was 87.1 in 2016, 2.6 points below the 2016 state CPI of 89.7.
- Math CPI declined by 2.0 points in the 5<sup>th</sup> grade, by 1.2 points in the 6<sup>th</sup> grade, and by 2.3 points in the 8<sup>th</sup> grade.

**Table 14: Malden Public Schools  
Math Composite Performance Index (CPI) by Grade 2013-2016**

| Grade | Number | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | State | 4-Year Trend | 2-Year Trend |
|-------|--------|------|------|------|------|-------|--------------|--------------|
| 3     | 533    | 75.1 | 72.2 | 80.3 | 80.2 | --    | 5.1          | -0.1         |
| 4     | 444    | 72.5 | 69.4 | 72.3 | 76.5 | --    | 4.0          | 4.2          |
| 5     | 453    | 72.4 | 72.2 | 72.7 | 70.4 | --    | -2.0         | -2.3         |
| 6     | 460    | 82.0 | 84.3 | 79.0 | 80.8 | --    | -1.2         | 1.8          |
| 7     | 425    | 68.7 | 70.2 | 69.0 | 75.2 | --    | 6.5          | 6.2          |
| 8     | 386    | 76.2 | 69.4 | 75.7 | 73.9 | --    | -2.3         | -1.8         |
| 10    | 419    | 84.3 | 89.1 | 89.1 | 87.1 | 89.7  | 2.8          | -2.0         |
| All   | 3,252  | 75.8 | 75.5 | 76.5 | 77.7 | --    | 1.9          | 1.2          |

The percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations in math ranged from 31 to 60 percent in the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade, from 36 to 60 percent in the 4<sup>th</sup> grade, from 23 to 42 percent in the 5<sup>th</sup> grade, from 45 to 64 percent in the 6<sup>th</sup> grade, from 34 to 62 percent in the 7<sup>th</sup> grade, and from 18 to 66 percent in the 8<sup>th</sup> grade. The percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced was 77 percent in the 10<sup>th</sup> grade.

**Table 15: Malden Public Schools  
Math Meeting or Exceeding Expectations by School and Grade 2015-2016<sup>7</sup>**

| School          | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 10  | Total |
|-----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| Malden ELC      | --  | --  | --  | --  | --  | --  | --  | --    |
| Beebe ESMS      | 47% | 36% | 39% | 59% | 62% | 49% | --  | 48%   |
| Ferryway ESMS   | 60% | 46% | 28% | 45% | 48% | 54% | --  | 48%   |
| Forestdale ESMS | 41% | 53% | 31% | 64% | 48% | 35% | --  | 45%   |
| Linden ESMS     | 41% | 47% | 42% | 59% | 53% | 66% | --  | 50%   |
| Salemwood ESMS  | 31% | 60% | 23% | 50% | 34% | 18% | --  | 40%   |
| Malden High     | --  | --  | --  | --  | --  | --  | 77% | 77%   |
| District        | 45% | 47% | 32% | 53% | 47% | 46% | 74% | --    |

<sup>7</sup> 10<sup>th</sup> grade results are MCAS and refer to the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced.



**Between 2013 and 2016, math CPI improved by 1.2 to 5.0 points in 4 out of the 5 elementary-middle schools, and by 3.7 points at Malden High.**

- Math CPI for high needs students improved by 0.1 to 5.0 points in 4 of the 5 elementary-middle schools, and declined by 0.2 points at Malden High.
- Math CPI for English language learners improved by 1.8 to 10.3 points in 3 of the 5 elementary-middle schools, and by 8.3 points at Malden High.
- Math CPI for students with disabilities improved by 1.9 to 3.8 points in 3 of the 5 elementary-middle schools, and declined by 1.7 points at Malden High.

**Table 16: Malden Public Schools  
Math Composite Performance Index by School and Subgroup 2013-2016**

|                 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 3- or 4-Year Trend |
|-----------------|------|------|------|------|--------------------|
| Malden ELC      | --   | --   | --   | --   | --                 |
| High Needs      | --   | --   | --   | --   | --                 |
| Econ. Disad.    | --   | --   | --   | --   | --                 |
| ELLs            | --   | --   | --   | --   | --                 |
| SWD             | --   | --   | --   | --   | --                 |
| Beebe ESMS      | 77.5 | 76.6 | 75.9 | 78.7 | 1.2                |
| High Needs      | 72.8 | 72.5 | 71.2 | 74.5 | 1.7                |
| Econ. Disad.    | --   | --   | 73.2 | 76.0 | --                 |
| ELLs            | 78.1 | 75.0 | 74.9 | 79.9 | 1.8                |
| SWD             | 43.7 | 47.7 | 40.3 | 45.6 | 1.9                |
| Ferryway ESMS   | 78.5 | --   | 72.7 | 77.4 | -1.1               |
| High Needs      | 75.6 | --   | 68.9 | 72.8 | -2.8               |
| Econ. Disad.    | --   | --   | 71.5 | 74.3 | --                 |
| ELLs            | 77.3 | --   | 70.4 | 75.3 | -2.0               |
| SWD             | 50.6 | --   | 33.0 | 38.8 | -11.8              |
| Forestdale ESMS | 72.3 | 73.8 | 74.2 | 77.3 | 5.0                |
| High Needs      | 65.2 | 66.8 | 68.3 | 70.2 | 5.0                |
| Econ. Disad.    | --   | --   | 69.3 | 73.5 | --                 |
| ELLs            | 62.0 | 62.5 | 66.4 | 72.3 | 10.3               |
| SWD             | 56.1 | 51.6 | 58.2 | 59.9 | 3.8                |
| Linden ESMS     | 78.4 | 77.8 | 80.5 | 79.8 | 1.4                |
| High Needs      | 73.1 | 71.3 | 72.6 | 73.2 | 0.1                |
| Econ. Disad.    | --   | --   | 76.0 | 76.9 | --                 |
| ELLs            | 75.0 | 69.0 | 76.4 | 72.6 | -2.4               |
| SWD             | 51.9 | 48.5 | 53.6 | 54.8 | 2.9                |
| Salemwood ESMS  | 71.3 | 69.5 | 73.3 | 73.3 | 2.0                |
| High Needs      | 69.1 | 67.3 | 69.5 | 69.7 | 0.6                |
| Econ. Disad.    | --   | --   | 70.8 | 71.3 | --                 |
| ELLs            | 65.1 | 59.7 | 65.8 | 68.8 | 3.7                |
| SWD             | 48.1 | 49.2 | 46.4 | 44.5 | -3.6               |
| Malden High     | 85.2 | 90.1 | 90.7 | 88.9 | 3.7                |
| High Needs      | 81.6 | 87.5 | 87.4 | 81.4 | -0.2               |
| Econ. Disad.    | --   | --   | 89.3 | 87.7 | --                 |
| ELLs            | 68.5 | 82.0 | 81.3 | 76.8 | 8.3                |
| SWD             | 61.6 | 60.9 | 67.9 | 59.9 | -1.7               |

**Between 2013 and 2016, science proficiency rates declined by 5 percentage points in the district as whole, from 44 percent in 2013 to 39 percent in 2016, 15 percentage points below the 2016 state rate of 54 percent.**

- 5<sup>th</sup> grade science proficiency rates decreased by 9 percentage points from 40 percent in 2013 to 31 percent in 2016, 16 percentage points below the 2016 state rate of 47 percent.
- 8<sup>th</sup> grade science proficiency rates decreased by 4 percentage points from 33 percent in 2013 to 29 percent in 2016, 12 percentage points below the 2016 state rate of 41 percent.
- The 10<sup>th</sup> grade science proficiency rate was 61 percent in 2013 and 60 percent in 2016, 13 percentage points below the 2016 state rate of 73 percent.

**Table 17: Malden Public Schools  
Science Percent Proficient or Advanced by Grade 2013-2016**

| Grade | Number | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | State | 4-Year Trend | 2-Year Trend |
|-------|--------|------|------|------|------|-------|--------------|--------------|
| 5     | 471    | 40%  | 42%  | 41%  | 31%  | 47%   | -9%          | -10%         |
| 8     | 453    | 33%  | 32%  | 29%  | 29%  | 41%   | -4%          | 0%           |
| 10    | 370    | 61%  | 63%  | 65%  | 60%  | 73%   | -1%          | -5%          |
| All   | 1,294  | 44%  | 45%  | 44%  | 39%  | 54%   | -5%          | -5%          |

**In 2016, in the 5<sup>th</sup> grade the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in science ranged from 16 percent at Forestdale to 47 percent at Linden, and was below the 2016 state rate of 47 percent at 4 of the 5 schools with a 5<sup>th</sup> grade. In the 8<sup>th</sup> grade science proficiency ranged from 17 percent at Forestdale and Salemwood to 42 percent at Linden, and was below the 2016 state rate of 41 percent in 4 of the 5 schools with an 8<sup>th</sup> grade. In grade 10 the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced in science was 62 percent, 11 percentage points below the 2016 state rate of 73 percent.**

**Table 18: Malden Public Schools  
Science Percent Proficient or Advanced by School and Grade 2015-2016**

| School          | 3  | 4  | 5   | 6  | 7  | 8   | 10  | Total |
|-----------------|----|----|-----|----|----|-----|-----|-------|
| Malden ELC      | -- | -- | --  | -- | -- | --  | --  | --    |
| Beebe ESMS      | -- | -- | 27% | -- | -- | 37% | --  | 32%   |
| Ferryway ESMS   | -- | -- | 35% | -- | -- | 37% | --  | 36%   |
| Forestdale ESMS | -- | -- | 16% | -- | -- | 17% | --  | 16%   |
| Linden ESMS     | -- | -- | 47% | -- | -- | 42% | --  | 45%   |
| Salemwood ESMS  | -- | -- | 29% | -- | -- | 17% | --  | 22%   |
| Malden High     | -- | -- | --  | -- | -- | --  | 62% | 62%   |
| District        | -- | -- | 31% | -- | -- | 29% | 60% | 39%   |
| State           | -- | -- | 47% | -- | -- | 41% | 73% | 54%   |

**Between 2013 and 2016, science proficiency rates declined by 5 to 13 percentage points in 4 out of 5 elementary-middle schools. Science proficiency improved by 1 percentage point at Malden High.**

- Science proficiency rates for high needs students declined in 4 out 5 elementary-middle schools. Science proficiency rates for high need students did not improve at Malden High.

- Science proficiency rates for English language learners did not improve in 3 of the 5 elementary-middle schools. Science proficiency rates for English language learners did not improve at Malden High.
- Science proficiency rates for students with disabilities declined in 4 of 5 elementary-middle schools, and improved by 15 percentage points at Malden High.

**Table 19: Malden Public Schools**  
**Science Percent Proficient or Advanced by School and Subgroup 2013–2016**

|                        | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 4-Year Trend |
|------------------------|------|------|------|------|--------------|
| <b>Malden ELC</b>      | --   | --   | --   | --   | --           |
| High Needs             | --   | --   | --   | --   | --           |
| Econ. Disad.           | --   | --   | --   | --   | --           |
| ELLs                   | --   | --   | --   | --   | --           |
| SWD                    | --   | --   | --   | --   | --           |
| <b>Beebe ESMS</b>      | 31%  | 43%  | 29%  | 32%  | 1%           |
| High Needs             | 18%  | 36%  | 21%  | 21%  | 3%           |
| Econ. Disad.           | --   | --   | 24%  | 20%  | --           |
| ELLs                   | 6%   | 38%  | 23%  | 22%  | 16%          |
| SWD                    | 10%  | 10%  | 3%   | 3%   | -7%          |
| <b>Ferryway ESMS</b>   | 49%  | 39%  | 42%  | 36%  | -13%         |
| High Needs             | 45%  | 34%  | 37%  | 28%  | -17%         |
| Econ. Disad.           | --   | --   | 42%  | 26%  | --           |
| ELLs                   | 43%  | 26%  | 36%  | 27%  | -16%         |
| SWD                    | 8%   | 10%  | 4%   | 0%   | -8%          |
| <b>Forestdale ESMS</b> | 29%  | 29%  | 30%  | 16%  | -13%         |
| High Needs             | 18%  | 13%  | 21%  | 12%  | -6%          |
| Econ. Disad.           | --   | --   | 24%  | 15%  | --           |
| ELLs                   | --   | --   | --   | 9%   | 9%           |
| SWD                    | 15%  | 0%   | 7%   | 7%   | -8%          |
| <b>Linden ESMS</b>     | 50%  | 51%  | 49%  | 45%  | -5%          |
| High Needs             | 41%  | 44%  | 36%  | 25%  | -16%         |
| Econ. Disad.           | --   | --   | 42%  | 32%  | --           |
| ELLs                   | 25%  | 33%  | 41%  | 10%  | -15%         |
| SWD                    | 7%   | 18%  | 10%  | 10%  | 3%           |
| <b>Salemwood ESMS</b>  | 30%  | 28%  | 28%  | 22%  | -8%          |
| High Needs             | 26%  | 26%  | 21%  | 17%  | -9%          |
| Econ. Disad.           | --   | --   | 23%  | 17%  | --           |
| ELLs                   | 17%  | 12%  | 15%  | 17%  | 0%           |
| SWD                    | 20%  | 6%   | 6%   | 0%   | -20%         |
| <b>Malden High</b>     | 61%  | 65%  | 67%  | 62%  | 1%           |
| High Needs             | 51%  | 55%  | 56%  | 51%  | 0%           |
| Econ. Disad.           | --   | --   | 61%  | 60%  | --           |
| ELLs                   | 25%  | 35%  | 35%  | 24%  | -1%          |
| SWD                    | 10%  | 5%   | 27%  | 25%  | 15%          |

## Leadership and Governance

---

### ***Contextual Background***

Malden has a nine-member school committee chaired by the mayor. Eight members are elected by ward. Four members are new, having assumed their positions in January 2016. The committee meets monthly, except in late spring 2016, when it met more frequently to consider reductions to close a substantial gap between the cost of a level-service budget and the funding the mayor was making available to the schools for 2016-2017. The school committee has had two active standing subcommittees, policy and procedures and budget, but has others to call upon when needed and has recently formed a task force on social-emotional health.

The district's central office "cabinet" meets weekly, and is made up of the interim superintendent and three other central office administrators: the interim assistant superintendent for curriculum, instruction, and assessment; the assistant superintendent for special education and student services; and the business manager. There are also three central office manager positions focused on operations: the data and assessment manager, the parent information center manager, and the facilities manager. In addition, an executive administrative assistant supports the business manager by handling routine human resource responsibilities.

After several years of prioritizing classroom resources by streamlining leadership positions, four central office positions currently focus on teaching and learning: the director of STEM disciplines, K-12 (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics); the K-5 literacy and Title I director; the director of humanities (6-12 English language arts, K-12 history/social studies, fine arts and world languages); and the K-12 ELL and Title III director. Two of these positions, K-5 literacy and Title I director and K-12 ELL and Title III director, are funded with federal grants.

The superintendent and assistant superintendents meet twice each month with principals for 90 minutes and once each month with directors for 2 hours.

All K-8 schools have two assistant principals except Forestdale, the smallest, which has one assistant principal. Malden High School has four house principals. The district has a tradition of school autonomy and has three different models for its five K-8 schools: one Innovation School (Linden), which is a STEAM Academy (science, technology, engineering, arts, mathematics), two Expanded Learning Time (ELT) schools (Ferryway and Salemwood), and two traditional schools (Beebe and Forestdale). These classifications have meant varied resources (time on learning, staffing, professional development opportunities) across the K-8 schools.

The previous superintendent departed at the close of the 2015-2016 school year after serving as Malden's superintendent for five years. On June 30, 2016, the school committee finalized a contract with an interim superintendent who has expressed interest in becoming Malden's permanent superintendent. The interim superintendent presented an entry plan describing his plans for gathering and reporting information that will lead to revising the current District Improvement Plan. He held a

two-day leadership retreat in the summer 2016 to establish goals for the 2016-2017 school year, and at the time of the onsite planned to lead a school committee retreat in November 2016 to establish goals and guidelines for the fiscal year 2018 budget process.

Many other leaders are new to their positions, in part because protracted budget deliberations about their positions led several to seek and secure positions elsewhere. New to their positions are the interim assistant superintendent for curriculum, instruction, and assessment (a longtime K-8 principal in the district), the STEM director, the humanities director, the business manager (formerly interim), the facilities manager, and two of the seven principals.

## **Strength Finding**

### **1. District leaders are in the elementary stages of articulating a district vision and plan for improvement, aligning district and school planning, and bringing greater focus on improving teaching and learning.**

**A.** In fall 2015, the previous superintendent presented to the school committee a District Improvement Plan (DIP) developed with a broad range of community stakeholders and in collaboration with the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) and the Gateway City Partnership.

1. The superintendent described it to the school committee as “a plan that will drive school improvement plans, smart goals, and community partnerships...The real work now is in making this document come alive and support the students....”
2. Six of the seven schools prepared School Improvement Plans for 2016-2017 using the same format as the district plan and addressing each of the four priorities identified in the plan: early childhood, social-emotional growth, college and career readiness, and newcomer programs.

**B.** Interviews and a document review indicated that the interim superintendent has begun to take steps to focus the district’s work on teaching and learning and lay the foundation for a revised DIP.

1. At the start of the 2016-2017 school year the interim superintendent presented to the school committee and posted on the district’s website an entry plan describing the steps he was planning to gather the information needed to “revise and improve” the current DIP and “devise a plan for supporting the schools to reach their goals.”
  - a. The interim superintendent led a two-day summer retreat with district and school leaders to develop district goals and priorities for 2016-2017. He also invited the president of the teachers’ association to participate.
  - b. The leaders developed the district’s instructional focus for 2016-2017, identifying three goals for the year focused on teaching and learning, a description of “Common Teaching

and Learning Best Practices,” and chose six elements from the educator evaluation rubric as “focus indicators.”

- c. The leaders also developed a plan for monthly Instructional Focus Walks (IFWs) for all leaders to monitor progress and have held two such walks since the start of school.
  - i. The interim superintendent invited the president of the teachers’ association and members of the school committee to participate.
  - ii. The president of the teachers’ association and several school committee members have participated in the IFWs.
- d. The superintendent and principals reported that they are committed to having every teacher visited at least bi-weekly.
- e. Some teachers said that they are familiar with the new walkthrough plan and process.
2. Principals reported that the interim superintendent is expecting them to develop student learning goals for educator evaluation that are based on data about student performance.
3. At the time of the onsite the interim superintendent was planning a November 2016 school committee retreat to establish goals for the year.
4. He has developed a budget calendar that calls for the school committee to establish budget guidelines in advance of his development and presentation of a proposed fiscal year 2018 budget.

**Impact:** Laying the foundation for a broadly understood and accepted district strategy that is focused on teaching and learning and guides school improvement planning is a critical starting point for improving student achievement.

## **Challenges and Areas for Growth**

### **2. The district’s improvement planning process has not sufficiently supported improvement in student learning.**

- A. No district plan for improvement existed in recent years until the previous superintendent developed a District Improvement Plan (DIP) in 2015.
- B. Few of the 24 strategic initiatives in the 2015 (DIP) focus on teaching and learning.
  1. Only three focus on instruction: “professional development in content literacy and ELL strategies,” “professional development in social emotional learning,” and “more collaboration between content teachers and ELL specialists.”
  2. None explicitly mention English, mathematics, science, social studies, world languages, or the arts.

3. Only 2 of the 24 initiatives mention curriculum: “identify/establish strong, target curriculum for all (pre-school) students and “develop a plan to adopt a Tier 1 (social emotional) curriculum.”

