Marshall Memo 645

A Weekly Round-up of Important Ideas and Research in K-12 Education
July 11, 2016

In This Issue:

Quotes of the Week

"In real life, the push of selfishness is matched by the pull of empathy and altruism… As babies, our neural connections are built by love and care. We have evolved to be really good at cooperation and empathy. We are strongly motivated to teach and help others."

David Brooks (see item #1)

"This is why, before we say exactly what is on our minds, we run it past ourselves, to see if it makes sense, is true, is fair, has a flavor of kindness, and won't hurt someone or make someone's difficult life more difficult. Because there are, among us, in every political camp, limited, angry, violent, and/or damaged people, waiting for any excuse to throw off the tethers of restraint and get after it. After which it falls to the rest of us, right and left, to clean up the mess."

George Saunders in "American Chronicles" in *The New Yorker*, July 11 & 18, 2016 (Vol. XCII, #21, p. 50-61), http://bit.ly/29HzYw2

"[W]hen a teacher gives up on students, it is not long afterward that the students will often give up on themselves."

Kathleen Collins and Beth Ferri (see item #5)

"Sociologists, advertisers, stock market analysts – everyone wants to know what happens when the generation born glued to screens has to look up and interact with the world."

Jessica Contrera (see item #2)

"The writing process is a learned skill. It comes from many hours spent writing a lot. It comes from a mind-set that whenever you write, you consider not only what you will write *about* but also how you will write *well*."

Lucy Calkins and Mary Ehrenworth (see item #3)

"Feedback is most potent when students don't yet have mastery and when it is given just in time to learners in the midst of work."

Lucy Calkins and Mary Ehrenworth (*ibid*.)

1. David Brooks on Altruism versus Selfishness

"Western society is built on the assumption that people are fundamentally selfish," says David Brooks in this *New York Times* column. Machiavelli believed people want to maximize power, Adam Smith that they want more and more material goods, Sigmund Freud that children are little egotists focused on satisfying their needs, the Founding Fathers that constitutional checks and balances are needed to harness factional competition into a smoothly functioning democracy. They all work on the belief that private vices can be channeled into public virtue.

"But this worldview is clearly wrong," says Brooks. "In real life, the push of selfishness is matched by the pull of empathy and altruism… As babies, our neural connections are built by love and care. We have evolved to be really good at cooperation and empathy. We are strongly motivated to teach and help others." Brooks cites research showing that when people are rewarded and punished based on an assumption of selfishness, their natural propensity for altruism goes down. Giving a baby a reward for being kind significantly reduces the likelihood that the baby will be helpful when the next opportunity presents itself. Other examples:

• An Israeli day care center announced that parents would henceforth be fined each time they were late picking up their children at the end of the day. After this, two times as many parents were late. "Before the fine," says Brooks, "picking up their kids on time was an act of being considerate to the teachers. But after the fine, showing up to pick up their kids became an economic transaction."

• In 2001 the Boston Fire Department ended its policy of unlimited sick leave and announced that employees who used more than 15 sick days a year would have their pay docked. Right after that, the number of firefighters who called in sick on Christmas and New Year's increased tenfold. "Suddenly," says Brooks, "what had been an ethic to serve the city was replaced by a utilitarian paid arrangement."

People see the world through two lenses, he continues – economic and moral. "When you introduce a financial incentive, you prompt people to see their situation through an economic lens. Instead of following their natural bias toward reciprocity, service, and cooperation, you encourage people to do a selfish cost-benefit calculation. They begin to ask, 'What's in this for me?' By evoking an economic motivation, you often get worse outcomes."

The truth is that many of our professional and civic commitments – being an effective teacher, a brave soldier, a good clerk – depend on an altruistic commitment to a group or an ideal. Without that, we might falter when the going gets tough. "Arrangements that arouse the

financial lens alone are just messing everything up," says Brooks. The problem today is that institutions that historically supported the moral lens – religions, guilds, community organizations, honor codes – have withered while those that manipulate incentives – the market and the state – have expanded. "Now economic, utilitarian thinking has become the normal way we do social analysis and see the world," he concludes. "We've wound up with a society that is less cooperative, less trusting, less effective, and less lovely… Maybe it's time to build institutions that harness people's natural longing to do good."

