Marshall Memo 516

A Weekly Round-up of Important Ideas and Research in K-12 Education
December 23, 2013

In This Issue:

1. Grim news from the NAEP
2. A thorough analysis of value-added scoring of teachers
3. Helping students work through mathematical conjectures
4. Assessing Maryland fourth and fifth graders' analytical writing skills
5. An emotionally smart literacy environment for ELLs
6. Running an anger-management group for troubled adolescents

Quotes of the Week

"Teacher VAM [value-added model] scores should emphatically *not* be included as a substantial factor with a fixed weight in consequential teacher personnel decisions. The information they provide is simply not good enough to use in that way. It is not just that the information is noisy. Much more serious is the fact that the scores may be systematically biased *for* some teachers and *against* others, and major potential sources of bias stem from the way our school system is organized."

William Haertel (see item #2)

"You can't fire your way to Finland."

Linda Darling-Hammond (quoted in item #2)

"Fifty-four percent of students who enrolled in college for the first time in 2007 had a certificate or degree to show for it six years later, exactly the same as the previous year."

Katherine Mangan in "Despite Push for College Completion, Graduation Rates Haven't Budged" in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Dec. 20, 2013 (Vol. LX, #16, p. A3)

"Many ELLs become frightened when they have to read unfamiliar text aloud. Because they are nervous they do poorly. Because they do poorly they become stressed. Students know that if they mispronounce a word or read slowly, their classmates will make fun of them."

Rocio Dresser (see item #5)

"We should all hang our heads in shame if we don't dramatically intervene in these districts."

Andy Smarick commenting on student achievement in several U.S. cities (see item #1)

"There can be no keener revelation of a society's soul than the way in which it treats its children."

Nelson Mandela in a May 8, 1995 speech in Pretoria, South Africa

1. Grim News from the NAEP

In this *Education Gadfly* article, Andy Smarick says the just-released National Assessment of Educational Progress data from 20 large U.S. cities contain lots of sad news about disadvantaged students. Specifically:

- In the average city, only one in four students reached proficiency in 4th-grade and 8th-grade reading and 8th-grade math. For example, in Baltimore, 16 percent of 8th graders read proficiently; in Philadelphia, 18 percent of 8th graders were proficient in math.
- In 4th-grade math, the supposed bright spot, only one in three reached proficiency.
- In terms of progress made since 2011, there were only 14 statistically significant gains in scale scores out of 84 test results. The rate of improvement is only 2 percentage points in 4th grade reading proficiency, and not a single city made statistically significant gains in 8th-grade math proficiency.
- The most encouraging news came from Washington, D.C., which had significant gains in all four areas, Los Angeles, with improvement in three areas, and Fresno, which improved in two. But despite these gains, all three cities still lagged far behind the large-city average. In Washington, D.C., only 8 percent of low-income 8th graders were proficient in math. In Los Angeles, only 9 percent of African-American 8th graders were proficient in reading.
- The data undermine the credibility of the Broad Prize: Houston, this year's winner, had one significantly negative result (4th-grade reading), made no progress in the other three areas, and had distressingly low achievement (e.g., 19 percent of 8th graders proficient in reading). And previous Broad winners Miami, New York City, and Boston had no statistically significant gains from 2011.
- Detroit is an educational emergency, says Smarick, with the lowest performance in all four areas and a nose-dive in 8th-grade math to 3 percent of students proficient, 9 percent in 8th-grade reading. Cleveland and Milwaukee are close behind. "We should all hang our heads in shame if we don't dramatically intervene in these districts," he says.
- "Once you disaggregate results, your heart truly breaks," says Smarick. White and non-poor students in several districts did quite well, pulling up the numbers. But the average proficiency rate for African-American students across all 20 cities was 12 percent.