**C.** The 2015 DIP is not driving planning or decision-making at the district level.

1. The DIP does not appear on the district’s website; instead, the “District Strategy,” dated 2011-2012, is currently on the website.
2. School committee members and district leaders agreed that the committee has not used the 2015 DIP to drive its meeting agendas or decisions.
  - a. School committee members had little knowledge of the plan and most members did not report a focus on improving student achievement.
  - b. School committee members reported that the committee’s priority for budget decisions has been avoiding “cutting any teachers.”
  - c. The budget document reviewed by the committee and made available to the public does not contain a narrative to describe district goals or priorities.
3. Central office administrators, directors, and principals reported that little attention has been paid to the 2015 DIP.
4. Interviews and a document review indicated that, in general, school committee agendas do not focus adequately on student achievement; rather, they focus predominantly on such topics as school extra-curricular and co-curricular activities, student field trips, vacation buy-back for individuals, transportation, and monthly enrollment trends.

**D.** The DIP is not driving planning or decision-making at the school level.

1. School Improvement Plans (SIPs) vary significantly in form and substance and not all schools have developed them.
2. Principals and district leaders reported that until summer 2016, they had not been expected to align their SIPs with district priorities.
3. Principals and district leaders agreed that principals have received little feedback from district staff or colleagues about their plans.
4. Interviews with principals, district leaders, and school committee members and a review of school committee minutes indicated that the superintendent and principals have not presented SIPs to the school committee.
5. Teachers reported little awareness of a District Improvement Plan.

- E.** There is no system in place to regularly access, analyze, and share data about student performance and other information to inform district and school planning or implementation of improvement efforts.
1. School committee members review little data other than data about accountability levels of schools such as basic MCAS/PARCC data, results of the youth behavior risk assessment, and monthly district attendance trends.
  2. District leaders reported that, with the exception of K-5 literacy and K-12 English language literacy data, district and school leaders do not have access to student or teacher performance data analyzed and presented in ways that make trends and patterns apparent.
  3. Until fall 2016, school leaders had not collaborated to analyze state testing data or had sufficient support to interpret the results and plan how to present the results to their staffs.

**Impact:** Without an effective process for developing, implementing, and monitoring progress on aligned District and School Improvement Plans, improvement efforts are likely isolated, uncoordinated, and inadequately supported. As a result, they have limited impact on improving student learning and achievement.

**3. The district does not have adequate capacity to develop and implement the structures and processes required to ensure effective and equitable approaches to improvement.**

- A.** District leadership positions have been reduced in recent years.
1. According to ESE data, in 2016 the district's administrator-to-student ratios far exceeded the state averages.<sup>8</sup>
    - a. The district administrator-to-student ratio exceeded the state average by 47 percent (1:730 in Malden compared with 1:497 in the state).
    - b. The "other" district instructional leader-to-student ratio exceeded the state average by 150 percent (1:2,190 in Malden compared with 1:865 in the state).
    - c. The school administrator-to-student ratio exceeded the state average by 49 percent (1:329 in Malden compared with 1:221 in the state).
  2. The "other" instructional leader-to-student ratio has eroded from 1:934 in 2014 to 1:2,190 in 2016.
  3. Further cuts in administrative staffing were made for fiscal year 2017; though some of those positions (including the STEM director, the humanities director, the athletics director, and the facilities manager positions) were restored for one year with one-time savings because of retirements.

---

<sup>8</sup> See staff data definitions in the [District Analysis and Review Tool \(DART\)](#) Detail: Staffing & Finance.



- B.** According to ESE data, during the same period, 2014-2016, school-based teaching and instructional support positions have remained relatively stable.
  - 1. In 2016, the district's teacher-to-student, paraprofessional-to-student, and instructional coach-to-student ratios compare favorably with the state averages.
    - a. For teachers, the ratio is close: 1:14.3 in Malden compared with 1:14.1 statewide.
    - b. For paraprofessionals, the ratio is also close: 1:43.1 in Malden compared with 1:41.1 statewide.
    - c. For instructional coaches, the ratio favors Malden at 1:821 in Malden compared with 1:846.1 statewide.
  - 2. From 2014-2016, the teacher-to-student ratio slightly improved, from 1:14.4 in 2014 to 1:14.3 in 2016, though ratios in general education declined modestly from 1:20.2 in 2014 to 1:21.3 in 2016.
- C.** With the exception of K-5 literacy, K-12 English Language Learning (ELL), and special education, where sufficient focused district leadership exists, district curriculum leadership is limited, especially for grades 6-8 (See the Challenge finding in the Curriculum and Instruction standard below).
  - 1. Directors described themselves as "stretched" with responsibility for as many as seven different content areas.
  - 2. Principals reported that the role and impact of directors has changed dramatically as the number of content areas for which they are responsible has grown. They said that they are no longer able to provide content expertise in all subjects for which they are responsible.
  - 3. Malden High School has teachers with release time to lead the mathematics, English language arts, foreign language, science, and history/social studies departments.
  - 4. Teachers in grades 5-8 described themselves as "leaderless" in regard to curriculum, noting that "without a leader, [curriculum] has become disjointed."
    - a. Because each middle grade school typically has only one teacher for each content area at each grade level, collaboration on content is limited and the role of district content support more critical.
  - 5. Elementary teachers reported that far less support is available for mathematics than for reading and ELA, citing too little data to inform math instruction, less support for differentiation in math, and fewer shared expectations for math.
- D.** There are inequities among K-8 schools.
  - 1. The 5 K-8 schools operate under 3 different governance and funding models.

- a. Linden STEAM Academy is an Innovation School that operates independently of many district policies, practices, and professional development requirements and uses only some of the district's assessments and curriculum resources.
  - b. Ferryway and Salemwood are Extended Learning Time (ELT) Schools with extra funding from the state, different requirements for planning and scheduling, and more time available for student learning and teacher planning.
  - c. Beebe and Forestdale are expected to follow district policies, practices, and requirements with little access to additional state or federal funding beyond their share of district Title I, Title III, and other non-local funding.
2. Staff reported that principals have a great deal of autonomy to make decisions about how their schools will operate and be staffed.
  - a. Principals stated that they have autonomy to make all hiring and reassignment decisions for the schools and that beginning in 2014 they were no longer required to accept transfer requests, except in circumstances involving reduction-in-force.
  - b. Principals and directors reported that principals use directors in various ways in: hiring, teacher observation, evaluation, decisions about purchasing materials, and content support.
  - c. Teachers said that planning processes look "different at each school" and the plans themselves vary in the nature and clarity of their goals as well as in their use of data.
3. The time available for teacher common planning time and professional development varies by school, from daily at Ferryway and Linden, every other day in a four-day cycle at Salemwood, and once or twice each week at Beebe and Forestdale.
4. Only Ferryway and Salemwood hold meetings focused on analyzing data about student performance in mathematics to guide instructional planning.
5. Interviewees said that some ELA and math intervention programs are not available at all elementary schools.
  - a. Although all K-8 schools have Lexia and Project Read, only Salemwood and Beebe have Read 180.
  - b. The Beebe and Forestdale schools and the Linden STEAM Academy do not have Tier 2 math interventions. Only the Salemwood School has Math 180.
6. The review team was told that there was insufficient staff capacity at the high school and at Salemwood to analyze and track intervention data.

- a. Three math coaches are shared across the five K-8 schools with Salemwood having a full-time math coach and the other schools, part-time coaches. Interviewees noted that even their shared time was uneven among schools.
  - i. District leaders reported that Salemwood has a full-time math coach because it has the largest enrollment of the K-8 schools.<sup>9</sup>
7. Interviews and a review of documents provided by the district indicated that the Ferryway School has only one school adjustment counselor (SAC) for its 925 students. In contrast, the Beebe School has two SACs, or one counselor for every 445 students; Linden has one SAC for its 594 students and Salemwood, one counselor for its 579 students.
8. Student access to specialized programs and technology varies by school, for example:
- a. The district's gifted and talent program is located at the Linden STEAM Innovation Academy.
  - b. Exploratory subjects and course offerings vary among K-8 schools.
  - c. Computer resources and expertise vary.
9. The district's move to neighborhood schools and recent budget reductions are calling attention to differences and inequities.
- a. Some school committee members pointed out that the district has one gifted program at the Linden, noting that having another at the other end of the city would give more families access.
  - b. Some school committee members suggested having another Innovation School at the Beebe so that families "at both ends of the city" would have access.

**Impact:** Without adequate guidance and support from curriculum leaders, the district's school-based leaders, teachers, specialists and support staff---especially those serving students in grades 6-8---are not getting the direction and support they need to implement the changes in professional practice required for students to gain proficiency in the standards outlined in the 2011 Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. The absence of sufficient direction and support is likely leading to the inconsistent quality and rigor of classroom instruction observed throughout the district.

#### **4. The district does not have adequate district-level leadership in human resources.**

- A.** In January 2013, an outside organization conducted an audit and assessment of the district's human resources (HR) management practices. Among the findings and recommendations in the assessment were the following:

---

<sup>9</sup> In 2015-2016, Salemwood's enrollment was 1,158 students; enrollment in the other K-8 schools in the district ranged from 594 to 928 students.

1. The district's many HR management functions<sup>10</sup> were completed partially by an HR administrative assistant with other responsibilities spread among other employees, including the superintendent.
  2. The organization recommended that a single, full-time HR director would more effectively and efficiently address the district's HR management. A full-time HR director would also help improve communication with the city's HR office.
  3. The district has acted on the recommendation to transfer responsibility for overseeing supervision and evaluation of custodians from the superintendent to the business manager.
  4. The district has not acted on the report's primary recommendation for a full-time executive director of human resources.
- B.** Interviews and a document review indicated that no single professional is responsible for overseeing human resources in the Malden Public Schools.
1. The district has reported to ESE that its business manager serves as both its "school business official" and its "executive assistant for human resources."
  2. Interviews and a document review indicated that an executive administrative assistant is responsible for overseeing routine human resource functions, including posting positions requested by principals or directors with School Spring, completing the paperwork required to add someone to the district payroll, and compiling and reporting staff data to ESE through EPIMS. This position does not appear on the district's organizational chart.
  3. The superintendent and assistant superintendents are regularly required to take time away from more strategic instructional leadership work to address personnel issues that are typically dealt with by a human resources manager.
  4. The business manager has had to take time away from more strategic work with facilities and budget analysis to address personnel issues, notably those related to supervision and evaluation of the 27-member custodial staff, for which she became responsible when the position of facilities manager was eliminated in June 2016. The facilities manager position was restored in October 2016.

**Impact:** Without dedicated professional leadership of human resources (HR), central office administrators are regularly required to take time away from more strategic work critical to district improvement in order to address personnel issues. As a consequence, they are challenged to fulfill their many responsibilities. Also, district leaders act without the benefit of professional guidance and support on HR policy and practice and employees do not have an HR professional to advocate on their behalf.

---

<sup>10</sup> These include: recruitment; hiring; induction and retention; staffing; employee non-renewals and dismissals; licensure; HR information systems; performance evaluation; employee and labor relations; legal compliance issues; substitutes; employee benefits; and communication and coordination with municipal offices.

## Recommendations

- 1. The district should continue to enhance its improvement planning and implementation process to guide the work of the school committee, district leaders, school leaders, and all district staff.**
  - A.** The interim superintendent should lead a working group with wide representation to analyze student performance and other data and develop a District Improvement Plan (DIP) or revise the existing DIP.
  - B.** The DIP should identify the key strategic objectives and initiatives the district will undertake over the next three-to-five years to improve student learning and include the districts' mission or vision, goals, and priorities for action.
    1. The teaching and learning goals, instructional best practices, and strategic goals identified during the August 2016 and November 2016 retreats should inform the DIP.
    2. DIP goals should be SMART (Specific and Strategic; Measureable; Action Oriented; Rigorous, Realistic, and Results Focused; and Timed and Tracked).
  - C.** The DIP's performance goals for students should drive the development, implementation, and modification of the district's educational programs.
    1. School improvement Plans (SIPs) should be created in alignment with the DIP and based on an analysis of student performance data.
      - a. Principals should provide the superintendent, school committee, and staff regular updates toward SIP goals.
      - b. Each principal should use the SIP to inform his/her self-assessment and goal setting process when creating the Educator Plan, and progress toward Educator Plan goals should be used as evidence during implementation.
    2. The identified district and school priorities established in the improvement plans should be supported by appropriate allocation of resources that are clearly identified in the improvement plans and in the annual district budget.
    3. Professional development should be designed to support DIP initiatives and goals.
  - D.** The DIP should be used as a tool for continuous improvement.
    1. The superintendent should periodically report to the school committee, staff, families, and community on progress toward achieving DIP goals.
    2. The district should establish procedures to review the DIP annually. Strategic activities and benchmarks should be adjusted when necessary to meet current conditions.

3. The superintendent and the school committee should consider aligning some goals in the Superintendent's Educator Plan (as part of the district's educator evaluation system) with DIP goals.

**Benefits:** By implementing this recommendation the district will achieve the accelerated improvement of teaching practice and student learning that comes from greater alignment, coherence, and synergy between and among initiatives, as well as consistently higher performance of leaders, teachers and students across grades and schools. The DIP and SIPS will provide guidance and ensure that the work at each level is intentionally designed to accomplish the district's short- and long-term goals.

**Recommended resources:**

- ESE's *Planning for Success* tools (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/success/>) support the improvement planning process by spotlighting practices, characteristics, and behaviors that support effective planning and implementation and meet existing state requirements for improvement planning.
- *District Accelerated Improvement Planning - Guiding Principles for Effective Benchmarks* (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/docs/ese/accountability/turnaround/level-4-guiding-principles-effective-benchmarks.pdf>) provides information about different types of benchmarks to guide and measure district improvement efforts.
- The *District Governance Program* (<http://www.masc.org/field-services/district-governance-project>), provided by the Massachusetts Association of School Committees, is designed to focus on continuous improvement and to build understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the school committee and the superintendent.
- *Best Practices in School District Budgeting* (<http://www.gfoa.org/best-practices-school-district-budgeting>) outlines steps to developing a budget that best aligns resources with student achievement goals. Each step includes a link to a specific resource document with relevant principles and policies to consider.

**2. The district should ensure adequate curriculum leadership and support to core-content teachers to ensure the consistent development, alignment, and effective delivery of the curriculum.**

- A. The district should provide content expertise to all teachers in core content subjects by identifying content specialists in ELA, math, science, and social studies and defining their role in providing curriculum leadership.
  1. This role should include leading frequent conversations about curriculum, instruction, and assessment and ensuring that teachers are implementing the curriculum with fidelity.
- B. Time must also be provided to complete this important work.

1. The district should consider ways to provide sufficient common planning time districtwide in order to support curriculum development and instructional improvement.

**Benefits:** Implementing this recommendation will mean more consistent teaching practice aligned to the curriculum frameworks across grades and schools, more consistently high quality and rigorous classroom instruction across grades and schools, and higher student achievement with less variation between subgroups and schools.

**Recommended resources:**

- *Smarter School Spending* (<http://smarterschoolspending.org>) provides free processes and tools to help districts use their resources to improve student achievement.
  - *Time for Teachers* (<http://www.timeandlearning.org/sites/default/files/resources/timeforteachers.pdf>) describes the systems and practices implemented at 17 schools to provide their teachers with more time to reflect on, develop, and hone their craft.
3. **The district should review its practices for managing human resources functions and revisit the findings and recommendations provided by an outside organization in the 2013 Human Resources Assessment Report.**
    - A. The school committee and the interim superintendent should review the recommendations of the 2013 study of human resources to determine how they might be implemented under current conditions.
    - B. The interim superintendent should identify options for reallocating staffing and financial resources to ensure that those human resources functions most critical to the success of Malden's teachers and students can be met more effectively.
      1. The most critical functions include: recruitment, hiring and retention of staff; contract administration; and structures and processes to support teacher leadership and teacher collaboration.
    - C. District leaders should consider exploring some ways to reallocate funds to restore either a full-time or a part-time human resources director. One option for district leaders to investigate is a position shared between the school department and the city.

**Benefits:** Restoring a human resources director with knowledge of relevant best practices will likely speed up progress in critical areas of teaching and learning and enable administrators to focus on work appropriate to their expertise.

**Recommended resources:**

- The Working Group for Educator Excellence (WGEE), in partnership with ESE, compiled a list of *District Promising Practices and Tools* (<http://wgee.org/best-practices/promising-practices-by-district/>) that support seven levers of educator expertise:
  - Recruitment, Hiring and Placement
  - Comprehensive Induction
  - Professional Development
  - Supervision and Evaluation
  - Teacher Leadership
  - Organizational Structure
  - Adult Professional Culture



## Curriculum and Instruction

---

### ***Contextual Background***

The district is a member of the 5 District Partnership (5DP), a collaborative educational initiative serving the districts of Chelsea, Everett, Malden, Revere, and Winthrop. The 5DP's main goal is to improve curriculum, instruction, and student achievement across the five districts. A priority for establishing the 5DP was to ensure continuity in schooling for the large number of students who move in and out of the five neighboring communities. Using an inclusive process, the 5DP developed Year Long Plans (YLPs), or curriculum maps, that are fully aligned with the 2011 Massachusetts Frameworks and are vertically aligned from pre-kindergarten to grade 8. Teachers in Malden's K-8 schools do not consistently use the YLPs as curriculum maps and do not use them in the same way. In the 2016-2017 school year, the K-8 schools are to pilot common assessments based on the YLPs in English Language Arts and math. The high school does not use the 5DP YLP curriculum documents and has created its own.

Beginning in 2010, the district eliminated or consolidated the curriculum content director positions. In 2010, the director of foreign languages became the assistant superintendent for curriculum, instruction, and assessment, assumed direction of the visual arts and music programs, and retained responsibility for the world language programs. In 2013, the superintendent eliminated the directorships of English Language Arts, mathematics, technology, science, social studies, and guidance and consolidated the five content areas within two new positions: director of humanities K-12 and director of STEM, K-12. As a result, high-school content teacher leaders on a reduced teaching schedule and teacher leaders on a full-time teaching schedule provide leadership for the implementation of curriculum in all schools. While the responsibilities of the directors are diffuse and each K-8 school functions autonomously, the district is challenged to ensure alignment of the implemented curriculum among schools and across grade spans.

During its visit to the district, the review team found a welcoming environment in all schools. For a large urban high school, the team found the atmosphere at Malden High School to be particularly comfortable and pleasant. Malden High School students and adults were open and friendly to the visitors. Both students and adults were focused on their work and at ease in their school setting. Teacher presentations in general were well planned, purposeful, and focused. Most teachers made effective use of all available instructional time.

The team observed 89 classes throughout the district: 19 at the high school (9-12), 34 in the middle grades (5-8), and 36 in the elementary grades (K-4). The team observed 37 ELA classes, 32 mathematics classes, 11 science classes, 2 social studies classes, 4 ELL classes, 1 career/technical education class, and 2 support classes.

The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length. All review team members collected data using ESE's instructional inventory, a tool for recording observed characteristics of standards-based teaching. These data are presented in Appendix C.

Observers noted a number of classrooms in which multiple adults were present to provide necessary differentiated instructional experiences and support. The team observed teachers employing a variety of well-developed strategies such as co-teaching with teachers of general education, special education or ESL; push-in services for both students with disabilities and English language learners; and teaching assistants, paraprofessionals, and student teachers all working with individual or groups of students.