"The Power of Altruism" by David Brooks in *The New York Times*, July 8, 2016, http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/08/opinion/the-power-of-altruism.html?_r=0

Back to page one

2. The Online Life of a 13-Year-Old Girl in Virginia

In this article in *The Week*, Jessica Contrera reports on what it's like to be 13 years old glued to a smartphone and laptop for much of the day, measuring your worth in likes, comments, and notifications. Katherine, who lives in a comfortable home outside Washington, D.C., is on her phone from the moment it rings her awake in the morning till she goes to bed at night. It's where all her friends hang out, so that's where she is, too. She's on it at school, when she can sneak it. She sets it down to play basketball, to skateboard, to watch PG-13 comedies, and sometimes to eat dinner. After these breaks, she might have more than 60 unread messages. Contrera is able to capture the activity on Katherine's 12-minute ride home from school:

- Immediately her phone is out and her thumb is on Instagram. She scrolls through several memes and closes the app.
- She opens BuzzFeed and scrolls past a political story to one about Janet Jackson and another about being British and American and closes the app.
- She opens Instagram, opens the NBA app, shuts the screen off, turns it back on.
- She opens Spotify, then Fitbit, which tells her she has 7,427 steps.
- Instagram again, then Snapchat and she watches a sparkly rainbow flow from a friend's mouth.
- She watches a YouTube star make pouty faces at the camera, then a tutorial on nail art.

"Sociologists, advertisers, stock market analysts – everyone wants to know what happens when the generation born glued to screens has to look up and interact with the world," says Contrera.

Now Katherine is home explaining to Contrera that she has 604 Instagram followers and "only" 25 photos on her page, having deleted the ones that didn't have good lighting, show the coolest moments, or get enough likes. "Over 100 likes is good, for me," she says, and comments on another girl who gets lots of likes by actively soliciting them – she posts a photo and writes, "Like all my pictures for a tbh [to be heard or to be honest], comment when done." Katherine explains, "It kind of, almost, promotes you as a good person. If someone says, 'tbh you're nice and pretty,' that kind of, like, validates you in the comments. Then people can look at it and say, 'Oh, she's nice and pretty.'"

Now Katherine is on her own page, checking comments under a photo of a friend that she posted for the girl's birthday. "Happy birthday posts are a pretty big deal," she says. "It really shows who cares enough to put you on their page." She shows Contrera the little notification box that appears when someone has liked, tagged, or followed her on Instagram.

Katherine has lots of friends and does well in school, including playing a lead part in an upcoming performance of *The Lion King*. But there is great sadness in this family: her mother died of cancer a year ago. "Katherine won't talk about it, today or any day," says Contrera. "Not talking about it means she doesn't need to think about it, except when the house is quiet and the thinking just seeps in. She doesn't tell her friends how it feels. When she's asked about it, she crumples. Her shoulders hunch, her eyes well, but no tears fall on her cheeks. Please, she would say if she were reading this, go back to talking about my phone."

Katherine's father, a 56-year old lawyer figuring out how to be a single dad, worries about Katherine's electronics, including how many gigabytes she's using (18 a month), whether to cap her use, and whether to invoke parental controls to keep her from being on her phone at night (he tried that and soon backed off). "Even if her dad tried snooping around her apps," says Contrera, "the true dramas of teenage-girl life are not written in the comments. Like how sometimes Katherine's friends will borrow her phone just to un-like all the Instagram photos of girls they don't like. Katherine can't go back to those girls' pages and re-like the photos because that would be stalking, which is forbidden… It's also totally embarrassing and stressful to have a low Snapchat score. So in one day, she sent enough snaps to earn 1,000 points."

A few days later, it's Katherine's 14th birthday and her grandparents are visiting to celebrate. The big question is which of her friends will post birthday pictures. "They should be posted in the morning, any minute now," reports Contrera. "She scrolls past a friend posing in a bikini on the beach. Then a picture posted by Kendall Jenner. A selfie with coffee. A basketball Vine. A selfie with a girl's tongue out. She scrolls, she waits. For that little notification box to appear."

"Growing Up in the Screen Age" by Jessica Contrera in *The Week*, June 17, 2016 (Vol. 16, #775, p. 36-37), excerpted from a longer article in *The Washington Post,* no free e-link

Back to page one

3. Teaching Writing Effectively

"The writing process is a learned skill," say Lucy Calkins and Mary Ehrenworth (Teachers College, Columbia University) in this article in *The Reading Teacher*. "It comes from many hours spent writing a lot. It comes from a mind-set that whenever you write, you consider not only what you will write *about* but also how you will write *well*."

There's no question, say Calkins and Ehrenworth, that writing is an essential 21st-century skill – and many schools are not teaching it effectively. Recent complaints from the business world are less about grammar, punctuation, and spelling, and more about "fuzzy thinking," young people not knowing how to bring "focus, energy, and passion" to the points they want to make, and not being able to analyze information and write with "a real voice."

"The good news," say the authors, "is that across the nation, thousands of schools are finding that when students participate in a culture that values writing, are given explicit instruction in the skills and strategies of proficient writing, and work toward crystal-clear goals and receive feedback on their progress, their writing skills increase dramatically." They believe these are the key elements:

The enduring essentials of good writing instruction:

• *Protected time to write* – "Writing, like running or reading, is a skill that develops with use," say Calkins and Ehrenworth. "Writers need time to write. In too many schools, this time is compromised." They suggest that the ideal (daily) writers' workshop should have 10 minutes of explicit whole-class instruction, at least half an hour of writing time (with the teacher conferencing with students), ending with 5-10 minutes for students to share what they've done with another writer and set goals.