"The 10 Things to Know About NAEP TUDA 2013" by Andy Smarick in *The Education Gadfly*, Dec. 19, 2013 (Vol. 13, #48), http://www.edexcellence.net/commentary/education-gadfly-weekly

Back to page one

2. A Thorough Analysis of Value-Added Scoring of Teachers

In this important 28-page paper published by Educational Testing Service, Edward Haertel (Stanford University) assesses the reliability and validity of using student test scores to evaluate teachers. He begins by summarizing Americans' opinions on public education: we're falling behind other nations in test scores and college completion rates; teacher evaluation in most school districts is ineffective; we're not identifying and dismissing our poorest-performing teachers; and teachers' credentials alone say very little about instructional quality. "What could be more reasonable, then, than looking at students' test scores to determine whether or not their teachers are doing a good job?" asks Haertel. "The teacher's job is to teach. Student test scores measure learning. If teachers are teaching, students should learn and test scores should go up. If they are teaching well, scores should go up a lot. If test scores are not moving, then teachers should be held accountable." A new generation of sophisticated value-added teacher evaluation seems to make this possible.

How much does teacher effectiveness matter to student achievement? Haertel asks. Researchers estimate that factors outside the schoolhouse – family background, neighborhood environment, peer influences, and differences in students' aptitudes for schooling – account for as much as 60 percent of the variation in students' test scores. Other factors account for another 30 percent. That leaves teaching with only 10 percent of total impact – not very much, but it's the 10 percent that is most amenable to policy intervention, hence the push to evaluate teachers more rigorously and "get rid of" the worst. But if the goal is to dramatically improve student achievement, identifying and removing low-performing teachers won't be nearly enough; as Linda Darling-Hammond puts it, "You can't fire your way to Finland."

However, the quality of teaching clearly matters, especially for disadvantaged students. "A classroom full of students with no teacher would probably not learn much," says Haertel, "– at least not much of the prescribed curriculum. But the relevant question is not between some teacher and no teacher, but rather between a good teacher in some sense and a poor teacher." When students have several consecutive years with effective teaching, they make significant progress – and when they have several years of substandard teaching, the achievement gap widens. Which brings us back to the question of how to evaluate and improve the quality of teaching across the board.

The simplistic approach of using students' end-of-year test-scores to compare and evaluate teachers has serious psychometric problems, says Haertel. First, because most tests don't have equal-interval scales, the impact of the same teacher depends on the achievement levels of his or her students, with the biggest variations occurring at the top and bottom of the achievement scale. Second, if tests aren't vertically aligned from grade to grade (and most aren't), it's unfair to compare the instructional impact of teachers working at different grade levels. Finally, some teachers have more challenging groups of students than others. Using test scores is therefore highly problematic – and has the unintended consequence of creating disincentives to working with challenging students, teaching at certain grade levels, and even working with high-achieving students.

These are exactly the problems that value-added models (VAM) are supposed to solve. Their goal is to strip away the factors that are not under the teacher's control and leave just the achievement information that the teacher can control – the causal effect for which he or she can be held accountable. For example, the formula used to calculate the effectiveness of Los Angeles teachers (the results were published by the *LA Times* in 2010) included five data points: students' gender; test performance the previous year; English language proficiency; eligibility for Title I services; and whether the student began school in the LA Unified School District. Other value-added formulas use several years of prior test scores, attendance, suspensions, grade retentions, and several demographic factors. Having taken all these variables into account, the formulas aim to predict each student's potential test scores with *any* teacher. It's then possible to compare that hypothetical projection with what an *actual* teacher produced. That's the teacher's value-added.

But there are problems. First, different teachers have very different working conditions and it's impossible for a value-added formula to take them all into account. "School climate and resources, teacher peer support, and, of course, the additional instructional support and encouragement students receive both out of school and from other school staff," says Haertel, make some teacher's work much more challenging than others.

Second, U.S. schools are highly stratified by socioeconomic status, and it's difficult to project students' hypothetical scores without going well beyond the available data. "For this reason," says Haertel, "VAM estimates are least trustworthy when they are used to compare teachers working in very different schools or with very different student populations."

Third, the academic composition of each class influences the teacher's pacing, the level at which the material is explained, the amount of work assigned, and expectations. In addition, peer dynamics within classes can promote or disrupt learning. "Just about every teacher can recall some classes where the chemistry was right," says Haertel, "– perhaps one or two strong students always seemed to ask just the right question at just the right time to move the classroom discussion along. Most teachers can also recall some classes where things did not go so well." This means some teachers can move much more quickly through the curriculum than others, and because the grouping of students within schools is "massively nonrandom" and some schools have climates much more conducive to learning than others, comparisons among teachers are inherently unfair.