In observed classrooms, review team members found that the quality and rigor of instruction was inconsistent throughout the district. Of particular concern was a wide variation in most characteristics of effective instruction between the K-8 schools and the high school, specifically in the use of appropriate instructional strategies, student motivation and engagement, critical thinking, formative assessments, and students assuming responsibility for their own learning.

Team members were also concerned by low incidence of differentiated instruction---particularly at the middle- and high-school levels---to make lesson content accessible for all learners, especially in light of the diversity of needs among Malden's student population.

## Strength Findings

### **1. The district has fostered the use of the 5 District Partnership's (5DP) Year Long Plans, curriculum maps that are aligned with the state curriculum frameworks.**

**A.** The district is a member of the 5 District Partnership (5DP), composed of the school districts of Chelsea, Everett, Malden, Revere, and Winthrop.<sup>11</sup>

1. The 5DP has three major resources available to members: Year Long Plans (YLPs), Model Instructional Units built using an Understanding By Design (UbD) format, and Common Assessments.

**B.** A document review indicated that representatives from the 5DP districts collaboratively developed the YLPs in English language arts (K-10), mathematics (K-8) and algebra 1, algebra 2, geometry, science (grades 3-8), and history/social studies (grades 2-8).

1. Common assessments from 5DP in ELA and math based on the YLPs are being piloted in grades 2-8 during the 2016-2017 school year in Malden and in the other 5DP districts.

**C.** Principals reported that K-8 teachers follow the YLPs and teach the same standards but may use different materials based on what is available and on teachers' professional discretion.

**D.** High-school teachers do not use the YLPs, except in some math classes.

---

<sup>11</sup> The Mission of the 5DP: "Faced with struggling student achievement and a highly mobile interdistrict population, the 5DP seeks to mitigate the gap in student achievement and maximize resources by aligning curriculum, performance standards, assessment, instruction, resources and professional development across the five districts. (5DP Website, [5districts.com](http://5districts.com))

- E. The superintendent said that the district is investing energy into rejuvenating Malden's efforts with the 5DP.

**Impact:** By fostering the use of the 5DP Year Long Plans, the district has set the foundation to ensure that each school's taught curricula are aligned to state curriculum frameworks and to the MCAS performance level descriptions. It is also poised to ensure that curriculum is aligned vertically (between grades) and horizontally (across classrooms at the same grade level) and across sections of the same course.

**2. The district has established focused curricular and instructional leadership in its K-12 English Language Learning program and in its K-5 literacy program.**

- A. The English Language Learning (ELL) and Title III director has created and maintained a planned, ongoing, and systematic program, which is aligned with the district curriculum and the state curriculum frameworks.
  - 1. The K-8 SEI and ELL programs have a pacing guide and unit benchmark assessments based on state frameworks and WIDA.
    - a. Walkthroughs are used to monitor pacing and ELL coaches may work with literacy coaches, going into classrooms to do supplemental support for students.
  - 2. All SEI and ELL curriculum documents are posted on the ELL website along with information for parents to access translation help if needed.
  - 3. The ELL program has two strands: a Newcomers Program, which follows its own curriculum, and SEI, which is aligned with the Year Long Plans.
  - 4. The ELL and Title III director organizes and provides professional development programs for ESL staff and general classroom teachers. He also hires teachers in the summer to write curriculum to enhance current efforts. Also, ESL liaisons connect with other departments (English, math, science, and social studies) to ensure alignment of curriculum.
- B. The literacy and Title I director maintains a program that uses Title I funding to support additional teachers for each of the K-8 schools to provide small-group instruction to students in need. In addition, Title I funding provides literacy coaches who support classroom teachers in each of the K-8 schools and who work with administration to help improve reading and writing for all students. Title I funding also provides literacy assistants who work with students under the direction of the literacy coaches.
  - 1. The literacy and Title I director meets with the coaches monthly to coordinate their efforts districtwide.

- a. As district math coaches are recent additions and there is no system in place to support them, the literacy coaches are guiding the development of the math coaches and their program.
2. The literacy and Title I director holds K-5 data meetings with grade-level teams following assessments to construct an instructional plan for each grade level and group students according to their strengths and challenges. The director also holds a “sense of urgency” meeting after benchmarking if students have not made sufficient progress. The director provides weekly model assessments that can be used for small-group instruction and mini-formative assessments intended for use during daily lessons.
3. The literacy program holds a few “fun family literacy nights” at each of the schools several times a year with refreshments and something for every member of the family.
4. The Title I program holds monthly morning parent workshops on different topics at each of the Title I Schools. As part of the Parent Academy the Salemwood School holds evening workshops for all K-8 parents.
5. In order to help meet the needs of parents and families, the literacy director publishes a *School and Community Resource Guide* in English, Spanish, Portuguese, French, and Chinese to provide information on how to access a variety of services.
6. Teachers told reviewers that the literacy and Title I director communicates expectations and that coaches “enforce standards.” They said there is a lot of “pressure and accountability” about literacy but noted that it is “not necessarily a bad thing.”

**Impact:** Focused leadership in the K-12 English language learner and the K-5 literacy programs ensures consistent use, alignment, and effective delivery of the district’s curricula. It also provides direction to ensure that teachers and other staff make effective use of curriculum guides that include objectives, resources, instructional strategies, timelines, and assessments for all content areas.

**3. District and school leaders have begun to collaboratively monitor the quality of instruction and acquire a common understanding of high-quality instruction.**

- A. As a part of his entry to the district, the interim superintendent led a leadership team workshop in August of 2016. Included were central office staff, principals, assistant principals, house principals, program managers, and curriculum directors. The president of the Malden Teachers’ Association was invited but was unable to attend.
1. During the workshop, in order to place the focus of the district on improving instruction, the interim superintendent led the team in reaching consensus on a definition of rigor; in developing a set of common teaching and learning best practices expected to be seen daily in each classroom; and in developing a set of instructional focus indicators for 2016-2017 based on ESE’s Model Rubric for Teachers. They collaboratively developed a process for

Instructional Focus Walks (IFWs) and an Instructional Focus Walks Guide to use as an instrument during the walks.

2. The interim superintendent told the team that the district had not previously used IFWs but that the walks are planned monthly and principals are committed to seeing every teacher at least bi-weekly. He said that IFWs would also be used to monitor progress. In September 2016, the interim superintendent was doing IFWs in one school each day; at the time of the onsite he was doing two per week.
3. The interim superintendent stated that he had invited the school committee to participate in the IFWs and that the mayor has participated in several and two other members also attended.
4. Principals and curriculum directors told the team that they see value in IFWs.
  - a. An administrator told the team that IFWs enable them to ensure that teachers are teaching the same content across grade levels. They said that the common planning in grade-level teams becomes obvious in the IFWs.
  - b. Another leader said he liked to do IFWs with people he normally would not be with because they looked at things differently and that was “good.”

**Impact:** By defining rigor, developing a set of teaching and learning best practices, and implementing regular Instructional Focus Walks, the district is developing a common understanding of high-quality teaching; focusing increased attention on instructional practices and student learning; and collaboratively collecting data about teaching and learning. In addition, teachers and leaders are provided opportunities to share evidence about what is and is not observed and learn from other participants through their observations, questions, experiences, and perspectives. Ultimately, Instructional Focus Walks are likely contributing to improved instruction and higher levels of student achievement.

## Challenges and Areas for Growth

4. **The responsibilities assigned to curriculum content area directors are too diffuse to allow sufficient attention to individual content areas districtwide.**
  - A. Before 2013, the district had 10 K-12 curriculum content coordinators including directors of English Language Arts, mathematics, social studies, science, technology, English Language Learning and Title III, K-5 literacy and Title I, , guidance counseling for grades 5-12, and physical education and health. Between 2010 and 2013, the assistant superintendent assumed responsibility for foreign languages, visual arts, and music.

- B.** In 2013, the district eliminated 5 director positions and combined their responsibilities into two new consolidated positions: director of humanities K-12 and director of STEM K-12.
  - 1. The director of humanities K-12 is responsible for the development, implementation, oversight and assessment of English, history and social studies, foreign languages, visual arts, and music.
    - a. The director of humanities K-12 is responsible for directing and overseeing the work of 96 teachers: 34 in English, 29 in social studies and history, 12 in foreign languages, 11 in music, and 10 in visual arts.
    - b. Those 96 teachers implement multiple courses, including 60 at Malden High School alone.
  - 2. The director of STEM K-12 is responsible for the development, implementation, oversight, and assessment of mathematics, science, computer science, technology education, and engineering.
    - a. The director of STEM is responsible for directing and overseeing the work of 75 teachers: 38 in math, 32 in science, and 5 in technology education and engineering.
    - b. The 75 teachers implement 45 different courses at Malden High School alone.
  - 3. The district has not had a director of guidance for at least three years.
- C.** Teachers told the team that without a dedicated leader, their programs have become disjointed.
  - 1. As the responsibilities of the directors are diffuse and the principals of each K-8 school function autonomously, it is difficult to ensure alignment of the implemented curriculum among schools and across grade spans.
  - 2. Teachers told the team that the broad responsibilities of the directors have led to an absence of focus on individual content areas.
- D.** Principals told the team that they depend on the directors to provide direction and assistance with.
  - 1. One principal told reviewers that principals and directors collaborate but the directors have the final say to keep the implementation of curriculum uniform. Directors were described as instructional leaders who bring a “district view.”
  - 2. Another principal described principals’ role as “more the implementers rather than the creators of curriculum.”
- E.** Although the district has fostered the use of 5DP Year Long Plans (YLPs), schools do not have a consistent approach to align curriculum with the state standards.

1. For example, the team was told that while teachers at the Linden STEAM Academy refer to the YLPs, they do not use them as the curriculum. The school has “differentiated” or leveled classrooms that interviewees reported are based on student needs (a co-taught classroom that is predominantly students with disabilities, a “regular classroom,” and an advanced classroom). Teachers are expected to modify and enhance curriculum based on the needs of students.
  2. Principals told the team they have mixed reactions to the 5DP efforts. One described it as a good concept but expressed the view that it is not a productive partnership for Malden. Another said that 5DP was never fully rolled out, noting that “you don’t hear about it.” A third principal told reviewers that what happens in Malden is different from what happens in Everett and Chelsea.
- F.** Teachers in the K-8 schools do not universally make use of the YLPs and do not use them in the same way. High-school teachers do not use the YLPs, except in some math classes.
1. Teachers told the team that content comes from the textbooks (*Reading Street*, *My Math K-4*, *History Alliance*, and *Stem Scopes for Science K-4*). The YLPs recommend anchor texts for ELA in grades 5-8. Math teachers follow YLPs in grades 5-8 using select lessons and units from *My Math* for grades 5-8.
  2. K-4 teachers told the review team that they make different decisions about how to implement the 5DP YLPs.
    - a. Teachers said there are common standards but the delivery may vary.
    - b. There has been more emphasis on using 5DP YLPs for reading than for math.
    - c. K-4 teachers told the team that the 5DP YLPs do not always match the goals and objectives of the *Reading Street* program.
  3. In grades 5-8 there is usually only one teacher in each content area for each grade level and there is some confusion among 5-8 teachers about the role of the 5DP and the need to maintain fidelity to the YLPs.
    - a. Teachers told the team that the YLPs are used in social studies but that English Language Arts does not have a YLP.
    - b. Teachers said that they might choose to use the YLPs or the textbook. They may use either one as a resource but noted that Malden does not have the same resources as “the initiator of 5DP.” They reported that the 5DP is a resource that can be used by teachers if they have the appropriate materials and other resources available.
  4. High-school teachers have developed their own curriculum maps and in general do not use 5DP resources.

- a. One administrator said that the 5DP YLPs are used in Algebra I and II and Geometry, but not in all courses. An YLP is used in Algebra II because a Malden teacher wrote the YLP. The English department planned to use the YLPs but withdrew because of the costs associated with the required texts. The review team was told that the social studies department has never had YLPs.
  - b. Another high-school leader told reviewers that the district created the YLPs four or five years ago and “never talked about them again.”
  - c. Teachers in the high-school focus group uniformly expressed negative views of the 5DP YLPs.
5. The review team was told that Malden was the only district that contributed social studies units to the 5DP and so it stopped participating.
  6. Teachers said that two English teachers worked on the YLPs but created their own curriculum maps after determining that Malden was “ahead” of the 5DP YLPs, which were not as skills based and did not use the textbook as the curriculum.
  7. The team was told that teachers did some work on science YLPs, but that the director’s responsibilities were so diffuse that these units have not had any focus.

**Impact:** Without specialists with specific knowledge and expertise in each content area, the district cannot ensure the establishment of unified, aligned districtwide K-12 content curricula that are rigorous and reflect current content research. The absence of content-area specialists may also result in the district being unable to adequately develop teachers’ knowledge of effective, subject-specific skills, knowledge, and teaching strategies. In addition, the district’s ability to identify appropriate staffing needs and select highly qualified staff might be compromised. Ultimately, the absence of content-area specialists with specific knowledge and expertise may make it challenging to improve instruction and student achievement.

**5. In observed classrooms the quality and rigor of instruction was inconsistent from class to class within schools, from school to school, and from level to level, and instruction often did not sufficiently challenge students.**

**A. Focus Area #1: Learning Objectives & Instruction:** In most observed classrooms teachers demonstrated knowledge of subject matter and content. In general, teachers provided and referred to clear learning objectives in the lesson. While in most observed classrooms in the K-8 schools teachers implemented lessons reflecting high expectations aligned to the objectives, a lower incidence of this characteristic was observed in the high school as was the use of appropriate instructional strategies.

1. Team members found moderate and strong evidence that teachers demonstrated knowledge of subject matter and content in 92 percent of elementary and middle-grade classes and in 84 percent of high-school classes.



2. Observers saw moderate and strong evidence of teachers providing and referring to clear learning objective(s) in the lesson in 90 percent of elementary classrooms, in 92 percent of middle-grade classrooms, and in 84 percent of high-school classrooms.
    - a. An example of a clear learning objective that was posted and referred to in the lesson was seen in a kindergarten class: "I will be able to sort and categorize in different ways."
    - b. An example of a clear learning objective that was posted and referred to in the lesson was seen in a high school anatomy and physiology class: "Students will be able to explain basic cell processes, define what stem cells are and explain how they become one of 200 types of cells < > cell division."
  3. Strong and moderate evidence of teachers implementing lessons that reflected high expectations aligned to the learning objectives was observed in 77 percent of elementary classrooms, in 65 percent of middle- grade classrooms, and in only 48 percent of observed high-school classrooms.
    - a. An example of a lesson that reflected high expectations aligned to the learning objective was seen in a grade 4 ELA class in which the learning objective was for students to be able to identify the ongoing cause and effective relationships among characters in a book. Students were asked to work in small groups to analyze the theme of the book and give supportive evidence for their analysis.
  4. Team members saw moderate and strong evidence of teachers using appropriate instructional strategies well matched to learning objective(s) in 86 percent of elementary classrooms, in 80 percent of middle-grade classes, and in 63 percent of high-school classes.
- B. Focus Area #2: Student Engagement & Critical Thinking:** Students were observed to be highly motivated and engaged and assuming responsibility for their own learning in the majority of elementary and middle-grade classes visited.
1. The team found moderate and strong evidence that students were motivated and engaged in the lesson in 87 percent of elementary classes, in 82 percent of classrooms in the middle grades, and in just 42 percent of high- school classes.
    - a. In a high school English class, some students were not motivated and engaged in the lesson. The posted objective was, "Students will fully explore an example of indirect characterization by completing their first readers' notebook." However, students were told to silently read any book of their choosing. One student read a book of poetry, two students shared a book that has a reading level of 5.2, one student read *Sports Illustrated* magazine, and two students engaged in conversation during the entire observation. The teacher, who was also reading for the full 20 minutes of the observation, continually reminded students to keep reading.

2. Observers noted moderate and strong evidence that teachers facilitated tasks that encouraged students to develop and engage in critical thinking in 76 percent of elementary classes, in 68 percent of classes in middle grades, and in only 43 percent of high-school classes.
3. Moderate and strong evidence of students assuming responsibility for their own learning, whether individually, in pairs or in groups, was seen in 75 percent of elementary classes, in 71 percent of middle- grade classes, and in just 31 percent of high-school classes.
  - a. In a grade 8 math class, observers saw an example of strong student engagement, the facilitation of tasks that encouraged critical thinking, and students assuming responsibility for their own learning. The students worked in groups or with partners at their own pace on solving linear function word problems. Students could choose from tasks of varying difficulty on the same topic at three different work centers.

**C. Focus Area #3: Differentiated Instruction & Classroom Culture:** Effective use of multiple instructional personnel to provide differentiation of instruction was observed in K-5 ELA. Review team members noted that differentiation of instruction was the least well-developed characteristic of effective instruction in other content areas across the district. Also, a low incidence of teachers conducting appropriate formative assessments to check for understanding and provide feedback to students was observed in high-school classes.

1. Moderate and strong evidence of differentiation was observed in 55 percent of elementary classrooms, in 38 percent of middle-grade classes, and in just 26 percent of high-school classes. The strongest use of differentiated instruction was observed in classes in which more than one adult was participating in instruction and the class was working in small learning groups.
  - a. Many K-5 literacy classes were observed using multiple centers with each center focused on a different activity related to the learning objective. The teacher and/or another adult addressed the needs of a small group in their center. Observers noted that often, however, all students sequenced through each of the centers and did the same activities. Sometimes the center's learning level was varied according to the students' specific needs--- for example, when a more advanced writing assignment was provided. Across the district there was less differentiation to address students' specific learning needs in other content areas.
2. Team members saw moderate and strong evidence of teachers using appropriate resources aligned to students' diverse learning needs (e.g., technology, manipulatives, support personnel) in the majority of classes at all grade levels: in 69 percent of elementary classes, in 65 percent of middle-grade classes, and in 63 percent of high-school classes.
  - a. Reviewers observed extensive and effective use of Chromebooks at the high school by both students and teachers.

- b. While white boards were present in most classrooms, they were often used as projector screens.
- 3. Observers found moderate and strong evidence of classroom climate characterized by respectful behavior, routines, tone, and discourse in 78 percent of elementary classes, in 86 percent of middle-grade classes, and in 63 percent of high-school classes.
- 4. Observers noted moderate and strong evidence that teachers conducted appropriate formative assessments such as tickets-to-leave, turn and talk, share and report, thumbs up/down and individual white boards, to check for understanding and provide feedback to students in 77 percent of elementary classes, in 72 percent of middle-grade classes, and in only 42 percent of high-school classes.

**Impact:** Without consistent use of effective instructional strategies, students are not likely to have the tools they need to achieve at higher levels and to succeed in college and careers. Instruction that does not adequately challenge and engage students limits their opportunity to learn critical content and skills.

## Recommendation

- 1. The district should take steps as soon as possible to complete K-12 curriculum in all subjects. It should ensure that teachers across the district consistently deliver effective, rigorous lessons.**
  - A.** The district should ensure that curriculum documents for all content areas include objectives, resources, instructional strategies, timelines, and assessments.
    - 1. Curriculum materials should be high quality, cohesive, aligned to appropriate standards, and aligned vertically between contiguous grades and horizontally across grades and schools.
  - B.** The district should review its participation with the 5 District Partnership (5DP) and determine whether to fully adopt and implement the 5DP Year Long Plans, unit plans, and assessments.
  - C.** The district should provide teachers at all schools with high-quality and sustained professional development to build their ability to create coherent and cohesive curriculum plans and to create units and lessons well.
    - 1. Expectations for instruction at all levels should be aligned with the district's Instructional Focus Walks.