Fourth, researchers have discovered a number of statistical anomalies that cast doubt on value-added measures. For example, when calculating year-to-year student learning increments, one has to take into account summer learning loss – and there are major differences in how much students lose over the summer: disadvantaged students typically lose ground over the summer, while advantaged students gain. "Some of this difference may be accounted for in VAMs that include adjustments for demographic factors," says Haertel, "but once again, it appears likely that value-added estimates may be biased in favor of some teachers and against others." In addition, researchers have found huge year-to-year variations in individual teachers' value-add scores – some veering from the top quintile one year to the bottom quintile the next. These variations reflect changes in the students taught and changes in

teachers' performance – but how much from which? About "half of the variation in these value-added estimates is signal," says Haertel, "and the remainder is noise… Sorting teachers according to single year value-added scores is sorting mostly on noise." Using three years of data increases reliability, but only to about .56, which is hardly impressive.

Fifth, research comparing teachers' value-added scores with administrators' observations and student survey data (the Measures of Effective Teaching study did this) show weak correlations. In some cases, teachers who scored in the top quartile on value-added had extremely poor evaluations from observers and students. And studies comparing teachers' value-added scores using different standardized tests (in one case, the state test, the Scholastic Reading Inventory, and the Stanford Achievement Test) show huge variations. "Therefore," says Haertel, "if a school district were to reward teachers for their performance, it would identify a quite different set of teachers as the best performers depending simply on the specific reading assessment used."

Sixth, value-added scores don't take into account non-cognitive learning, which is increasingly seen as a crucial factor in students' future prospects. Some teachers are making contributions to students' life trajectories that are simply not picked up in value-added data.

Finally, value-added scores are available for only a small minority of teachers within any district.

In short, even the most sophisticated value-added model "will *not* simply reward or penalize teachers according to how well or poorly they teach," Haertel says. "They will also reward or penalize teachers according to *which students* they teach and *which schools* they teach in… Adjusting for individual students' prior test scores and other background characteristics may mitigate – but cannot eliminate – this problem."

Haertel concedes that VAM scores *do* predict important student learning outcomes. Some studies have shown long-range benefits to students who were taught by teachers with high value-added scores – but the strongest evidence comes from studies that looked at tests that were not high-stakes for teachers. He agrees that value-added data can detect real differences in many teachers' effectiveness and might be useful when researchers compare large groups of teachers to assess how well training and policy innovations are working. He says *low-stakes* value-added data could be useful to principals and teachers if used under the following conditions: (a) Scores are based on sound, appropriate student tests; (b) Comparisons are limited to homogenous teacher groups; (c) There is no fixed weight – there's flexibility to interpret value-added scores in context for individual use; (d) Users are well trained to interpret scores; and (e) Everyone has clear and accurate information about the margin of error. "These five conditions would be tough to meet," he says, "but regardless of the challenge, if teacher value-added scores cannot be shown to be valid for a given purpose, then they should not be used for that purpose."

All that said, Haertel concludes with the following observations:

• "Teacher VAM scores should emphatically *not* be included as a substantial factor with a fixed weight in consequential teacher personnel decisions," he says. "The information they provide is simply not good enough to use in that way. It is not just that the information is

noisy. Much more serious is the fact that the scores may be systematically biased *for* some teachers and *against* others, and major potential sources of bias stem from the way our school system is organized."

• "High-stakes uses of teacher VAM scores could easily have additional negative consequences for children's education," he says. "These include increased pressure to teach to the test, more competition and less cooperation among the teachers within a school, and resentment or avoidance of students who do not score well."

"Reliability and Validity of Inferences About Teachers Based on Student Test Scores" by Edward Haertel in The 14th William H. Angoff Memorial Lecture, March 22, 2013 (Educational Testing Service), http://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/PICANG14.pdf

Back to page one

3. Helping Students Work Through Mathematical Conjectures

In this thoughtful article in *Teaching Children Mathematics*, Amy Hillen and Tad Watanabe (Kennesaw State University) say that an important Common Core math reasoning skill is making conjectures and assessing them based on evidence. They suggest the following 60-minute lesson for elementary students:

- The teacher displays 1-9 on the board: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
- The teacher picks the number 4 and writes it on another part of the board.
- The teacher calls on a student to pick another number – 8 is chosen.
- The teacher writes the 8 by the 4.
- "With these two numbers, which two-digit numbers can we make?" the teacher asks.
- 48 and 84
- "Which is larger?" 84. The teacher writes the numbers using vertical notation: 84
48
- The teacher asks students to subtract, and the answer is 36.
- "Let's try this with some other numbers." This time, a student picks the first number, 7. The teacher picks the second number, 3 (making sure the difference is going to be 36).
- The teacher again sets up the subtraction problem: 73 – 37, and the answer is 36.
- "It's the same!" students exclaim. "It's always going to be 36!"
- The teacher explains that this is a *conjecture* and writes it on the board – "If two different numerals are picked randomly to form 2 two-digit numbers, the difference will always be 36."
- "I wonder if this will always be true," says the teacher. "How can we find this out?" Students suggest some ideas, and the teacher has students spend ten minutes working with a partner – just enough time for them to come up with only one or two possible combinations (students were given a template to set up the subtraction problems).
- Students post their subtraction problems on the board.
- Everyone looks at the examples (duplicates are removed), and students notice that some problems have answers other than 36. Their initial conjecture was not true.

- Now students are asked to work in pairs to revise their initial conjecture and formulate new conjectures based on the set of subtraction problems posted on the board.
- Some students are boggled by the number of problems on the board and are prompted to sort them into groups with the same answer and asked, "What do you notice about the problems whose difference is 36?"
- Now the whole class discusses different conjectures. One student says that when the numbers chosen are next to each other, the answer is always 9. The teacher has the student clarify what "next to each other" means.
- Another student says that when the chosen numbers are separated by one number, the answer is always 18.
- Now students work in pairs again to try to refine the conjecture. Students often notice that the difference will always be a "nine fact" – a multiple of nine; that all the problems that have the same difference involve numerals whose difference is the same; and the difference will always be a product of 9 and the difference between the two.
- Students are challenged to explain to a skeptic why these conjectures will always be true. The teacher asks, "How do we know that there is not a problem that we don't have on the board whose difference is not a multiple of 9?" One approach is "proof by exhaustion" – trying all the possible problems. But is there another way? This might lead to organizing examples in a systematic way.
- The teacher concludes the lesson by pointing out the important reasoning-and-proving work they have done, the importance of perseverance when the initial conjecture proved false, and how that led to a more sophisticated finding. In fact, conjecturing and proving (and disproving) are the essence of doing mathematics.

To see a delightful video of a Japanese teacher teaching this lesson, go to (free registration): http://www.globaledresources.com/user-info.php?id=curious-subtraction.

"Mysterious Subtraction" by Amy Hillen and Tad Watanabe in *Teaching Children Mathematics*, December 2013/January 2014 (Vol. 20, #5 p. 294-301), http://bit.ly/1hz3128; the authors can be reached at ahillen@kennesaw.edu and twatanab@kennesaw.edu.

Back to page one

4. Assessing Maryland Fourth and Fifth Graders' Analytical Writing Skills

In this sobering article in *Elementary School Journal*, Richard Correnti, Lindsay Clare Matsumura, and Elaine Wang (University of Pittsburgh) and Laura Hamilton (Rand Corporation) report on their study of urban elementary students' ability to write analytically in response to a text. The researchers developed the Response-to-Text Assessment (RTA) and administered it in a way that separated students' reading fluency/vocabulary/comprehension skills from their analytical skills. This was accomplished by reading passages aloud to students and asking them a few basic comprehension questions to make sure they understood the material they were about to analyze and write about.

Fourth graders in the study worked with a James Marshall story, "Rats on the Roof," and were asked, "Is the Tomcat someone you would want to help you with a problem? Why or

why not? Use at least 3 or 4 examples from the text to explain your answer." Fifth graders worked with a *Time for Kids* story about a poverty-eradication project in Kenya and were asked, "Why do you think the author thinks it's important for kids in the United States to learn about what life was like in Kenya before and after the Millennium Villages project? Make sure to include at least 3 examples of what life in Kenya was like before the Millennium Villages project and what life is like now."