**Benefits:** Implementing this recommendation will mean a fully developed and documented curriculum in ELA, math, and science aligned to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. Districtwide teachers and other staff will be able to make use of well-developed curriculum materials that support teaching and learning. The ultimate benefit will be that the educational program will be strengthened and students will have access to a more rigorous, engaging, and challenging school experience that will prepare them for college and career.

### Recommended resources:

- *Creating Curriculum Units at the Local Level*  
([http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/mcu\\_guide.pdf](http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/model/mcu_guide.pdf)) is a guidance document that can serve as a resource for professional study groups, as a reference for anyone wanting to engage in curriculum development, or simply as a way to gain a better understanding of the process used to develop Massachusetts' Model Curriculum Units.
- *Model Curriculum Units*  
([http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssqvx\\_Yjra4nBfqQPwc4auUBu](http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLTuqmiQ9ssqvx_Yjra4nBfqQPwc4auUBu)) is a video series that shows examples of the implementation of Massachusetts' Model Curriculum Units.
- *ESE's Learning Walkthrough Implementation Guide*  
(<http://www.mass.gov/edu/government/departments-and-boards/ease/programs/accountability/tools-and-resources/district-analysis-review-and-assistance/learning-walkthrough-implementation-guide.html>) is a resource to support instructional leaders in establishing a *Learning Walkthrough* process in a school or district. It is designed to provide guidance to those working in an established culture of collaboration as well as those who are just beginning to observe classrooms and discuss teaching and learning in a focused and actionable manner. (The link above includes a presentation to introduce Learning Walkthroughs.)

Appendix 4, *Characteristics of Standards-Based Teaching and Learning: Continuum of Practice* (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/docs/ease/accountability/dart/walkthrough/continuum-practice.pdf>) is a framework that provides a common language or reference point for looking at teaching and learning.

- *ESE's Calibration Video Library* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/resources/calibration/>) is a collection of professionally created videos of classroom instruction produced by the School Improvement Network. These videos depict a range of practice (this is NOT a collection of exemplars) to support within-district calibration activities that promote a shared understanding of instructional quality and rigor.
- *ESE's Online Calibration Training Tool*  
(<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/resources/calibration/tool/>) uses videos of classroom instruction from ESE's Calibration Video Library to simulate brief, unannounced observations. Groups of educators, such as a district leadership team, watch a video together and then individually assess the educator's practice related to specific elements from the Model Classroom Teacher Rubric and provide the educator with written feedback. Through real-time data displays, the group members can then see how their conclusions compare to each other, as well educators throughout the state.

- ESE's *"What to Look For" Observation Guides* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/candi/observation/>) describe what observers should expect to see in a classroom at a particular grade level in a specific subject area. This includes the knowledge and skills students should be learning and using (as reflected in state learning standards) and best practices related to classroom curriculum, instruction, and assessment for each subject area. The guides are not designed to replace any evaluation system or tools districts currently use, but are a resource to help classroom observers efficiently identify what teachers and students should be experiencing in specific subjects and grade levels.

## Assessment

---

### ***Contextual Background***

Although the district does not have a strong data literate culture, it has two established exemplars in the analysis and use of data to drive instruction---K-5 literacy and K-12 English Language Learning (ELL). A districtwide literacy director provides leadership to a unified data-focused literacy program K-5. Similar to the literacy program, the ELL program K-12 has a director, along with an ESL coach, to guide the use and analysis of data to inform instruction and improve student achievement. The district is challenged to replicate these models in all content areas across all schools.

The district does not administer a comprehensive set of assessments. There are no benchmark assessments for math K-8 or for ELA in grades 6-8. K-5 the district administers only one benchmark assessment in literacy, DIBELS, as well as formative, diagnostic and summative assessments. In grades 6-12, midterms in ELA, math, and science are used formatively and final common assessments in ELA, math, and science are summative. During the 2016-2017 school year, the district is piloting common formative assessments developed by the 5 District Partnership (5DP) in ELA and math in grades 2-8. Apart from K-5 literacy and K-12 ELL, teachers have not had the benefit of ongoing training in data analysis and how to use it to improve student achievement. Although each of the district's K-8 schools has a literacy coach who guides data analysis and supports teachers in literacy instruction, there are only three math coaches shared among the district's five K-8 schools. Structured opportunities to collaborate about data vary across schools. In addition, the district's ability to develop a data literate culture has been impeded by uneven resources and expertise to support data literacy.

### **Strength Finding**

**1. The K-5 literacy program and the K-12 ELL program have developed well-organized data structures to drive instructional decision making based on student performance data.**

**A.** The district has an established, unified, and well-organized data-driven approach to literacy instruction K-5. Four of the district's five elementary schools partner with the Bay State Reading Institute (BSRI) which provides ongoing coaching, modeling, and professional development in using data to drive literacy instruction. The remaining school, Ferryway, which was the past recipient of a Reading First grant, follows a similar data-driven instructional approach for literacy.

1. In the four BSRI schools, data team meetings with a BSRI coach take place every six weeks. During these meetings, a BSRI coach provides professional development and coaching and models lessons for teachers. In all five elementary schools, K-5 teachers collaborate to analyze literacy data during grade-level data team meetings.
  - a. All five schools use the same assessments, Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) and Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation (GRADE) to

drive literacy instruction. DIBELS is administered three times a year K-5 and GRADE is administered twice a year K-5. The team observed data walls displayed in teachers' workrooms that tracked individual student progress on DIBELS' fall, winter, and spring assessments and compared them with those of the previous year.

2. The team was told that grade-level data meetings to analyze DIBELS and GRADE assessments take place over two days, five times a year. Grade-level teams include teachers, coaches, interventionists, principals, and assistant principals. Coaches provide teachers with data. After data meetings, literacy coaches construct detailed instructional plans for each classroom based on data. The plans focus on literacy skills targeted in DIBELS and provide teachers with an action plan for literacy instruction.
  - a. K-5 teachers use DIBELS data to group students for instruction according to their strengths and challenges and base their classroom learning centers on assessment data, including *Reading Street* end-of-unit assessments, teacher-driven weekly assessments, and classroom formative assessments.
  - b. GRADE is used to establish groups so that teachers can target areas of need in reading comprehension or enrich students' learning.
  - c. Data teams also conduct "sense of urgency" meetings for a check-in after benchmarking if students are not making adequate progress. They may also provide students with additional assessments and might identify students needing interventions.
- B.** The literacy and Title I director oversees literacy data collection, dissemination, and analysis districtwide, but she focuses on K-8 literacy. In addition, she works closely with literacy coaches to ensure fidelity to the literacy instructional model and provides teachers with professional development (PD) opportunities targeted at literacy instruction.
  1. The literacy director meets monthly with the five K-8 literacy coaches to review progress and communicate expectations for literacy instruction. There is one coach for each elementary school.
  2. The literacy director also provides new teachers with two days of PD on the BSRI literacy model before the start of school. In addition, she organizes a literacy academy where teachers may participate voluntarily in after-school PD with literacy topics selected by teachers.
- C.** The ELL and Title III director oversees the ACCESS data collection, dissemination, and analysis for ESL K-12, in addition to other assessments administered to English language learners (ELLs).
  1. The ESL department administers online ACCESS K-12, a summative/diagnostic assessment for ELLs. Literacy coaches and the ESL coach attend data team meetings and present ACCESS results, emphasizing that ELLs belong to everyone. The team was told that ESL and SEI teachers use data to make individual learning decisions about students, to differentiate

- instruction, to modify curriculum, and to schedule ELLs for support. For example, at the high school, ACCESS assessment analysis indicated that students' reading scores and writing scores did not match. As a result, the ELL director and ESL teachers created back-to-back separate classes for reading and writing to differentiate levels.
- a. Teachers told the team that the ESL department provides a lot of PD to differentiate instruction based on ACCESS scores to meet students where they are.
  - b. Interviewees reported that ESL teachers in grades 9-12 are trained to look at benchmark data and do so during common planning time. With multiple teachers teaching the same class, they can use assessment data to guide instruction.
2. The team was told that the ESL department uses the ELLEVATION software program to hold their ACCESS data K-12. The program enables teachers to create lessons with "can do descriptors" tailored to students' ELL levels.
  3. K-8, ESL teachers have data meetings tied to the literacy data meetings. For K-5 newcomers, ESL teachers give DIBELS assessments every other week to check on students' literacy progress and adjust instruction. ESL teachers also use GRADE to establish reading groups so that teachers can target areas of need or enrich student learning.
  4. At the time of the review in October 2016, the ELL director told the team that he was meeting with the 5DP's ELL directors to better align their intake and testing resources to be data driven rather than anecdotal.

**Impact:** By establishing collaborative data-driven practices in the K-5 literacy and K-12 ELL programs, the district has a highly functioning model that could guide a districtwide data-driven approach.

## Challenges and Areas for Growth

2. **The district does not have a comprehensive system of formative and benchmark assessments and sufficient leadership and staff training and supports to use achievement data and other relevant data to guide improvement decisions.**
  - A. Districtwide, the assessments in place at the time of the review do not represent a balanced system of formative and benchmark assessments to guide instruction.
    1. Among the assessments the district administers annually, only the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) is considered a benchmark assessment.
    2. The district administers two formative assessments: DIBELS three or more times a year K-5 and the Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation (GRADE) twice yearly K-5 and once yearly in grades 6-8. GRADE is used to group students and to determine reading comprehension levels.



3. The remaining district administered assessments in grades 6-12 are formative and summative. For example, in grades 6-12 in ELA, math and science, midterms are used formatively. In grades 6-8, midterm grades are not recorded on report cards. Common final assessments are administered in ELA, math, and science in grades 6-12 and are considered summative assessments.
    - a. The ACCESS assessment administered to English language learners (ELLs) K-12 is used both formatively and as a diagnostic tool.
  4. The district does not administer a benchmark assessment for math K-8. Teachers told the team that there are fewer shared expectations for math instruction. Interviewees stated that they do not have an assessment tool like DIBELS to progress monitor in math. K-8 teachers rely on end-of-unit assessments and other teacher-driven and/or school-based math assessments. For example, K-4 teachers use end-of-unit assessments from *My Math* to group students and to plan instruction.
    - a. During the 2016-2017 school year, the district is piloting Dynamic Group Math (DIBELS Math) K-1. This assessment is used to identify students who may be at risk in acquiring mathematics skills and to monitor progress.
  5. In 2016-2017 for the first time, the district is administering the 5DP common assessment, aligned to the 5DP curriculum maps (YLPs), in ELA and math in grades 2-8. The test is scheduled for the fall, winter, and spring. School leaders reported that they did not have a part in developing the 5DP tests, which they consider formative tests.
    - a. The first administration of the 5DP assessments took place while the review team was on site in late October 2016.
- B.** Before the 2016-2017 school year, the district did not provide ongoing staff training necessary to develop data literacy districtwide.
1. When the team asked teachers about professional development (PD) about analyzing data and using data for improvement, teachers stated that aside from literacy, there is not a lot of training districtwide on using data. School and district leaders told the team that little PD is offered to teachers on how to use data to guide instruction, again, with the exception of literacy. Interviewees stated that in the past there was formal data training but “not anymore.”
    - a. The team’s document review of indicated that in 2016-2017 topics relating to data were being addressed. For example, for kindergarten through grade 8, PARCC data analysis, accountability data, ACCESS data analysis, and Next Generation MCAS were among topics listed. For grades 9-12, topics relating to data included MCAS data analysis and accountability data.
- C.** There are uneven opportunities, resources, and expertise to support data literacy districtwide.

1. School leaders told the team that the district has not given the attention to data that it deserves and that teachers needed better structures to collaborate and to plan with data.
  2. Teachers reported obstacles to productive grade-level data meetings. Interviewees said that in grades 4-8, an absence of benchmark assessments in math prevented shared expectations for math instruction. Teachers in grades 5-8 spoke of an absence of content leadership to drive data analysis, noting that having only one content teacher per grade did not support collaboration.
  3. Interviewees reported that every school has a leadership team, but not a data team. The team was told that only the high school has a data team. The high school data team was formed following a recommendation from the 2014 *WestEd* review of the high school's English Language Learning program.
  4. All schools in the district have common planning time (CPT); however, the amount of time varies by school with the high school having the most time for teacher collaboration.<sup>12</sup>
    - a. During this time, co-teachers and content teachers can meet to go over data such as MCAS, attendance and behavioral data.
  5. While each K-8 school has a literacy coach, there are only 3 math coaches. Salemwood, the largest K-8 school, has one math coach; the remaining four schools share two math coaches.
    - a. The team was told that Beebe, Forestdale, and Linden do not conduct data meetings specifically about math. Interviewees told the team that while math coaches may develop school-based benchmark assessments for math, they are not used in all schools.
  6. The high school is experiencing a shift to being more data focused. Interviewees stated that in the past, high school teachers did not look at a lot of data. For example, common midterms and finals were not consistently looked at in a systematic and targeted way. The new principal is now meeting with content teams and starting to drill down on data and what it means for instruction and testing. For example, by drilling down on MCAS data, teachers discovered that students were struggling with writing in math, ELA, and science.
- D. District leaders and teachers do not have easy access to the information they need to make informed decisions.**
1. The district has a data manager who oversees the entry of data into the district's data management system, Aspen X2, and reports data to the state. The data manager is also responsible for accessing Edwin analytics. The team was told that the data manager ensures that the system is functioning, but is not involved in data analysis or sharing data analysis. There is no one person in the district in charge of data analysis.

---

<sup>12</sup> The high school has CPT daily; Ferryway and Linden Steam Academy have CPT daily; Salemwood has CPT every day in a four day cycle; and Beebe and Forestdale have one day a week by grade level for CPT.

- a. Interviewees said that while Aspen X2 is capable of being a fully SIF-enabled Student Information System, the district has not moved forward with setting up the interoperability framework.
2. Interviewees stated that they did not have access to EWIS reports and data on at-risk students. In addition, district and school leaders said that they needed a tracking system to run reports and to determine which students were receiving interventions.
3. Teachers and school leaders' data capacity was hindered by the district's use of three different analytical systems over the past three school years: Scantron, Performance Matters, and Mastery Connects. In 2016-2017, the district adopted Mastery Connects, because most of the 5DP's partner districts use it. Mastery Connects enables teachers and principals immediate access to data, which they did not have previously. In the past, teachers were not able to scan their own data, to compare assessment results beyond the district, or to access and track mastery of standards in their own classrooms. Interviewees stated that Mastery Connects enables them to do all these tasks.
  - a. Principals, coaches, and teacher leaders have been trained in Mastery Connects. Teacher leaders are to train teachers to use this system.
  - b. High-school teachers told the team that they hoped that Mastery Connects would allow them to link data from midterms and finals to MCAS standards, something they have not been able to do in the past.
  - c. District leaders reported that having district assessments on different platforms has been challenging and the district planned to have all district assessments on the same platform in the 2017-2018 school year.

**Impact:** Without a comprehensive set of assessments, teachers are not getting sufficient information to improve student learning. The variations across the district in the amount of common planning time to look at data and limited access to relevant district and school-based reports make it difficult to develop strengths in analyzing and using data for improvement. Finally, without focused leadership and sustained districtwide staff training and support, a culture of using data well cannot be established.

## Recommendation

**1. The district should develop uniform and integrated policies, structures, and practices for the continuous collection, analysis, and dissemination of student performance and other data sources.**

- A.** The superintendent, principals, and program leaders, in collaboration with teachers, should develop specific strategies, timelines, and clear expectations for the use of data districtwide.
  - 1. Building on the practices in place in some grade levels, the district should establish systematic, consistent processes for the analysis and use of assessment data.
  - 2. The district should ensure that educators at all levels use data strategically to inform instruction, ongoing curriculum revision, program evaluation, and the educator evaluation system.
- B.** Ongoing, targeted staff training in the collection, analysis and use of student achievement data should be provided for each school, grade level, and content area.
- C.** District and school leaders should systematically incorporate student assessment results and other pertinent data into all aspects of policy, prioritization, and decision making, including budget development and School Improvement Plans, and the evaluation of educational programs and services.

**Benefits:** By implementing these recommendations, the district will develop a data literate culture to improve student learning and to guide decision-making at all levels. The use of a comprehensive assessment system will better inform classroom teachers about student progress as well as their instructional strengths and challenges and help them plan more targeted instruction. District and school leaders will have clarity about the progress the district is making toward realizing its achievement targets and will have access to an efficient, secure way to share data across districts.

### Recommended resources:

- ESE's *Assessment Literacy Self-Assessment and Gap Analysis Tool* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/ddm/webinar/PartI-GapAnalysis.pdf>) is intended to support districts in understanding where their educators fit overall on a continuum of assessment literacy. After determining where the district as a whole generally falls on the continuum, districts can determine potential next steps.
- The *Edwin Analytics* web page (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edwin/analytics/>) includes links to a Getting Started Guide, as well as a video tutorial series.

- ESE's *District Data Team Toolkit* (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/government/departments-and-boards/e/programs/accountability/tools-and-resources/district-analysis-review-and-assistance/leadership-and-governance.html>) is a set of resources to help a district establish, grow, and maintain a culture of inquiry and data use through a District Data Team.

## Human Resources and Professional Development

---

### Contextual Background

The district has implemented an educator evaluation system aligned with the state Educator Evaluation Framework. Communications about teaching practices and other initiatives in the district have increased and often become more reflective as a result. However, an evaluator load of between 40-50 educators at the school level has made it difficult to consistently implement the system in the spirit in which it was intended. Evaluations are almost always missing specific and actionable recommendations to improve practice.

The district also offers a variety of professional development activities and training sessions to improve educators' skills, knowledge, and understandings. This school year, the district has planned 3 full days of professional development for all K-12 staff. In addition, the 5 K-8 schools have 8 early-release days and the high school has 8 late-entry days for staff development. Activities are largely shaped by school-based needs identified by principals or through teacher surveys. Some professional development topics are identified and decided from the perspective of the directors, but generally professional development is not linked to district goals and priorities.

The district does not have a dedicated human resources professional. Oversight and supervision of the district's human resources (HR) management functions are under the purview of the business manager; an executive administrative assistant is responsible for overseeing routine HR functions. The business manager is also responsible for the oversight and supervision of the district's finances, food service operations, and custodial services. The business manager's prior experience working for the city of Malden serves to facilitate the positive relationship between the business office and the city. However, the challenges that face the district include how the business manager can effectively and efficiently manage all the human resource functions as well as other responsibilities assigned to that position, particularly the budgeting and financial tracking obligations.

The district has begun to use NEMNET (New England Minorities Network) in conjunction with School Spring to reach and attract minority teacher candidates to help ensure that the teaching staff more closely represents the district's diverse student population. At the school level, the principals have been granted full autonomy in hiring and assigning staff.