Students' written responses to the prompts were scored on five dimensions (each is followed by the top-level descriptors in the researchers' four-level rubric):

- *Analysis* – Demonstrates a clear understanding of the purpose of the literary work; exhibits original insight and draws meaningful conclusions or demonstrates sophisticated and succinct synthesis of ideas; inference/insight is clearly, explicitly articulated; inference is elaborated upon, not just stated in a sentence or a few words in the beginning; addresses the prompt.
- *Evidence* – Selects detailed, precise, and significant evidence from the text; demonstrates integral use of selected details from the text to support and extend key ideas.
- *Organization* – Focuses on the main idea; demonstrates logical and seamless flow from sentence to sentence and idea to idea; has a strong sense of beginning, middle, and end; beginning and end must relate closely to the same key idea; must feature multiple appropriate paragraphs.
- *Style* – Features varied sentence lengths and structures, including complex structures; uses tier 2 vocabulary multiple times; uses sophisticated connectives multiple times correctly; features a number of sophisticated or original phrases.
- *MUGS* (mechanics, usage, grammar, and syntax) – Features errors that do not detract from communication of ideas; features very few minor errors, or a few "sophisticated" errors.

How did students do? "A key finding from our study," say Correnti, Matsumura, Hamilton, and Wang, "is that students' analytical text-based writing skills were weak overall. Relatively few students were able to generate a clear inference from the text, or use appropriate evidence from the text to support their claims. Students' writing also showed weaknesses with respect to their use of the vocabulary and more sophisticated sentence structures that characterize an academic voice." The only dimension in which students' scores were fairly evenly distributed on a 4-3-2-1 scale was MUGS; in the other areas, students mostly scored at the bottom two levels.

As things currently stand, the authors conclude, most of these students are not equipped to handle the expectations of the Common Core ELA standards. Much work needs to be done to refine classroom practice in ways that develop higher-level analytical skills.

"Assessing Students' Skills At Writing Analytically in Response to Texts" by Richard Correnti, Lindsay Clare Matsumura, Laura Hamilton, and Elaine Wang in *Elementary School Journal*, December 2013 (Vol. 114, #2, p. 142-177), http://bit.ly/1c1IFfJ

Back to page one

5. An Emotionally Smart Literacy Environment for ELLs

In this article in *Multicultural Education*, Rocio Dresser (San Jose State University) says that round-robin reading, a "one size fits all" classroom practice with no research support, is especially unhelpful for English language learners. "Many ELLs become frightened when they have to read unfamiliar text aloud," says Dresser. "Because they are nervous they do poorly. Because they do poorly they become stressed. Students know that if they mispronounce a word or read slowly, their classmates will make fun of them. In many cases, these students will dislike reading and as a result will fail at school."

Instead, says Dresser, teachers should weave social-emotional learning into the literacy program to create a safe and respectful environment, increase interest and reflection, and hook ELLs on learning. Here are some key practices:

• *Teachers modeling enthusiasm* – "Research shows that emotional states are contagious," says Dresser. "Thus, if we enjoy reading and like to engage in discourse with children, there is a greater chance that the children will also like it."

• *A supportive environment* – This includes giving students ample time to rehearse and study what they are reading. "Research shows that students who read the same selection several times and know the vocabulary tend to have a higher fluency rate," says Dresser, building competence and self-confidence. It's also helpful for students to read multiple selections from the same author, theme, or genre (Narrow Reading), discussing the common vocabulary, cognates, syntax, and ideas. Choral reading can also help students improve their pronunciation, intonation, and enunciation.

• *Rich reading experiences* – Teachers should be sure to include selections that deal with core human emotions such as love, anger, and fear (such as *Julie and the Wolves* by Jean Craighead George). It's also good for students to have some choice in what they read.

• *Reflection and feedback* – Students might keep a journal in which they write about their literacy experiences, responding to prompts such as, "I felt proud today when I read…" or "I worked with my group doing…" In class, students should have opportunities to practice giving compliments, sharing ideas, and working cooperatively, all aimed at becoming more understanding of the feelings and thought processes of others.

• *Strategic correction* – To accelerate ELLs' growth, it's wise for teachers to provide frequent, timely, nonjudgmental feedback that focuses on meaning – that is, correcting errors that change the meaning of a word or sentence versus errors having to do with accent.