## Challenges and Areas for Growth

### 1. The district has not achieved consistency in implementing its educator evaluation system.

- A. A review of the personnel folders of 60 teachers randomly selected from across the district indicated that in most instances they were missing specific suggestions to improve instruction or recommendations to promote professional growth.
  - 1. In almost every case, evaluation components were completed on time. The folders included self-assessments, evidence collection folders, educator goals and plans, and formative and summative evaluations. The review team members observed that at the time of the review in October 2016, there was some evidence of components documented for the 2016-2017 school year.
  - 2. In almost half of the folders reviewed, there was documentation of walkthroughs, inclusion of evaluators' comments, and sometimes teachers' responses.
  - 3. For the most part, evaluations were informative. They provided teachers with the evaluator's perception of teaching practices, professional contributions, and recognition of positive aspects of the teacher's performance.
  - 4. Only 4 of the 60 evaluations provided specific guidance and direction to promote the teacher's professional growth and improve his/her teaching.
  - 5. Evaluations generally included only a one sentence comment for each standard stating that the teacher had met all requirements of the standard, based on the administrator's understanding and review of that standard.
- B. All administrators were not always evaluated.
  - 1. The previous superintendent did not complete administrator evaluations in school year 2015-2016.
- C. Teachers' views of the educator evaluation system covered a wide spectrum.
  - 1. Some teachers said that the evaluation system helped them to focus on one or two things that they needed to focus on.
  - 2. Another stated that for a veteran teacher, the educator evaluation system was not helpful.
  - 3. Several teachers saw the educator evaluation system as just "additional paperwork and checking off boxes."
  - 4. Others perceived observations and evaluations as being valuable. They stated that feedback was "basically informative."

**Impact:** Without consistently providing teachers and administrators with clear, specific feedback to improve instruction and recommendations that might contribute to educators' growth, there are missed opportunities to promote the professional competencies of teachers and administrators and to substantially enhance learning opportunities, classroom instruction, and academic achievement for all district students.

**2. Professional development in the district is missing direct alignment with and sustained focus on district priorities. It is largely decentralized, site based, and uncoordinated.**

**A.** Interviews with administrators and a document review indicated that while the district offers a range of professional development (PD) activities, its PD program is not systematically determined and varies across schools.

1. District and school leaders, including directors, principals, coaches, and special education consultants, assess PD needs and provide input into decisions for job-embedded PD.

a. The literacy coaches, the math coaches, and the district's mentoring program provide districtwide job-embedded PD.

2. PD is primarily based upon teacher preferences identified in surveys.

3. Professional development is not ongoing and differs from school to school.

4. Professional development is primarily principal driven and building based.

**B.** Administrators told the team that surveys represent the primary means of evaluating the impact of PD on teacher practice and student outcomes. A director said that the summer 2016 PD survey forms have not been shared with the district's directors.

**C.** Until the fall 2016 the district did not have a PD committee to determine annual PD goals.

1. The review team was told that at the beginning of the 2016-2017 school year the district formed a PD committee with an initial goal to create a PD vision.

2. The PD committee is composed of: four members chosen by the teachers' association; the interim assistant superintendent for curriculum, instruction, and assessment; and three directors. At the time of the review in late October 2016, the committee had met once.

**Impact:** By not developing a comprehensive, coordinated, and fully articulated PD plan linked to district and school improvement goals, the district limits the effectiveness of its PD programming. Although targeted professional development defined by school and teacher needs can be helpful, these alone cannot sufficiently support educators at all stages of their careers, promote professional growth, improve instruction, advance district goals and priorities, and improve student achievement.



## Recommendations

1. **The district should develop policies and practices to effectively promote the culture of growth-oriented collaborative supervision and evidence-based evaluation that is the goal of the educator evaluation system.**
  - A. The district should review current supervisory policies, practices, and expectations to identify problems proactively, to collaboratively develop appropriate and timely solutions, and ensure that the quantity and quality of evaluative feedback, both written and verbal, is enhanced.
    1. The district should focus on opportunities to maximize the efficiency of the educator evaluation system by scrutinizing the amount of documentation that the district is requiring of educators and evaluators.
  - B. Evaluators should serve as instructional coaches/mentors to educators, to engage them in an ongoing, performance-based, collaborative dialogue, thereby providing them with feedback and guidance that is continuous, frequent, and focused on professional practice and skills.
  - C. The district should support and monitor the skills and practices of all evaluators to ensure that they are regularly providing all staff with high-quality instructional feedback that is timely, informative, instructive, and conducive to their professional development and overall effectiveness. All administrators should receive ongoing training to enhance their ability to observe and to analyze instruction and to provide feedback focused on professional practice, growth, and student achievement.

**Benefits:** Implementing this recommendation will improve the quality of educator evaluations, reinforce the importance of the role that educator evaluation plays in helping teachers and administrators improve their practices and grow professionally, and improve student achievement.

### Recommended resources:

- The Working Group for Educator Excellence (WGEE), in partnership with ESE, compiled a list of *District Promising Practices and Tools* (<http://wgee.org/best-practices/promising-practices-by-district/>) that support seven levers of educator expertise:
  - Recruitment, Hiring and Placement
  - Comprehensive Induction
  - Professional Development
  - Supervision and Evaluation
  - Teacher Leadership
  - Organizational Structure

- Adult Professional Culture

WGEE also offers an *Electronic Clearinghouse* (<http://wgee.org/electronic-clearinghouse-with-promising-practices/>), which includes exemplars for teachers, school administrators, district leaders and evaluators that clarify particular Indicators on the Classroom Teacher Rubric from the Massachusetts Model System for Educator Evaluation.

**2. The professional development committee should develop a professional development plan aligned with district improvement initiatives.**

- A.** The committee should develop a plan for the district that is aligned with the District Improvement Plan and the district’s instructional model.
  - 1. As part of this effort, the committee should outline and document a set of learning experiences for its educators that is systematic, sustained, and aligned with district goals.
- B.** The plan should identify specific professional development (PD) needs, determine how they might be met, and recommend adjustments in PD practices to meet them.
- C.** The plan should address needs indicated by student performance data and trends from classroom observations. It should include goals focused on improving teacher practice and student outcomes.
  - 1. The plan should include a mechanism for evaluating the effectiveness of PD.
- D.** PD requires a long-term commitment by administrators and embedded support structures, such as facilitated team meetings, to convey and promote a common understanding of instructional practices expected from all educators.

**Benefits:** Developing a districtwide PD development plan that is driven by district improvement goals will support teachers as lifelong learners and help to implement best practices throughout the district. A high-quality PD program coupled with the time and resources already available in the district will likely lead to educator growth and improved student achievement.

**Recommended resources:**

- *The Massachusetts Standards for Professional Development* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/pd/standards.pdf>) describe, identify, and characterize what high quality learning experiences should look like for educators.
- *The Teacher Education Materials Project Database* (<https://www.tes.com/resources/search/?q=Teacher%20Education%20Materials%20Project%20Database>) is a website that was developed to support professional development providers as they design and implement programs for pre-service and in-service K - 12 mathematics and science teachers.

- *PBS LearningMedia* (<http://www.pbslearningmedia.org/>) is a free digital media content library that provides relevant educational resources for PreK-12 teachers. The flexible platform includes high-quality content tied to national curriculum standards, as well as professional development courses.
- *ESE's Professional Development Self- Assessment Guidebook* (<http://www.mass.gov/edu/docs/ease/accountability/dsac/professional-development-self-assessment-guide.pdf>) provides tools for analyzing professional development offerings' alignment with the Massachusetts High-Quality Professional Development Standards, the Educator Evaluation Framework, and the Standards and Indicators of Effective Practice.
- *Identifying Meaningful Professional Development* (<https://youtu.be/zhuFioO8GbQ>) is a video in which educators from three Massachusetts districts discuss the importance of targeted, meaningful professional development and the ways districts can use the evaluation process to identify the most effective PD supports for all educators.

## Student Support

---

### Contextual Background

The district has instituted a range of programs and services that demonstrate its commitment to academic, social-emotional, and behavioral support for general education students, students with disabilities, and English language learners. To support programs and services, the district has put in place a number of managers, team leaders, and specialists with responsibility for meeting the needs of the district's most vulnerable students. However, the district also has eliminated the position of director of guidance.

For several years, the district has been expanding its inclusion model for students with disabilities in co-taught classrooms that follow the district's standards-based curriculum. In school year 2015-2016, 56 percent of students with disabilities were taught in full inclusion and 16 percent in partial inclusion. Malden High School has two co-teaching classrooms for each of the four core content areas. In many instances, co-teachers have subject as well as special education certification. A variety of other instructional support personnel such as part-time teaching assistants who are retired teachers, paraprofessionals, and ESL teachers also provide assistance in general and inclusion classrooms, especially in K-5 ELA. In school year 2015-2016, 16 percent of students receiving special education services were in substantially separate classes distributed across the district's schools; 11 percent of students receiving special education services were placed out of district. The district provides Wilson Reading instruction at every K-8 school and integrated kindergarten classes at 4 of the 5 K-8 schools. Program managers and other certified specialists are responsible for overseeing or implementing special education programs and services at the school or program level.

English language learners (ELLs) follow two strands of instruction. Newly arrived ELLs are placed in a Newcomers Program with its own curriculum that integrates language acquisition and content-based knowledge, skills, and understandings. Other ELLs are placed in Sheltered English Immersion (SEI) classrooms and receive instruction in English as a second language (ESL) and sheltered content instruction in core subjects. SEI classrooms also follow the district's 5DP standards-based Year Long Plans for content learning and assessment data guides ESL instructional decision-making. In addition, ELLs receive additional push-in or pull-out language instruction based on their ACCESS level. The English Language Learning (ELL) program has its own coach who works to develop all teachers' skills for effective teaching of ELLs and others for whom English is not a first language. An estimated 85 percent of all teachers have received RETELL and/or SEI category training. All schools use a translation service to provide families with interpreters and document translation in the district's six major languages: Arabic, Chinese, Haitian Creole, Portuguese, Spanish, and Vietnamese.

Under the leadership of the previous superintendent, the district made a commitment to address students' social-emotional and behavioral needs at all school levels, which has created an aware, caring, and supportive district culture. Uneven resources and expertise to support data literacy as well as high

rates of chronic absence at the high school are compromising the district's efforts to support all students.

## Strength Findings

### **1. The Pathways Program provides high-school students at risk of not completing graduation requirements a range of opportunities to earn academic course credits.**

- A.** Interviews and a document review indicated that since 2010, the Pathways Program, an alternative program at Malden High School, has offered alternative ways to earn course credits leading to a diploma or a certificate.
  - 1. At-risk students are enrolled in the Pathways Program through a referral process such as the Student Support Team (SST). In the 2016-2017 school year, 80 students from general and special education are enrolled.
  - 2. The Pathways Program offers courses in the four core academic subjects and options to participate in other learning experiences in or outside the high school.
  - 3. There is one Pathways teacher for each core subject and nine support staff, including the director, a social worker, a behavior interventionist, and an educational support person.
- B.** There are multiple ways for Pathways students to meet academic course requirements.
  - 1. Other than the program's core subjects, alternative study options include dual enrollment at Bunker Hill Community College (BHCC), PLATO online courses, independent study, internships, work-study, vocational groups, and credit recovery.
  - 2. The goal for Pathways students in grades 9 and 10 is to return to the general high school program.
  - 3. The high school principal must approve credit for alternative learning experiences.
  - 4. Flexible scheduling permits students to arrive late or take core courses after the end of the normal school day to accommodate work schedules, study at BHCC, internships, and other conflicts.
- C.** The program is designed to foster a positive learning environment and holds students to the same expectations as those in the general education program.
  - 1. Core-subject teachers review MCAS results, attendance data, conduct referrals, grades, and test data in weekly planning meetings and hold students to the same academic expectations as those in the general education program.
  - 2. Staff attend to students' behavioral issues through meetings with parents and students and sometimes develop a behavior contract for students and parents/guardians to sign.

**Impact:** With a variety of opportunities to earn course credit, a flexible schedule that accommodates students' work and external study options, and a supportive and caring environment, Malden High School has provided general and special education students at risk of failing courses or dropping out with a "pathway" to completing high school.

**2. The district has made a commitment through its staffing, support, programs, and culture to address the social-emotional and behavioral needs of all students.**

- A.** Staff in leadership, program management, support, and teaching roles address students' social-emotional and behavioral needs in a range of ways.
  - 1. School adjustment counselors (SACs), often referred to as social workers, counsel students and collect and analyze data to support behavioral accommodations and interventions identified through the Student Support Team (SST) referral process.
    - a. SACs address the social-emotional and behavioral needs of general education students and students with disabilities.
    - b. SACs provide crisis interventions and referrals to outside providers, agencies, and community resources, and coordinate the school's child protection team.
  - 2. Five Board Certified Behavior Analysts (BCBAs) consult with teachers, SACs, and administrators and provide direct services to Tier 2 students identified by SSTs as needing support.
  - 3. In addition, a consultant BCBA provides professional development to teachers and SACs and meets monthly with district BCBAs to review programs and strategies to improve services to students.
    - a. Interviewees agreed that a professional development session on autism provided to staff by the BCBA consultant several years ago was very helpful.
    - b. High-school students identified a number of staff they turn to for help, including guidance counselors, the principal, assistant principals, academic teachers, house masters, secretaries, former class advisors, and coaches.
    - c. Students also noted that the school was in touch with parents when behavior was an issue.
  - 4. Through the district's partnership with Cambridge Health Alliance a child/adolescent psychiatrist provides weekly on-site consultation. This individual meets with students and parents and assists with referrals to providers of counseling or psychopharmacology. She also meets regularly with the SACs to provide training and consultation on various mental health issues.

5. One school committee member proposed, and the committee established, a subcommittee to study the social-emotional well being of students.
- B.** A number of school-based programs address students' behavioral needs.
1. The district is collaborating with the Harvard Graduate School of Education to develop the MATCH program, a targeted curriculum addressing behavioral issues for K-7 students.
  2. The Linden STEAM Academy offers five classes for K-8 students with social-emotional and behavioral disabilities, many with trauma histories.
  3. The Pathways Program at the high school expects and supports at-risk students to learn to demonstrate responsibility and gain self-confidence as learners (see the Strength finding above).
  4. Morning students in the Pathways Program at the high school participate in a behavior management system to help them take responsibility for their behavior and understand societal expectations for employment and norms for their relationships with others.
- C.** The district's culture is working to increase awareness of the social-emotional struggles that students face.
1. In his March-April 2016 newsletter the previous superintendent reported on a meeting with state senators and representatives that addressed the social-emotional and physical well being of students and the community at large.
    - a. District staff and other representatives from the community attended as well as staff from the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and the Department of Mental Health.
    - b. The meeting, as reported in the superintendent's newsletter, addressed how poverty affects students' social-emotional health and well being; the newsletter also noted that the district had spent the last school year drawing attention to these topics in both the community and its schools.
  2. Parents of high-school students noted that they were impressed by the tolerance that has been fostered at the high school.
  3. Parents also stated that they believed the schools were emotionally safe and respectful environments and referred to the school adjustment counselors as "a great resource."
  4. The district's commitment to expanding co-teaching represents an indication that it is willing to put resources into classrooms to support the education of struggling students, students in general education, and students with disabilities, whether the needs are academic or behavioral. Generally, co-teachers have appropriate common planning time to discuss how to best meet their students' needs.

5. Staff told the team that “huge strengths in the district” were the commitment, collaboration, and resilience of the faculty and other staff members to help students.

**Impact:** When a district makes a multi-pronged effort to support students’ social-emotional and behavioral challenges in and out of the classroom at all school levels, it helps ensure that all students’ needs are addressed and met so that all students can perform to the best of their ability.

## Challenges and Areas for Growth

### 3. The district has developed a multi-tiered system of support, but resources and practices vary from school to school.

- A. Interviews, a document review, and classroom observations indicated multiple levels of academic and social-emotional and behavioral support for general education students.
  1. Initial academic supports for literacy K-5 take place at Tier 1 in the district’s three-tiered model of instruction and support that uses flexible grouping and supplemental small-group instruction.
    - a. Classroom teachers and grade-level teams use assessment data, mainly from literacy, to review, assign, and monitor Tier 1 interventions using instructional supports or programs such as Lexia.
  2. Teachers and grade-level teams also identify Tier 1 behavioral supports such as classroom management strategies and behavior management strategies.
  3. Student Support Teams (SSTs) are in all schools for Pre-K-8 and at the high school. The role of SSTs is to identify supports, accommodations, and interventions for general education students, usually at Tier 2.
  4. Classroom teachers, teacher teams, administrators, and parents can refer general education students with academic or social-emotional and behavioral needs to the SSTs. The district has developed standardized documents to facilitate the referral process.
  5. The SSTs, usually chaired by the assistant principal, use assessment and behavioral data and other information to review students’ needs and recommend Tier 2 accommodations or interventions for both academic and social-emotional and behavioral issues. The teams then monitor progress every four to six weeks and make adjustments.
  6. When students with social-emotional and behavioral issues at Tier 2, Level 2, are not making sufficient progress with school-based supports, school adjustment counselors (SACs) in kindergarten-grade 4 and guidance counselors in grades 5-8 and 9-12 intervene directly with students.



7. Also, five Board Certified Behavior Analysts (BCBAs), one per K-8 school, work with SACs or guidance counselors to help analyze behavioral data and help provide and monitor appropriate interventions for students with Tier 2, Level 2, behavioral needs. Assistant principals and SACs meet monthly with the BCBAs to review progress and make adjustments. A consultant BCBA meets monthly with school-based BCBAs to review challenges and discuss strategies.
  8. SSTs can refer students to a special education review (Tier 3) when Tier 2 interventions for academic and social-emotional and behavioral concerns do not produce adequate progress.
- B.** Despite the advantages of solid structures in place and multiple layers and roles of personnel, interviewees noted that it was difficult to have an effective tiered system of support given the inequities across schools. They pointed out that even with inconsistent resources all the schools were faced with meeting the same expectations.
1. Although all schools have common planning time (CPT) during which teacher teams discuss student performance and relevant data before initiating the SST process, the amount of CPT varies by school.
    - a. Interviewees reported and documents confirmed that CPT periods per week varied by school. For example, at the two Extended Learning Time (ELT) schools Ferryway teachers have CPT daily and Salemwood teachers have it every other day in a four-day cycle. The Linden STEAM Academy (an Innovation School) has daily CPT. Beebe and Forestdale have CPT once or twice a week.
    - b. At the high school, content-based teacher teams meet regularly for CPT, as do co-teachers, who have a daily co-planning period. An administrator noted that high-school teachers have not been accustomed to analyzing data, a key component of understanding student needs, but said that is changing with new leadership.
  2. The district's assessment system is not fully formed and balanced, which presents challenges to the staff in understanding students' strengths and challenges and identifying which supports can be most helpful.
  3. Further complications are presented by an inadequate data tracking and sharing system, which may be improved by the new Mastery Connects platform, the third analytical system in the district in as many years. Without adequate technology and a comprehensive assessment system, data-driven decision-making and tracking cannot be reliable and equitable across schools and in the district as a whole.
  4. Interviewees said that some intervention programs are not available across schools.
    - a. Read 180 is only available at the Salemwood and Beebe Schools and at the high school for struggling students in grades 9 and 10. All K-8 schools have Lexia as well as Project Read.

- b. Lexia, a literacy intervention, is available in every K-8 classroom; review team members saw students using it during classroom observations. However, the 2016 Title I Program Evaluation noted that “technology problems continue to consistently impair its [Lexia] use.” In addition, the report cited that “Lexia decreased the amount of text reading students were exposed to during literacy” and teachers were asked to limit Lexia during ELA lessons.
  - c. The Beebe and Forestdale Schools and the Linden School do not have Tier 2 math interventions or math data meetings. Only the Salemwood School has Math 180.
- 5. The review team was told about difficulties in analyzing, tracking, and using intervention data and other data relevant to the support process across grade levels, schools, and the district.
  - a. Interviewees noted that a lot of intervention data was available from Read 180, but said that at Salemwood there was insufficient capacity to analyze the data and at the high school there were not enough people to review it or who even know how to use it.
  - b. Three math coaches were hired in 2015-2016 and are shared across the five K-8 schools: Salemwood has a full-time coach; the others have a part-time coach. Interviewees noted that even the shared time was uneven among schools. The math coaches have begun to work with teacher teams to develop a more systematic analysis of math data. Interviewees noted that math has not been as thoroughly assessed as literacy.
  - c. The 2016 Title I Program Evaluation stated that the challenges in the district’s technology infrastructure and the three different data collection/analysis platforms in recent years have made it difficult to access, analyze, and use assessment data at the student, school, and district levels.
  - d. Teachers reported that there was no analysis of behavioral data such as attendance to guide decision-making.

**Impact:** When a district does not provide sufficient support and resources to all students, students do not have equitable opportunities to learn.

**4. The ELL program has recently experienced difficulty assessing the needs of incoming students who require English language instruction. ELL leaders have not been involved in some ESL hiring decisions.**

- A. The ELL and Title III director told the review team that the English Language Learning (ELL) program is facing challenges in assessing newly arrived students who require English language instruction.
  - 1. During the fiscal year 2017 budget process, the Parent Information Center was restructured and there was a change in staffing for the ESL test administrator.

- a. Without the involvement of ELL leadership, the district replaced the ESL teacher who tested and placed incoming English language learners (ELLs) with two part-time staff. The replacement test administrator was not certified in ESL but at the time could still administer WIDA-Model assessments for incoming students.
  - b. The new staff did not meet the certification requirements of new ESE guidelines issued in August 2016 and so were no longer qualified to administer the WIDA-Model assessments. The district then had to pay several ESL teachers to score the assessments and make placement decisions without interacting with students during the testing procedure.
  - c. As a result, approximately 30 placement changes took place in the month of October 2016.
  - d. The ESL position was eventually restored when funds were reallocated.
  - e. In other recent instances, ESL teachers have been hired without the involvement of the ESL leadership.
- B.** The district does not have adequate procedures to assess and address the language needs of Students with Limited or Interrupted Formal Education (SLIFE).
1. The review team was told of multiple examples of high need and/or newly arrived students who arrived in the district with interrupted or without prior schooling. Interviewees stated that some students return to home countries for part of the school year.
  2. Interviewees and a document review indicated inadequate testing and placement of newly arrived ELLs.
  3. A staff member noted that the district does not have the ability to test incoming ELLs in their native languages making it difficult to determine whether they are SLIFE.
  4. Another staff member stated that the district does not have the capacity or the structures to administer native language literacy and numeracy assessments to determine whether a student is performing two or more years below the expected grade level relative to peers. As a result, the district does not code “suspected SLIFE students” in its student information system.<sup>13</sup>
  5. The district places “suspected SLIFE students” in the Newcomers Program and provides literacy and numeracy interventions in the same manner that it would for other struggling ELLs in the district.

---

<sup>13</sup> Subsequent to the site visit, the ELL director reported that the 5DP ELL directors discussed SLIFE at an October 31, 2016, meeting at his suggestion. The 5DP team committed to developing common data-based measures to determine whether or not students have interruptions in their education and to aligning intake centers to use data rather than anecdotal information to determine ESL placements.

**Impact:** Without appropriate testing and placement of students who require English language instruction, the district cannot ensure that students are in correct levels and classrooms to receive the support they need to acquire both academic and language skills. It also cannot determine whether additional supports should be assigned to students in order to meet their learning needs. In addition, without the involvement of ELL leadership, the district cannot ensure that it is hiring the most qualified and capable ESL staff for the district's needs or deploying staff effectively.

**5. The rates of chronic absence in all high-school grades remain persistently high. Staff expressed concern about attendance and tardiness policies.**

**A.** The rates of chronic absence at Malden High School need improvement.

1. Although the overall rate for chronic absence improved steadily from 2011 to 2016, from 13.8 percent in 2014 to 12.7 percent in 2015 to 12.2 percent in 2016, the percentages of chronically absent students in high-school grades in 2016 were as follows: 17.9 percent in grade 9; 17.7 percent in grade 10; 17.6 in grade 11; and 19.9 percent in grade 12.

**B.** The district's school resource officer conducts home visits to stress the importance of regular school attendance and to encourage parents to send their children to school.

**C.** Staff expressed concern about district attendance and tardiness policies.

1. A document review indicated that a student arriving tardy to school (after 8:30) or returning to school after absence must check into the House Office with a note from a parent/guardian, doctor, court officer, or other official, as appropriate, before returning to class. The secretary in the House Office must then stamp the student's agenda book.
2. One administrator said that the attendance policy relies on "inappropriate negative reinforcement." For example, students who enter class without a stamp in their agenda may be placed in detention and/or suspended. "Four absences from class in a quarter will require a teacher to give a student a failing grade (59) for that quarter ... Three absences from class for seniors for the fourth quarter will require a teacher to give a failing grade for that quarter." Absence from class "can include any or all of the following: excused absence, truancy, dismissal, tardiness, suspension, being sent from class for disciplinary reasons, and class cutting."
3. The tardiness policy seems to be contradictory in places. For example, the policy includes the following statements:
  - a. "A student who arrives late to class without a signed [stamped] agenda book will be given one absence from class if he/she is late three times in one quarter."
  - b. "Remember that if you are more than 15 minutes late to any class that is considered an absence from that class."

4. Interviewees stated that the policy is almost always “circumnavigated by an attendance board.”
  5. As a result of prioritizing classroom resources for fiscal year 2017, the high school eliminated two of four secretarial positions, making the secretary-to-student ratio 1:900 rather than 1:450. Interviewees said that, as a result, the line for students to have their agendas stamped before entering class is excessively long. This means that students miss more instruction waiting for secretaries to stamp their agendas.
- D.** The guidance department has gained two counselors and lost its leader. The district has not had a guidance director for three years and does not have a registrar or guidance support staff for a high school of more than 1,800 students.
1. Interviewees stated that a number of guidance and support functions have not been carried out since the guidance director’s position was cut. For example, data and reports from testing or other student data are not generated for staff review. There is no director to help counselors develop and assess interventions and to organize and lead teacher-counselor team meetings to discuss guidance issues. Teacher-counselor meetings now take place only at the Salemwood School.

**Impact:** Students who are not in school often fall behind and are at greater risk of low achievement and dropping out.

## Recommendations

- 1. District leaders, teachers, and staff should work collaboratively to improve practices and programs so that they are more effective in supporting and improving learning for all students.**
  - A.** The district is encouraged to provide sufficient opportunities for teacher teams to discuss students’ needs using student performance data and other data sources, to define appropriate accommodations and interventions, and to monitor progress and make necessary adjustments.
  - B.** The district should consider making Read 180 and Math 180 available at all schools.
  - C.** The district should consider ways to ensure effective and adequate leadership in the guidance department.

**Benefits:** Implementing this recommendation will ensure that all students receive the academic, social-emotional, and behavioral supports needed to perform to the best of their ability. Appropriate leadership in the guidance department will likely mean more effective policies and approaches to support and guide students for their lives after high school.

**Recommended resources:**

- The *Massachusetts Tiered System of Support (MTSS)* ([www.mass.gov/ese/mtss](http://www.mass.gov/ese/mtss)) is a blueprint for school improvement that focuses on systems, structures and supports across the district, school, and classroom to meet the academic and non-academic needs of all students. The MTSS website includes links to a self-assessment and a variety of helpful resources.
  - ESE's *Early Warning Indicator System* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edwin/analytics/ewis.html>) is a tool to provide information to districts about the likelihood that their students will reach key academic goals. Districts can use the tool in conjunction with other data and sources of information to better target student supports and interventions and to examine school-level patterns over time in order to address systemic issues that may impede students' ability to meet academic goals.
  - The *Early Warning Implementation Guide* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edwin/analytics/2014ImplementationGuide.pdf>) provides information on how to use early warning data, including the Massachusetts Early Warning Indicator System (EWIS), to identify, diagnose, support and monitor students in grades 1-12. It offers educators an overview of EWIS and how to effectively use these data in conjunction with local data by following a six-step implementation cycle.
- 2. The district should continue to create and implement systems and practices that ensure that newly arriving English language learners are provided with instruction and support that meets their needs.**
- A.** The district should provide clearly defined leadership, sufficient qualified teaching staff, appropriate placement and scheduling of classes with support interventions, and adequate resources.
  - B.** The ELL director should continue to collaborate with the SDP ELL directors to develop new models for intake and testing.
    - 1. SLIFE students often have a high risk of dropping out of school. The district should consider drop-out prevention measures for SLIFE students.

**Benefits:** Implementing this recommendation will provide English language learners (ELLs) a more effective, well-planned program, which can lead to increased student achievement and help ensure that the district provides all students with a high-quality education. This will help provide a smoother entrance of ELLs to the district and help students' academic progress and emotional well being.

**Recommended resources:**

- *The English Learner Toolkit for State and Local Education Agencies* (<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oela/english-learner-toolkit/index.html>) is designed to help state and local education agencies to meet their legal obligations to English language learners (ELLs) and to provide ELLs with the support needed to attain English language proficiency while meeting

college- and career- readiness standards. The tool kit includes such topics as identifying English language learners, evaluating the effectiveness of programs, and supporting limited English proficient parents. Each of its 10 chapters includes: (1) explanations of the civil rights and other legal obligations to ELLs; (2) checklists that can be used as self-monitoring tools; (3) sample tools that may be used or adapted for use to aid with compliance; and (4) free online resources that provide additional relevant information and assistance.

- Massachusetts Students with Limited or Interrupted Formal Education (SLIFE) Definition and Guidance Document, “Guidance on Identification, Assessment, Placement, and reclassification of English Learners” (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/SLIFE-Guidance.pdf>) is designed to help districts develop procedures to properly identify, test and place SLIFE students.

**3. The high school should revise its attendance and tardiness policies to improve students’ attendance.**

**A.** The high school should examine ways to encourage students to arrive at school on time.

1. Tardiness of a few minutes and tardiness that results in missing most or all of a class period should be viewed differently and assigned different consequences.
2. The high school might consider options that would allow students to enter the building early to study, to have breakfast, or to get extra help.

**B.** The high school should consider researching attendance and tardiness policies in similar districts in order to gain insights on how to make current policies more workable, more consistent, and more student friendly. For example, some districts use an incentive system such as offering donated movie tickets or special snacks in the cafeteria to reward students for improved attendance.

1. The high school should consider how technology might improve tracking and reporting on attendance and tardiness.

**Benefits:** Implementing this recommendation will mean more positive and more efficient attendance and tardiness policies and practices. In the end, the students at risk of not succeeding in school and at risk of leaving school before graduation will benefit.

**Recommended resources:**

- *Every Student, Every Day: A Community Toolkit to Address and Eliminate Chronic Absenteeism* (<http://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/chronicabsenteeism/toolkit.pdf>) is a set of Action Guides that provide information and resources to help ensure that all young people are in school every day and benefitting from coordinated systems of support.

- The *Impact of Dropping Out Student Flyer* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/dropout/2014-05ImpactFlyer.pdf>) is a brief resource that can be shared with students and their families as part of the exit intervention process to share the potential negative impacts of dropping out of high school.
- The *Impact of Dropping Out Staff Resources Summary* (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/dropout/2014-05ImpactSummary.pdf>) provides a summary of research findings on the impacts of dropping out, listed by the following categories: personal income and employment, economy, crime, literacy, health, and family formation. Following the summary of findings is a listing of references.



## Financial and Asset Management

---

### Contextual Background

Malden is an urban, racially and ethnically diverse district located 5 miles outside of Boston. The district serves 6,570 students PK-12 in 7 schools (in school year 2015-2016): an early learning center, 5 K-8 schools, and a high school. Malden's student enrollment has been stable for the past five years. Malden's fiscal year 2015 per-pupil spending was \$12,947, which was 90 percent of the state median of \$14,460. The average teacher salary for fiscal year 2015 was \$83,740, which exceeded the state median of \$73,127. Malden employed 458 teachers in school year 2015-2016.

According to Department of Revenue data, Malden's 2012 per capita income was \$21,839 and its 2014 equalized valuation per capita was \$86,248. The city's fiscal year 2017 free cash balance is \$12,455,252.

Malden exceeded its net school spending (NSS) requirement by 3.5 percent or \$2.9 million in fiscal year 2016. Between fiscal year 2012 and 2016 the district's actual NSS grew from 2.2 percent below its required NSS to 3.5 percent above, an increase of 5.7 percentage points. Over the same period the district's Chapter 70 aid grew by close to 10 percent, from \$44,091,112 to \$48,438,759.

### Strength Finding

#### 1. District and city administrators have strong working relationships.

- A. There are effective lines of communication and a strong, shared understanding between the district business manager and the city controller.
  - 1. The city and the schools use the same accounting system: SoftRight.
  - 2. The district business manager was a former consultant in the city controller's office, which has helped to foster a positive working relationship between the city and the schools.
  - 3. A city official noted that the level of trust between the city and the schools has greatly improved.
- B. The city and the schools have a clearly articulated agreement to determine the education related charges on the city's budget, including the city's share of the district's net school spending obligation. As much as possible, this agreement is based on actual, not estimated, expenditures.
- C. Both school leaders and city officials acknowledged inefficiencies in their operations and said that they are working collaboratively to resolve them.

1. Moving to bi-weekly payroll: The business manager and the city controller recognize the administrative burden and added costs of managing a weekly payroll. The district's collective bargaining agreements allow for a transition to a bi-weekly payroll. The district and the mayor are currently in discussions about moving the district in this direction and are close to implementing this change.
  2. Consolidating technology services: Historically Malden has maintained separate IT functions for each city department. The city is now in the process of consolidating all IT functions in a single unit to serve all city departments. Interviewees said that this transition would be complete before the end of fiscal year 2017, saving the city time and money and improving overall efficiency.
  3. Automating purchase orders: The business manager is working to streamline the requisition process so that principals can create purchase orders in the SoftRight system at the school level. The goal is to automate the process and reduce the amount of paper generated.
- D. The various players on both the city and school sides understand their roles and work together to solve problems and identify and plan for facility needs.
1. The K-8 schools in the district were all built 16 or 17 years ago and the high school was recently renovated. While the schools are all well maintained, they are reaching the point where they will start to require significant repairs, including roofs and HVAC systems.
  2. The schools are city buildings and are managed through joint oversight by the city's public facilities manager and the district's supervisor of buildings and grounds working with the district's business manager.
  3. The district's interim superintendent delegates building maintenance responsibilities to the city's public facilities manager, the district's supervisor of buildings and grounds, and the district's business manager, freeing him to focus on instruction.
  4. The district's 27 custodians are school employees and are responsible for cleaning and light maintenance in their assigned schools.
    - a. Custodians report to the principals in each school and to the supervisor of buildings and grounds. The supervisor of buildings and grounds evaluates each custodian.
    - b. A contractor cleans three of the seven schools at night; the district is in the process of having all the district's custodians clean all schools during the day.
  5. City maintenance staff (city employees or contractors) are responsible for more complicated repairs or system maintenance.
  6. The city and the schools have adopted FacilityDude to track maintenance issues. They are collecting data in the system to help them with capital planning and budgeting.

7. Interviewees told the team that while maintenance costs have been stable, finding sufficient time and money to do preventative maintenance is a challenge.
8. In an effort to take a more proactive approach to facility management, the public facilities manager in collaboration with the buildings and grounds supervisor and the district business manager is working to develop a five-year capital plan to identify maintenance needs, including playgrounds, roofs, and HVAC systems.
  - a. Malden is also participating with four other districts in an effort led by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) to hire a vendor to perform investment-grade energy audits to identify energy-saving renovations.

**Impact:** A strong relationship between city officials and district leaders has led to collaborative management and problem solving, placing the city and the schools in a position to address challenges well.

## Challenges and Areas for Growth

### **2. The district's improvement plan does not inform resource allocation decisions in the district.**

- A.** Interviews and a document review indicated that the district's budget development process is not driven by a clear set of priorities and improvement goals.
  1. In 2015, under the leadership of the previous superintendent, the district participated in the Planning for Success Pilot, a strategic planning initiative sponsored by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, to develop a District Improvement Plan (DIP) to guide strategic objectives and initiatives in the district between 2015 and 2018.
  2. The DIP outlines strategic initiatives in four priority areas: early education, social-emotional growth, college and career, and newcomer's programs.
  3. During the onsite the DIP was not widely known to various stakeholders, including district and city leaders and school committee members.
    - a. Interviewees stated that the previous superintendent discussed priorities with the school committee.
    - b. The district business manager said that she produced reports for the previous superintendent to update the school committee on budgeted versus actual expenditures and to flag any areas of concern.
  4. Interviewees told the team that the DIP is not referred to in the district's annual budget development process.

5. The budget documents provided to the review team do not contain a narrative explanation of the district's priorities or make any connection to the DIP. The budget documents also do not clearly distinguish between schools, funding priorities, or funding sources.

**Impact:** Without clearly articulated district goals and priorities driving decision making, the district cannot allocate resources in a cost-effective and targeted manner to have a positive impact on student achievement.

## Recommendation

- 1. Aligned with the strengthened improvement planning process recommended under Leadership and Governance above, the district's formal budget document should include a narrative explanation of the district's priorities as well as all revenue sources.**

- A. Key aspects of the District Improvement Plan should be included in the budget narrative, and specific statements about resources provided in the plan document for initiatives that have financial implications, for example, staffing changes, changes in class sizes, or new professional development.

1. Historical budget and spending data should be included in the final budget document.

**Benefits:** Implementing these recommendations will mean a comprehensive budget document that accurately reflects the financial position of the district and the responsible and focused use of all available resources.

### Recommended resources:

- The Rennie Center's Smart School Budgeting ([http://www.renniecenter.org/topics/smart\\_school\\_budgeting.html](http://www.renniecenter.org/topics/smart_school_budgeting.html); direct link: <http://www.renniecenter.org/research/SmartSchoolBudgeting.pdf>) is a summary of existing resources on school finance, budgeting, and reallocation of resources.
- In *Spending Money Wisely: Getting the Most from School District Budgets* (<http://dmcouncil.org/spending-money-wisely-ebook>), authors Nathan Levenson, Karla Baehr, James C. Smith, and Claire Sullivan of The District Management Council identify and discuss the top ten opportunities for districts to realign resources and free up funds to support strategic priorities. Drawing on the wisdom of leading thinkers, district leaders, and education researchers from across the country, the authors gathered a long list of opportunities for resource reallocation. To distill these down to the ten most high-impact opportunities, each opportunity was assessed based on its financial benefit, its impact on student achievement, its political feasibility, and its likelihood of success relative to the complexity of implementation.
- *Best Practices in School District Budgeting* (<http://www.gfoa.org/best-practices-school-district-budgeting>) outlines steps to developing a budget that best aligns resources with student

achievement goals. Each step includes a link to a specific resource document with relevant principles and policies to consider.

- ESE's *District Analysis and Review Tool (DART)* ( is organized by the District Standards and can help district leaders see where similar districts in the state are showing progress in specific areas to identify possible best practice.

## Appendix A: Review Team, Activities, Schedule, Site Visit

---

### Review Team Members

The review was conducted from October 24-27, 2016, by the following team of independent ESE consultants.

1. Karla Brooks Baehr, Ed. D., leadership and governance
2. Richard Silverman, Ed. D., curriculum and instruction
3. Suzanne Kelly, assessment
4. William Contreras, Ed. D., human resources and professional development
5. Linda L. Greyser, Ed. D., student support and *review team coordinator*
6. Rob O'Donnell, financial and asset management (ESE staff member)

### District Review Activities

The following activities were conducted during the review:

The team conducted interviews with the following financial personnel: business manager, accounts payable supervisor, payroll supervisor.