"Integrate Social-Emotional Learning Into Oral Reading Practices for Best Results" by Rocio Dresser in *Multicultural Education*, Winter 2013 (Vol. 20, p. 45-50), spotted in *Education Digest,* December 2013 (Vol. 79, #4), https://www.caddogap.com/periodicals.shtml; the author can be reached at rocio.dresser@sjsu.edu.

Back to page one

6. Running an Anger-Management Group for Troubled Adolescents

In this helpful article in *ASCA School Counselor*, Debra Madaris Efird (a middle-school counselor in Concord, North Carolina) describes how she convenes and runs sessions to help students handle anger.

• *Screening* – Efird distributes a needs assessment schoolwide that asks students to rate their feelings on a variety of topics. Students who self-identify as having a higher level of anger than their peers are invited to a preliminary meeting in which she explains that she will be convening small groups to work on anger management. "A few students will flare quickly, snarling 'I don't need anger management!'" says Efird. "Exactly." She tells students that the groups will be voluntary (sighs of relief) and they'll meet once a week for six weeks. She then has students complete an anger assessment survey and write at the bottom whether or not they are interested in being in a group. She uses the responses to form balanced groups of 8-10, and follows up with individual meetings with students whose surveys show a high level of anger but say they don't want to participate.

• *The first session* – Efird goes over the schedule, agenda, parent permission, and ground rules (confidentiality, respect, not monopolizing the conversation, etc.) and then has students choose one of several large sheets of construction paper on the floor and write on it a brief story about how anger led them to do:

- Something stupid
- Something dangerous
- Something regrettable
- Something out of control
- Something that made me cry.

Students then stand on their sheet of construction paper (there can be more than one person on a sheet) and tell their story to the group – for example, "I bashed the windshield of my stepfather's car with a golf club" and "I pushed my best friend off the porch, and she could have broken a bone." Students then move to another sheet and write and tell a different story. Some students exaggerate and need to be reined in, but most of them "hear the negative power of their anger, and some admit the need for self-control," says Efird. She closes with an anger-reducing exercise like taking several deep breaths together. There are always a few students who say they've tried that before and it didn't work, but Efird emphasizes the benefit of calming yourself and buying time to make better decisions.

• *The second session* – This time, Efird elicits stories about the costs and consequences of anger, if necessary referring back to the stories told the week before – monetary costs such as repair of damaged property, court costs, bail, and nonmonetary costs like damage to one's reputation, disappointing parents, or bodily harm (like breaking your hand punching a wall). Efird concludes by having students write about their anger (they may use profanities) and then standing in a circle and ceremoniously tearing their papers into tiny pieces and dumping them in a trashcan.

• *The third session* – Efird talks about the different levels of anger and has students rate their reaction to different scenarios: disappointed, annoyed, furious, or enraged. "Noting the distinctions helps them assess if their anger response is reasonable or appropriate for the situation," she says. "In group discussion, they learn the same situation can elicit differing responses among their peers." Students identify their top three anger triggers, discuss avoidant and confrontational anger, brainstorm ideal responses, and think about how to communicate

their needs in an assertive manner. This session's concluding anger-reducing tool is having a five-minute chat with a partner (chosen by drawing numbers) on the value of talking out an anger situation with a trusted friend.

• *The fourth session* – Students focus on the feelings underlying their anger. Efird peels off a leaf from a head of cabbage while naming an anger-triggering situation, pauses, and reveals the feeling beneath that – hurt or fear of rejection. The cabbage is passed around and each student peels off a leaf and articulates the underlying feelings. Students say things like, "I get mad when my parents compare me to my much smarter brother" (jealousy or fear of not measuring up), or "I hate it when I am blamed by a teacher for something I didn't do" (disappointment at being labeled a troublemaker or fear of being out of control). "For most of them," says Efird, "this will be the first time they've attempted to explore the fears, hurts, disappointments, and losses that can be fueling their anger." The closing anger-reducing technique for this session is taking a brisk walk inside or outside the school, "walking it out."

• *The fifth session* – The theme this time is forgiveness, reading studies about its physical and mental-health benefits. Efird uses a current news story about someone forgiving a malefactor ("I could never do that!" a student will say), and then has students each draw a piece of paper from a basket and respond to a statement, including:

- Forgiving is an act of kindness to ourselves, not to the person we forgive.
- Forgiving means being willing to forgive ourselves, too.
- Forgiving may not necessarily lead to restoration of a relationship.

The closing activity this time is closing their eyes and imagining they are walking on a beach.

• *The last session* – Efird reviews the discussions from each of the preceding meetings, focusing especially on the anger-reducing techniques used at the end. "Encourage them to keep searching for healthy anger-reducing activities that work for them," she says. "In closing, remind them that anger is a normal emotion that will pop up in their lives (and yours) over and over again. Just because they have completed anger-management group counseling does not guarantee wise responses in future anger incidents." But you've provided practical tools for self-regulation and a foundation on which to build their skills for understanding and dealing with difficult situations throughout their lives. The last word: you're available in crisis situations. Before they leave, students fill out an evaluation.

"Address Adolescent Anger" by Debra Madaris Efird in *ASCA School Counselor*, November/December 2013 (Vol. 51, #2, p. 22-27), www.schoolcounselor.org; Efird can be reached at debra.efird@cabarrus.k12.nc.us.

Back to page one

© Copyright 2013 Marshall Memo LLC

Do you have feedback? Is anything missing?

If you have comments or suggestions, if you saw an article or web item in the last week that you think should have been summarized, or if you would like to suggest additional publications that should be covered by the Marshall Memo, please e-mail: kim.marshall48@gmail.com

About the Marshall Memo

Mission and focus:

This weekly memo is designed to keep principals, teachers, superintendents, and others very well-informed on current research and effective practices in K-12 education. Kim Marshall, drawing on 43 years' experience as a teacher, principal, central office administrator, and writer, lightens the load of busy educators by serving as their "designated reader."

To produce the Marshall Memo, Kim subscribes to 64 carefully-chosen publications (see list to the right), sifts through more than a hundred articles each week, and selects 5-10 that have the greatest potential to improve teaching, leadership, and learning. He then writes a brief summary of each article, pulls out several striking quotes, provides e-links to full articles when available, and e-mails the Memo to subscribers every Monday evening (with occasional breaks; there are 50 issues a year).

Subscriptions:

Individual subscriptions are $50 for a year. Rates decline steeply for multiple readers within the same organization. See the website for these rates and how to pay by check, credit card, or purchase order.

Website:

If you go to http://www.marshallmemo.com you will find detailed information on:

- How to subscribe or renew
- A detailed rationale for the Marshall Memo
- Publications (with a count of articles from each)
- Article selection criteria
- Topics (with a count of articles from each)
- Headlines for all issues
- Reader opinions (with results of an annual survey)
- About Kim Marshall (including links to articles)
- A free sample issue

Subscribers have access to the Members' Area of the website, which has:

- The current issue (in Word or PDF)
- All back issues (also in Word and PDF)
- A database of all articles to date, searchable by topic, title, author, source, level, etc.
- How to change access e-mail or log-in

Core list of publications covered

Those read this week are underlined.

American Educational Research Journal
American Educator
American Journal of Education
American School Board Journal
AMLE Magazine
ASCA School Counselor
ASCD SmartBrief/Public Education NewsBlast
Better Evidence-Based Education
Center for Performance Assessment Newsletter
District Administration
ED Magazine
Education Digest
Education Gadfly
Education Next
Education Update/Curriculum Update
Education Week
Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis
Educational Horizons
Educational Leadership
Educational Researcher
Elementary School Journal
Essential Teacher
Go Teach
Harvard Business Review
Harvard Education Letter
Harvard Educational Review
Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk (JESPAR)
Journal of Staff Development
Kappa Delta Pi Record
Knowledge Quest
Middle School Journal
NASSP Journal
NJEA Review
Perspectives
Phi Delta Kappan
Principal
Principal Leadership
Principal's Research Review
Reading Research Quarterly
Reading Today
Responsive Classroom Newsletter
Rethinking Schools
Review of Educational Research
School Administrator
School Library Journal
Teacher
Teachers College Record
Teaching Children Mathematics
Teaching Exceptional Children/Exceptional Children
The Atlantic
The Chronicle of Higher Education
The District Management Journal
The Language Educator
The Learning Principal/Learning System/Tools for Schools
The New York Times
The New Yorker
The Reading Teacher
Theory Into Practice
Time
Wharton Leadership Digest