The team conducted interviews with the following members of the school committee: eight school committee members.

The review team conducted interviews with the following representatives of the teachers' association: president and vice-president.

The team conducted interviews/focus groups with the following central office administrators: interim superintendent; interim assistant superintendent for curriculum, instruction, and assessment; assistant superintendent for special education and student services; business manager; literacy and Title I director, and ELL and Title III director.

The team visited the following schools: Beebe School (K-8), Ferryway School (K-8), Forestdale School (K-8), Linden School (K-8), Salemwood School (K-8), and Malden High School (grades 9-12).

During school visits, the team conducted interviews with seven principals and focus groups with six teachers from kindergarten through grade 4, five teachers from grades 5-8, and four teachers from grades 9-12. The district asked for one volunteer from each K-8 school and one from each academic discipline at the high school to participate in the teacher focus groups.

The team observed 89 classes in the district: 19 at the high school, 34 in the middle grades 5-8, and 36 in the elementary grades K-4.

The review team analyzed multiple data sets and reviewed numerous documents before and during the site visit, including:

- Student and school performance data, including achievement and growth, enrollment, graduation, dropout, retention, suspension, and attendance rates.
- Data on the district's staffing and finances.
- Published educational reports on the district by ESE, the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC), and the former Office of Educational Quality and Accountability (EQA).
- District documents such as district and school improvement plans, school committee policies, curriculum documents, summaries of student assessments, job descriptions, collective bargaining agreements, evaluation tools for staff, handbooks, school schedules, and the district's end-of-year financial reports.
- All completed program and administrator evaluations, and a random selection of completed teacher evaluations.

## Site Visit Schedule

| <b>Monday</b><br>10/24/2016  | <b>Tuesday</b><br>10/25/2016  | <b>Wednesday</b><br>10/26/2016   | <b>Thursday</b><br>10/27/2016  |
|--|---|--|--|
| Orientation with district leaders and principals; interviews with district staff and principals; document reviews; interview with teachers' association. | Interviews with district staff and principals and city personnel; review of personnel files; teacher focus groups; parent focus group; high school student focus group and visit to Salemwood School and Malden High School for classroom observations. | Interviews with school leaders and district staff; interviews with school committee members; visits to Beebe School, Ferryway School, and Forestdale School for classroom observations; review of documents and personnel files. | Interviews with school leaders; district review team meeting; visits to Salemwood School, Forestdale School, Linden School, and Malden High School for classroom observations; district wrap-up meeting with the superintendent. |

## Appendix B: Enrollment, Performance, Expenditures

**Table B1a: Malden Public Schools  
2015–2016 Student Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity**

| Student Group            | District     | Percent of Total | State          | Percent of Total |
|--------------------------|--------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| African-American         | 1,317        | 20.0%            | 83,481         | 8.8%             |
| Asian                    | 1,525        | 23.2%            | 61,584         | 6.5%             |
| Hispanic                 | 1,436        | 21.9%            | 176,873        | 18.6%            |
| Native American          | 17           | 0.3%             | 2,179          | 0.2%             |
| White                    | 2,020        | 30.7%            | 59,502         | 62.7%            |
| Native Hawaiian          | 4            | 0.1%             | 888            | 0.1%             |
| Multi-Race, Non-Hispanic | 251          | 3.8%             | 30,922         | 3.2%             |
| <b>All Students</b>      | <b>6,570</b> | <b>100.0%</b>    | <b>953,429</b> | <b>100.0%</b>    |

Note: As of October 1, 2015

**Table B1b: Malden Public Schools  
2015–2016 Student Enrollment by High Needs Populations**

| Student Groups           | District |                       |                     | State   |                       |                  |
|--------------------------|----------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------|-----------------------|------------------|
|                          | N        | Percent of High Needs | Percent of District | N       | Percent of High Needs | Percent of State |
| Students w/ disabilities | 1,060    | 25.5%                 | 15.9%               | 165,559 | 39.4%                 | 17.2%            |
| Econ. Disad.             | 2,638    | 63.5%                 | 40.2%               | 260,998 | 62.2%                 | 27.4%            |
| ELLs and Former ELLs     | 1,231    | 29.6%                 | 18.7%               | 85,763  | 20.4%                 | 9.0%             |
| All high needs students  | 4,155    | 100.0%                | 62.2%               | 419,764 | 100.0%                | 43.5%            |

Notes: As of October 1, 2015. District and state numbers and percentages for students with disabilities and high needs students are calculated including students in out-of-district placements. Total district enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 6,677; total state enrollment including students in out-of-district placement is 964,026.



**Table B2a: Malden Public Schools  
English Language Arts Performance, 2013–2016**

| Grade and Measure |     | Number Included (2016) | MCAS Year |      |        | PARCC |      | Gains and Declines |
|-------------------|-----|------------------------|-----------|------|--------|-------|------|--------------------|
|                   |     |                        | 2013      | 2014 |        | 2015  | 2016 | 2-Year Trend       |
| 3                 | CPI | 531                    | 74.7      | 72.4 | CPI    | 75.9  | 78.2 | 2.3                |
|                   | P+  | 531                    | 37%       | 37%  | Lv 4&5 | 37%   | 40%  | 3                  |
| 4                 | CPI | 445                    | 67.0      | 68.0 | CPI    | 70.4  | 77.6 | 7.2                |
|                   | P+  | 445                    | 32%       | 34%  | Lv 4&5 | 45%   | 54%  | 9                  |
|                   | SGP | 405                    | 38.0      | 46.0 | SGP    | 52.0  | 56.0 | 4.0                |
| 5                 | CPI | 442                    | 78.7      | 76.2 | CPI    | 78.9  | 77.4 | -1.5               |
|                   | P+  | 442                    | 53%       | 50%  | Lv 4&5 | 46%   | 42%  | -4                 |
|                   | SGP | 402                    | 61.0      | 55.0 | SGP    | 60.0  | 44.0 | -16.0              |
| 6                 | CPI | 460                    | 80.9      | 80.3 | CPI    | 78.3  | 82.0 | 3.7                |
|                   | P+  | 460                    | 56%       | 57%  | Lv 4&5 | 42%   | 52%  | 10                 |
|                   | SGP | 422                    | 61.0      | 62.0 | SGP    | 53.0  | 57.5 | 4.5                |
| 7                 | CPI | 423                    | 86.4      | 85.5 | CPI    | 82.4  | 84.9 | 2.5                |
|                   | P+  | 423                    | 68%       | 64%  | Lv 4&5 | 52%   | 56%  | 4                  |
|                   | SGP | 375                    | 68.0      | 62.5 | SGP    | 61.0  | 55.0 | -6.0               |
| 8                 | CPI | 424                    | 88.1      | 85.9 | CPI    | 85.4  | 87.5 | 2.1                |
|                   | P+  | 424                    | 74%       | 69%  | Lv 4&5 | 45%   | 51%  | 6                  |
|                   | SGP | 384                    | 48.0      | 52.5 | SGP    | 43.0  | 44.5 | 1.5                |

**Table B2b: Malden Public Schools  
English Language Arts Performance, 2013–2016<sup>14</sup>**

| Grade and Measure |     | Number Included (2016) | MCAS/Accountability Year |      |      |      | State (2016) | Gains and Declines |              |
|-------------------|-----|------------------------|--------------------------|------|------|------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|
|                   |     |                        | 2013                     | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |              | 4-Year Trend       | 2-Year Trend |
| 10                | CPI | 417                    | 92.6                     | 94.3 | 95.8 | 94.4 | 96.7         | 1.8                | -1.4         |
|                   | P+  | 417                    | 82%                      | 84%  | 90%  | 87%  | 91%          | 5                  | -3           |
|                   | SGP | 265                    | 50.0                     | 40.0 | 44.0 | 45.0 | 50.0         | -5                 | 1            |
| All               | CPI | 3,224                  | 81.1                     | 80.6 | 80.6 | 82.6 | 87.2         | 1.5                | 2.0          |
|                   | P+  | --                     | 57%                      | 57%  | --   | --   | --           | --                 | --           |
|                   | SGP | 2,259                  | 55.0                     | 52.0 | 53.0 | 51.0 | 50.0         | -4.0               | -2.0         |

<sup>14</sup> In the All category 2015 and 2016 CPI and SGP are based on MCAS and PARCC test scores.

**Table B2c: Malden Public Schools  
Mathematics Performance, 2013–2016**

| Grade and Measure |     | Number Included (2016) | MCAS Year |      |        | PARCC |      | Gains and Declines |
|-------------------|-----|------------------------|-----------|------|--------|-------|------|--------------------|
|                   |     |                        | 2013      | 2014 |        | 2015  | 2016 | 2-Year Trend       |
| 3                 | CPI | 533                    | 75.1      | 72.2 | CPI    | 80.3  | 80.2 | -0.1               |
|                   | P+  | 533                    | 52%       | 47%  | Lv 4&5 | 43%   | 45%  | 2                  |
| 4                 | CPI | 444                    | 72.5      | 69.4 | CPI    | 72.3  | 76.5 | 4.2                |
|                   | P+  | 444                    | 39%       | 36%  | Lv 4&5 | 39%   | 47%  | 8                  |
|                   | SGP | 399                    | 48.0      | 50.0 | SGP    | 58.0  | 43.0 | -15.0              |
| 5                 | CPI | 453                    | 72.4      | 72.2 | CPI    | 72.7  | 70.4 | -2.3               |
|                   | P+  | 453                    | 47%       | 49%  | Lv 4&5 | 37%   | 32%  | -5                 |
|                   | SGP | 412                    | 50.0      | 55.0 | SGP    | 65.0  | 33.0 | -32.0              |
| 6                 | CPI | 460                    | 82        | 84.3 | CPI    | 79.0  | 80.8 | 1.8                |
|                   | P+  | 460                    | 63%       | 66%  | Lv 4&5 | 49%   | 53%  | 4                  |
|                   | SGP | 422                    | 71.0      | 82.0 | SGP    | 78.0  | 76.0 | -2                 |
| 7                 | CPI | 425                    | 68.7      | 70.2 | CPI    | 69.0  | 75.2 | 6.2                |
|                   | P+  | 425                    | 44%       | 46%  | Lv 4&5 | 45%   | 47%  | 2                  |
|                   | SGP | 383                    | 41.0      | 52.0 | SGP    | 49.0  | 57.0 | 8.0                |
| 8                 | CPI | 386                    | 76.2      | 69.4 | CPI    | 75.7  | 73.9 | -1.8               |
|                   | P+  | 386                    | 54%       | 45%  | Lv 4&5 | 50%   | 46%  | -4                 |
|                   | SGP | 351                    | 67.0      | 54.0 | SGP    | 47.0  | 48.0 | 1                  |

**Table B2d: Malden Public Schools  
Mathematics Performance, 2013–2016<sup>15</sup>**

| Grade and Measure |     | Number Included (2016) | MCAS/Accountability Year |      |      |      |      | Gains and Declines |              |
|-------------------|-----|------------------------|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|--------------------|--------------|
|                   |     |                        | 2013                     | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |      | 4-Year Trend       | 2-Year Trend |
| 10                | CPI | 419                    | 84.3                     | 89.1 | 89.1 | 87.1 | 89.7 | 2.8                | -2           |
|                   | P+  | 419                    | 69%                      | 76%  | 75%  | 74%  | 78%  | 5%                 | -1%          |
|                   | SGP | 265                    | 44.5                     | 55.0 | 51.0 | 51.0 | 50.0 | 6.5                | 0.0          |
| All               | CPI | 3,252                  | 75.8                     | 75.5 | 76.5 | 77.7 | 81.5 | 1.9                | 1.2          |
|                   | P+  | --                     | 52%                      | 53%  | --   | --   | --   | --                 | --           |
|                   | SGP | 2,288                  | 55.0                     | 58.0 | 59.0 | 53.0 | 50.0 | -2.0               | -6.0         |

<sup>15</sup> In the All category 2015 and 2016 CPI and SGP are based on MCAS and PARCC test scores.

**Table B2e: Malden Public Schools  
Science and Technology/Engineering Performance, 2013–2016**

| Grade and Measure |     | Number Included (2016) | Spring MCAS Year |      |      |      |              | Gains and Declines |              |
|-------------------|-----|------------------------|------------------|------|------|------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|
|                   |     |                        | 2013             | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | State (2016) | 4-Year Trend       | 2-Year Trend |
| 5                 | CPI | 876                    | 471              | 72.9 | 71.7 | 73.2 | 76.4         | -5.3               | -5.6         |
|                   | P+  | 876                    | 471              | 40%  | 42%  | 41%  | 47%          | -9%                | -10%         |
| 8                 | CPI | 748                    | 453              | 67   | 64.7 | 65.4 | 71.3         | -3.3               | -1.7         |
|                   | P+  | 748                    | 453              | 33%  | 32%  | 29%  | 41%          | -4%                | 0%           |
| 10                | CPI | 527                    | 370              | 82.8 | 84.6 | 86.1 | 88.9         | 0.6                | -2.7         |
|                   | P+  | 527                    | 370              | 61%  | 63%  | 65%  | 73%          | -1%                | -5%          |
| All               | CPI | 2,151                  | 1,294            | 74   | 73   | 74.3 | 78.7         | -3.2               | -3.5         |
|                   | P+  | 2,151                  | 1,294            | 44%  | 45%  | 44%  | 54%          | -5%                | -5%          |

Notes: P+ = percent *Proficient* or *Advanced*. Students participate in Science and Technology/ Engineering (STE) MCAS tests in grades 5, 8, and 10 only. Median SGPs are not calculated for STE.

**Table B3a: Malden Public Schools  
English Language Arts (All Grades)  
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2013–2016<sup>16</sup>**

| Group and Measure  |          |     | Number Included (2016) | Accountability |      |        |       |      | 2-Year Trend | 4-Year Trend |
|--------------------|----------|-----|------------------------|----------------|------|--------|-------|------|--------------|--------------|
|                    |          |     |                        | MCAS           |      |        | PARCC |      |              |              |
|                    |          |     |                        | 2013           | 2014 |        | 2015  | 2016 |              |              |
| High Needs         | District | CPI | 2,111                  | 77.1           | 76.1 | CPI    | 75.4  | 77.0 | 1.6          | -0.1         |
|                    |          | P+  | --                     | 50%            | 48%  | Lv 4&5 | --    | --   | --           | --           |
|                    |          | SGP | 1,383                  | 54.0           | 52.0 | SGP    | 52.0  | 51.0 | -1.0         | -3.0         |
|                    | State    | CPI | 222,707                | 76.8           | 77.1 | CPI    | 76.3  | 77.1 | 0.8          | 0.3          |
|                    |          | P+  | --                     | 48%            | 50%  | Lv 4&5 | --    | --   | --           | --           |
|                    |          | SGP | 165,487                | 47.0           | 47.0 | SGP    | 47.0  | 47.0 | 0.0          | 0.0          |
| Econ. Disad.       | District | CPI | 1,566                  | --             | --   | CPI    | 77.7  | 78.7 | 1.0          | --           |
|                    |          | P+  | --                     | --             | --   | Lv 4&5 | --    | --   | --           | --           |
|                    |          | SGP | 1,036                  | --             | --   | SGP    | 52.0  | 51.0 | -1.0         | --           |
|                    | State    | CPI | 152,877                | --             | --   | CPI    | 77.6  | 78.2 | 0.6          | --           |
|                    |          | P+  | --                     | --             | --   | Lv 4&5 | --    | --   | --           | --           |
|                    |          | SGP | 114,361                | --             | --   | SGP    | 46.0  | 46.0 | 0.0          | --           |
| SWD                | District | CPI | 555                    | 59.9           | 58.0 | CPI    | 57.7  | 58.5 | 0.8          | -1.4         |
|                    |          | P+  | --                     | 18%            | 16%  | Lv 4&5 | --    | --   | --           | --           |
|                    |          | SGP | 343                    | 39.5           | 44.0 | SGP    | 39.0  | 38.0 | -1.0         | -1.5         |
|                    | State    | CPI | 91,177                 | 66.8           | 66.6 | CPI    | 67.4  | 68.2 | 0.8          | 1.4          |
|                    |          | P+  | --                     | 30%            | 31%  | Lv 4&5 | --    | --   | --           | --           |
|                    |          | SGP | 66,633                 | 43.0           | 43.0 | SGP    | 43.0  | 43.0 | 0.0          | 0.0          |
| ELL or Former ELLs | District | CPI | 843                    | 67.5           | 69.8 | CPI    | 71.2  | 73.9 | 2.7          | 6.4          |
|                    |          | P+  | --                     | 35%            | 38%  | Lv 4&5 | --    | --   | --           | --           |
|                    |          | SGP | 509                    | 60.0           | 63.0 | SGP    | 59.0  | 56.0 | -3.0         | -4.0         |
|                    | State    | CPI | 52,960                 | 67.4           | 67.8 | CPI    | 68.9  | 70.7 | 1.8          | 3.3          |
|                    |          | P+  | --                     | 35%            | 36%  | Lv 4&5 | --    | --   | --           | --           |
|                    |          | SGP | 35,109                 | 53.0           | 54.0 | SGP    | 53.0  | 54.0 | 1.0          | 1.0          |
| All students       | District | CPI | 3,224                  | 81.1           | 80.6 | CPI    | 80.6  | 82.6 | 2.0          | 1.5          |
|                    |          | P+  | --                     | 57%            | 57%  | Lv 4&5 | --    | --   | --           | --           |
|                    |          | SGP | 2,259                  | 55.0           | 52.0 | SGP    | 53.0  | 51.0 | -2.0         | -4.0         |
|                    | State    | CPI | 491,267                | 86.8           | 86.7 | CPI    | 86.8  | 87.2 | 0.4          | 0.4          |
|                    |          | P+  | --                     | 69%            | 69%  | Lv 4&5 | --    | --   | --           | --           |
|                    |          | SGP | 388,999                | 51.0           | 50.0 | SGP    | 50.0  | 50.0 | 0.0          | -1.0         |

<sup>16</sup> 2015 and 2016 CPI and SGP are based on MCAS and PARCC test scores.

**Table B3b: Malden Public Schools  
Mathematics (All Grades)  
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2013–2016<sup>17</sup>**

| Group and Measure  |          |     | Number Included (2016) | Accountability |      |        |       |      | 2-Year Trend | 4-Year Trend |
|--------------------|----------|-----|------------------------|----------------|------|--------|-------|------|--------------|--------------|
|                    |          |     |                        | MCAS           |      |        | PARCC |      |              |              |
|                    |          |     |                        | 2013           | 2014 |        | 2015  | 2016 |              |              |
| High Needs         | District | CPI | 2,142                  | 71.6           | 70.7 | CPI    | 71.2  | 71.9 | 0.7          | 0.3          |
|                    |          | P+  | --                     | 46%            | 45%  | Lv 4&5 | --    | --   | --           | --           |
|                    |          | SGP | 1,417                  | 54.0           | 57.0 | SGP    | 60.0  | 51.0 | -9.0         | -3.0         |
|                    | State    | CPI | 222,349                | 68.6           | 68.4 | CPI    | 67.9  | 68.8 | 0.8          | 0.3          |
|                    |          | P+  | --                     | 40%            | 40%  | Lv 4&5 | --    | --   | --           | --           |
|                    |          | SGP | 165,191                | 46.0           | 47.0 | SGP    | 46.0  | 46.0 | 0.0          | 0.0          |
| Econ. Disad.       | District | CPI | 1,583                  | --             | --   | CPI    | 73.5  | 74.1 | 0.6          | --           |
|                    |          | P+  | --                     | --             | --   | Lv 4&5 | --    | --   | --           | --           |
|                    |          | SGP | 1,052                  | --             | --   | SGP    | 61.0  | 52.0 | -9.0         | --           |
|                    | State    | CPI | 152,560                | --             | --   | CPI    | 69.2  | 70.0 | 0.6          | --           |
|                    |          | P+  | --                     | --             | --   | Lv 4&5 | --    | --   | --           | --           |
|                    |          | SGP | 114,091                | --             | --   | SGP    | 46.0  | 45.0 | 0.0          | --           |
| SWD                | District | CPI | 578                    | 49.9           | 49.3 | CPI    | 48.4  | 49.0 | 0.6          | -0.9         |
|                    |          | P+  | --                     | 12%            | 12%  | Lv 4&5 | --    | --   | --           | --           |
|                    |          | SGP | 373                    | 39.5           | 46.0 | SGP    | 43.0  | 43.0 | 0.0          | 3.5          |
|                    | State    | CPI | 91,049                 | 57.4           | 57.1 | CPI    | 57.3  | 58.1 | 0.8          | 1.4          |
|                    |          | P+  | --                     | 22%            | 22%  | Lv 4&5 | --    | --   | --           | --           |
|                    |          | SGP | 66,511                 | 42.0           | 43.0 | SGP    | 43.0  | 44.0 | 0.0          | 0.0          |
| ELL or Former ELLs | District | CPI | 855                    | 70.2           | 67.9 | CPI    | 71.3  | 73.7 | 2.4          | 3.5          |
|                    |          | P+  | --                     | 45%            | 41%  | Lv 4&5 | --    | --   | --           | --           |
|                    |          | SGP | 520                    | 60.0           | 62.0 | SGP    | 68.0  | 58.0 | -10.0        | -2.0         |
|                    | State    | CPI | 53,048                 | 63.9           | 63.8 | CPI    | 64.5  | 65.8 | 1.8          | 3.3          |
|                    |          | P+  | --                     | 35%            | 36%  | Lv 4&5 | --    | --   | --           | --           |
|                    |          | SGP | 35,290                 | 53.0           | 52.0 | SGP    | 51.0  | 50.0 | 1.0          | 1.0          |
| All students       | District | CPI | 3,252                  | 75.8           | 75.5 | CPI    | 76.5  | 77.7 | 1.2          | 1.9          |
|                    |          | P+  | --                     | 52%            | 53%  | Lv 4&5 | --    | --   | --           | --           |
|                    |          | SGP | 2,288                  | 55.0           | 58.0 | SGP    | 59.0  | 53.0 | -6.0         | -2.0         |
|                    | State    | CPI | 490,612                | 80.8           | 80.3 | CPI    | 80.7  | 81.5 | 0.4          | 0.4          |
|                    |          | P+  | --                     | 61%            | 60%  | Lv 4&5 | --    | --   | --           | --           |
|                    |          | SGP | 388,423                | 51.0           | 50.0 | SGP    | 50.0  | 50.0 | 0.0          | -1.0         |

<sup>17</sup> 2015 and 2016 CPI and SGP are based on MCAS and PARCC test scores.

**Table B3c: Malden Public Schools  
Science and Technology/Engineering (All Grades)  
Performance for Selected Subgroups Compared to State, 2013–2016**

| Group and Measure                        |          |     | Number Included (2016) | Spring MCAS Year |      |       |      | Gains and Declines |              |
|--|----------|-----|------------------------|------------------|------|-------|------|--------------------|--------------|
|  |          |     |                        | 2013             | 2014 | 2015  | 2016 | 4-Year Trend       | 2-Year Trend |
| High Needs                               | District | CPI | 808                    | 69.1             | 67.6 | 68.7  | 63.7 | -5.4               | -5           |
|  |          | P+  | 808                    | 36%              | 37%  | 33%   | 27%  | -9%                | -6%          |
|  | State    | CPI | 89,857                 | 66.4             | 67.3 | 66.3  | 65.4 | -1                 | -0.9         |
|  |          | P+  | 89,857                 | 31%              | 33%  | 32%   | 31%  | 0%                 | -1%          |
| Econ. Disadv.                            | District | CPI | 567                    | 0                | 0    | 71.7  | 65.9 | 65.9               | -5.8         |
|  |          | P+  | 567                    | 0%               | 0%   | 39%   | 30%  | 30%                | -9%          |
|  | State    | CPI | 61,476                 | --               | --   | 67.1  | 65.8 | --                 | -1.3         |
|  |          | P+  | 61,476                 | --               | --   | 33.0% | 29%  | --                 | -4%          |
| Students w/ disabilities                 | District | CPI | 239                    | 51.4             | 46.2 | 53.2  | 50.7 | -0.7               | -2.5         |
|  |          | P+  | 239                    | 10%              | 8%   | 10%   | 8%   | -2%                | -2%          |
|  | State    | CPI | 38,109                 | 59.8             | 60.1 | 60.2  | 59.7 | -0.1               | -0.5         |
|  |          | P+  | 38,109                 | 20%              | 22%  | 22%   | 21%  | 1%                 | -1%          |
| English language learners or Former ELLs | District | CPI | 293                    | 57.7             | 60.1 | 63.4  | 57.1 | -0.6               | -6.3         |
|  |          | P+  | 293                    | 21%              | 26%  | 27%   | 20%  | -1%                | -7%          |
|  | State    | CPI | 18,594                 | 54               | 54   | 53.9  | 54.1 | 0.1                | 0.2          |
|  |          | P+  | 18,594                 | 19%              | 18%  | 18%   | 19%  | 0%                 | 1%           |
| All students                             | District | CPI | 1,294                  | 74               | 73   | 74.3  | 70.8 | -3.2               | -3.5         |
|  |          | P+  | 1,294                  | 44%              | 45%  | 44%   | 39%  | -5%                | -5%          |
|  | State    | CPI | 208,262                | 79               | 79.6 | 79.4  | 78.7 | -0.3               | -0.7         |
|  |          | P+  | 208,262                | 53%              | 55%  | 54%   | 54%  | 1%                 | 0%           |

Notes: Median SGPs are not calculated for Science and Technology/ Engineering (STE). State figures are provided for comparison purposes only and do not represent the standard that a particular group is expected to meet.

**Table B4: Malden Public Schools  
Annual Grade 9-12 Drop-Out Rates, 2012–2015**

| Group                     | School Year Ending |      |      |      | Change 2012–2015  |                | Change 2014–2015  |                | State (2015) |
|---------------------------|--------------------|------|------|------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------|
|                           | 2012               | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | Percentage Points | Percent Change | Percentage Points | Percent Change |              |
| High Needs                | 2.5                | 2.4  | 2.6  | 3.4  | 0.9               | 36%            | 0.8               | 31%            | 3.4          |
| Econ Disadv <sup>18</sup> | 2.2                | 2.3  | 2.5  | 2.9  | 0.7               | 32%            | 0.4               | 16%            | 3.3          |
| Students w/ disabilities  | 2.7                | 2.3  | 4.3  | 4.4  | 1.7               | 63%            | 0.1               | 2%             | 3.5          |
| ELL                       | 5.4                | 2.6  | 3.8  | 4.1  | -1.3              | -24%           | 0.3               | 8%             | 5.7          |
| All students              | 2.2                | 2.7  | 2.2  | 2.6  | 0.4               | 18%            | 0.4               | 18%            | 1.9          |

Notes: The annual drop-out rate is calculated by dividing the number of students who drop out over a one-year period by the October 1 grade 9–12 enrollment, multiplied by 100. Drop outs are those students who dropped out of school between July 1 and June 30 of a given year and who did not return to school, graduate, or receive a high school equivalency by the following October 1. Drop-out rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers.

**Table B5: Fall Malden Schools  
Attendance Rates, 2013–2016**

| Group        | School Year Ending |       |       |       | Change 2013–2016  |                | Change 2015–2016  |                | State (2016) |
|--------------|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------|
|              | 2013               | 2014  | 2015  | 2016  | Percentage Points | Percent Change | Percentage Points | Percent Change |              |
| All students | 94.9%              | 94.8% | 94.9% | 95.0% | 0.1               | 0.1%           | 0.1               | 0.1%           | 94.9%        |

Notes: The attendance rate is calculated by dividing the total number of days students attended school by the total number of days students were enrolled in a particular school year. A student's attendance rate is counted toward any district the student attended. In addition, district attendance rates included students who were out placed in public collaborative or private alternative schools/programs at public expense. Attendance rates have been rounded; percent change is based on unrounded numbers.

<sup>18</sup> Low income numbers used for economically disadvantaged for 2012, 2013, and 2014

**Table B6: Malden Public Schools**  
**Expenditures, Chapter 70 State Aid, and Net School Spending Fiscal Years 2014–2016**

|  | FY14         |               | FY15         |               | FY16          |               |
|--|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
|  | Estimated    | Actual        | Estimated    | Actual        | Estimated     | Actual        |
| <b>Expenditures</b>                        |              |               |              |               |               |               |
| From local appropriations for schools:     |              |               |              |               |               |               |
| By school committee                        | \$50,528,433 | \$61,250,236  | \$63,191,955 | \$62,378,707  | \$67,388,194  | \$64,905,433  |
| By municipality                            | \$39,674,654 | \$36,869,904  | \$35,972,148 | \$37,651,483  | \$37,963,946  | \$37,545,787  |
| Total from local appropriations            | \$90,203,087 | \$98,120,140  | \$99,164,103 | \$100,030,190 | \$105,352,140 | \$102,451,220 |
| From revolving funds and grants            | --           | \$14,711,011  | --           | \$14,854,227  | --            | \$14,268,628  |
| Total expenditures                         | --           | \$112,831,151 | --           | \$114,884,418 | --            | \$116,719,848 |
| <b>Chapter 70 aid to education program</b> |              |               |              |               |               |               |
| Chapter 70 state aid*                      | --           | \$46,962,532  | --           | \$47,246,321  | --            | \$48,438,759  |
| Required local contribution                | --           | \$35,163,691  | --           | \$35,343,087  | --            | \$35,620,417  |
| Required net school spending**             | --           | \$82,126,223  | --           | \$82,589,408  | --            | \$84,059,176  |
| Actual net school spending                 | --           | \$81,194,121  | --           | \$83,645,850  | --            | \$86,965,740  |
| Over/under required (\$)                   | --           | -\$932,103    | --           | \$1,056,442   | --            | \$2,906,564   |
| Over/under required (%)                    | --           | -1.1%         | --           | 1.3%          | --            | 3.5%          |

\*Chapter 70 state aid funds are deposited in the local general fund and spent as local appropriations.

\*\*Required net school spending is the total of Chapter 70 aid and required local contribution. Net school spending includes only expenditures from local appropriations, not revolving funds and grants. It includes expenditures for most administration, instruction, operations, and out-of-district tuitions. It does not include transportation, school lunches, debt, or capital.

Sources: FY14, FY15, and FY16 District End-of-Year Reports, Chapter 70 Program information on ESE website

Data retrieved 12/13/16



**Table B7: Malden Public Schools  
Expenditures Per In-District Pupil  
Fiscal Years 2013–2015**

| <b>Expenditure Category</b>                       | <b>2013</b> | <b>2014</b> | <b>2015</b> |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Administration                                    | \$340       | \$371       | \$402       |
| Instructional leadership (district and school)    | \$857       | \$1,056     | \$925       |
| Teachers  | \$5,249     | \$5,558     | \$5,803     |
| Other teaching services                           | \$959       | \$982       | \$1,026     |
| Professional development                          | \$25        | \$63        | \$15        |
| Instructional materials, equipment and technology | \$701       | \$589       | \$460       |
| Guidance, counseling and testing services         | \$413       | \$421       | \$413       |
| Pupil services                                    | \$887       | \$936       | \$915       |
| Operations and maintenance                        | \$697       | \$806       | \$856       |
| Insurance, retirement and other fixed costs       | \$2,119     | \$2,167     | \$2,131     |
| Total expenditures per in-district pupil          | \$12,247    | \$12,950    | \$12,947    |

Sources: [Per-pupil expenditure reports on ESE website](#)

Note: Any discrepancy between expenditures and total is because of rounding.

## Appendix C: Instructional Inventory

| Focus Area #1: Learning Objectives & Instruction  |         | Insufficient | Minimal | Moderate | Strong | Avg Number of points |
|---|---------|--------------|---------|----------|--------|----------------------|
|   |         | (0)          | (1)     | (2)      | (3)    | (0 to 3)             |
| 1. The teacher demonstrates knowledge of subject matter and content.                                      | ES      | 0%           | 8%      | 53%      | 39%    | 2.3                  |
|   | MS      | 0%           | 9%      | 71%      | 21%    | 2.1                  |
|   | HS      | 5%           | 11%     | 58%      | 26%    | 2.1                  |
|   | Total # | 1            | 8       | 54       | 26     | 2.2                  |
|   | Total % | 1%           | 9%      | 61%      | 29%    |                      |
| 2. The teacher provides and refers to clear learning objective(s) in the lesson.                          | ES      | 0%           | 25%     | 42%      | 33%    | 2.1                  |
|   | MS      | 3%           | 18%     | 52%      | 27%    | 2.0                  |
|   | HS      | 5%           | 16%     | 68%      | 11%    | 1.8                  |
|   | Total # | 2            | 18      | 45       | 23     | 2.0                  |
|   | Total % | 2%           | 20%     | 51%      | 26%    |                      |
| 3. The teacher implements a lesson that reflects high expectations aligned to the learning objective (s). | ES      | 0%           | 22%     | 58%      | 19%    | 2.0                  |
|   | MS      | 3%           | 32%     | 44%      | 21%    | 1.8                  |
|   | HS      | 5%           | 47%     | 26%      | 21%    | 1.6                  |
|   | Total # | 2            | 28      | 41       | 18     | 1.8                  |
|   | Total % | 2%           | 31%     | 46%      | 20%    |                      |
| 4. The teacher uses appropriate instructional strategies well matched to the learning objective(s).       | ES      | 0%           | 14%     | 53%      | 33%    | 2.2                  |
|   | MS      | 3%           | 18%     | 56%      | 24%    | 2.0                  |
|   | HS      | 11%          | 26%     | 47%      | 16%    | 1.7                  |
|   | Total # | 3            | 16      | 47       | 23     | 2.0                  |
|   | Total % | 3%           | 18%     | 53%      | 26%    |                      |
| Total Score For Focus Area #1   | ES      |              |         |          |        | 8.6                  |
|   | MS      |              |         |          |        | 8.0                  |
|   | HS      |              |         |          |        | 7.2                  |
|   | Total   |              |         |          |        | 8.0                  |

| <b>Focus Area #2: Student Engagement &amp; Critical Thinking</b>                                       |                | Insufficient | Minimal | Moderate | Strong | Avg Number of points |
|--|----------------|--------------|---------|----------|--------|----------------------|
|  |                | (0)          | (1)     | (2)      | (3)    | (0 to 3)             |
| 5. Students are motivated and engaged in the lesson.   | ES             | 0%           | 14%     | 56%      | 31%    | 2.2                  |
|  | MS             | 0%           | 18%     | 56%      | 26%    | 2.1                  |
|  | HS             | 11%          | 47%     | 37%      | 5%     | 1.4                  |
|  | <b>Total #</b> | 2            | 20      | 46       | 21     | 2.0                  |
|  | <b>Total %</b> | 2%           | 22%     | 52%      | 24%    |                      |
| 6. The teacher facilitates tasks that encourage students to develop and engage in critical thinking.   | ES             | 3%           | 28%     | 58%      | 11%    | 1.8                  |
|  | MS             | 3%           | 29%     | 44%      | 24%    | 1.9                  |
|  | HS             | 11%          | 37%     | 37%      | 16%    | 1.6                  |
|  | <b>Total #</b> | 4            | 27      | 43       | 15     | 1.8                  |
|  | <b>Total %</b> | 4%           | 30%     | 48%      | 17%    |                      |
| 7. Students assume responsibility for their own learning whether individually, in pairs, or in groups. | ES             | 0%           | 25%     | 58%      | 17%    | 1.9                  |
|  | MS             | 0%           | 29%     | 50%      | 21%    | 1.9                  |
|  | HS             | 10%          | 59%     | 21%      | 10%    | 1.3                  |
|  | <b>Total #</b> | 3            | 36      | 44       | 16     | 1.7                  |
|  | <b>Total %</b> | 3%           | 36%     | 44%      | 16%    |                      |
| <b>Total Score For Focus Area #2</b>   | ES             |              |         |          |        | <b>5.9</b>           |
|  | MS             |              |         |          |        | <b>5.9</b>           |
|  | HS             |              |         |          |        | <b>4.3</b>           |
|  | <b>Total</b>   |              |         |          |        | <b>5.5</b>           |

| <b>Focus Area #3: Differentiated Instruction &amp; Classroom Culture</b>   |                | Insufficient | Minimal | Moderate | Strong | Avg Number of points |
|--|----------------|--------------|---------|----------|--------|----------------------|
|  |                | (0)          | (1)     | (2)      | (3)    | (0 to 3)             |
| 8. The teacher appropriately differentiates instruction so the lesson content is accessible for all learners.                                | ES             | 14%          | 31%     | 36%      | 19%    | 1.6                  |
|  | MS             | 26%          | 35%     | 35%      | 3%     | 1.1                  |
|  | HS             | 32%          | 42%     | 26%      | 0%     | 0.9                  |
|  | <b>Total #</b> | 20           | 31      | 30       | 8      | 1.3                  |
|  | <b>Total %</b> | 22%          | 35%     | 34%      | 9%     |                      |
| 9. The teacher uses appropriate resources aligned to students' diverse learning needs. (e.g., technology, manipulatives, support personnel). | ES             | 5%           | 26%     | 53%      | 16%    | 1.8                  |
|  | MS             | 9%           | 26%     | 59%      | 6%     | 1.6                  |
|  | HS             | 5%           | 32%     | 47%      | 16%    | 1.7                  |
|  | <b>Total #</b> | 6            | 25      | 49       | 11     | 1.7                  |
|  | <b>Total %</b> | 7%           | 27%     | 54%      | 12%    |                      |
| 10. The classroom climate is characterized by respectful behavior, routines, tone, and discourse.  | ES             | 0%           | 22%     | 47%      | 31%    | 2.1                  |
|  | MS             | 3%           | 12%     | 71%      | 15%    | 2.0                  |
|  | HS             | 11%          | 26%     | 42%      | 21%    | 1.7                  |
|  | <b>Total #</b> | 3            | 17      | 49       | 20     | 2.0                  |
|  | <b>Total %</b> | 3%           | 19%     | 55%      | 22%    |                      |
| 11. The teacher conducts appropriate formative assessments to check for understanding and provide feedback to students.                      | ES             | 6%           | 22%     | 44%      | 28%    | 1.9                  |
|  | MS             | 0%           | 18%     | 65%      | 18%    | 2.0                  |
|  | HS             | 11%          | 47%     | 26%      | 16%    | 1.5                  |
|  | <b>Total #</b> | 4            | 23      | 43       | 19     | 1.9                  |
|  | <b>Total %</b> | 4%           | 26%     | 48%      | 21%    |                      |
| <b>Total Score For Focus Area #3</b>   | ES             |              |         |          |        | <b>7.4</b>           |
|  | MS             |              |         |          |        | <b>6.7</b>           |
|  | HS             |              |         |          |        | <b>5.9</b>           |
|  | <b>Total</b>   |              |         |          |        | <b>6.8</b>           |