• *Choice* – "To write well," say the authors, "writers need to write about topics they know a lot about and care about… A writer's commitment to his or her subject leads that writer to bring the imprint of his or her own passions to the page, writing with that magical quality we call voice."

• *Feedback* – The best feedback includes "medals and missions" – compliments and next steps. "Feedback is most potent when students don't yet have mastery," say Calkins and Ehrenworth, "and when it is given just in time to learners in the midst of work." The best feedback is frequent, close to the time the writer writes, and followed by opportunities for more practice.

What recent research says:

• *Direct instruction* – Clear, explicit instruction on specific points takes place in mini-lessons, conferences, and small-group work. "We have found," say Calkins and Ehrenworth, "that when curriculum is organized so all students in a class (or better yet, at a grade level) are working within a shared genre – employing strategies and emulating mentor texts of that genre, teachers have a context within which to explicitly teach the craft and structure of that particular genre."

• *Working toward clear goals* – "To accelerate achievement, learners need to answer the question, 'Where am I going?'" say the authors. And that means having a crystal-clear vision of what good writing looks like (mentor texts are important) and specific goals for getting there.

• *Transfer* – Calkins and Ehrenworth quote Grant Wiggins saying that students often don't realize that what they learn in one classroom can help them in another. Sometimes teachers don't realize that either.

The role of school leaders:

• *Teachers need a shared vision of good writing*. Ideally this is developed collaboratively (the principal as the key orchestrator) and has buy-in across a school. Student exemplars are important to showing and tracking good work over time. "One of the most potent ways for a school or a district to lift the quality of good writing," say Calkins and

Ehrenworth, "is for teachers across a grade level to meet together to norm their expectations of student writing, learning to look at student writing with shared lenses."

• *Teachers need a shared vision of good writing instruction*. Teachers benefit enormously "from observing teaching together, talking afterward about what worked and what could have been better," say the authors. "Raising the level of writing in a school or district takes a collaborative mind-set."

• *Teachers need to teach within a strategic cross-grade curriculum*. "In too many schools, kids need to luck out to get a teacher who teaches writing," say Calkins and Ehrenworth. Teachers need to develop a grade-to-grade progression of skills, so instruction builds each year on a solid foundation. The Common Core standards provide a good template for this (although poetry needs to be added).

• *Teachers need shared expectations and ways to track growth*. It's essential, say the authors, to track student progress by looking at regular on-demand writing – where students write from start to finish without help from others. "When teachers study students' on-demand writing from the start of the year until the most recent assessment," they say, "what they see is the effect of their instruction over the year. This requires a mind-set wherein teachers study student work not only as a reflection of students' progress but also as a reflection of the teachers' teaching… Shared assessments, exemplars, and tools for self-assessment and goal setting can make an important contribution toward helping a school move from an individualistic culture to a collaborative culture – one in which teachers think not about 'my kids' but about 'our kids.'"

• *Teachers need serious professional development*. "Professional development will be the heartbeat of your school," say Calkins and Ehrenworth. "It should be intense, collaborative, collegial, and practical. It should be focused on strengthening teachers' methods and spirits. It should be varied in form, flexible, and responsive. Good professional development creates lasting communities of practice."

"Growing Extraordinary Writers: Leadership Decisions to Raise the Level of Writing Across a School and a District" by Lucy Calkins and Mary Ehrenworth in *The Reading Teacher*, July/August 2016 (Vol. 70, #1, p. 7-18), available for purchase at http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/trtr.1499/abstract; Calkins can be reached at lucy@readingandwritingproject.com.

Back to page one

4. Can High-School Students Accurately Assess Each Others' Writing?

In this *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy* article, Christian Schunn, Amanda Godley, and Sara DeMartino (University of Pittsburgh) say a major reason teachers don't assign students enough writing is the amount of time it takes to grade and provide feedback. One way of cutting down the teacher workload, increasing the amount of writing, and getting more-frequent comments to students is having peers give each other feedback on drafts and then having students submitting finished papers to the teacher for grades.

But can students give accurate and helpful feedback? Schunn, Godley, and DeMartino

reviewed the research and found that in secondary and college classrooms using peer review, students tend to give each other empty praise and avoid criticism for fear of negative social consequences. This is especially true when comments are given face to face – students pull their punches for fear of embarrassing their classmates or coming across as mean and focus only on superficial suggestions. Even when rubrics and guidelines are provided, if teachers don't monitor the process closely and hold students accountable, peers often ignore the rules and give low-quality feedback.

This negative track record notwithstanding, Schunn, Godley, and DeMartino wondered if peer review might work using a different process. They conducted an experiment with 1,215 students in AP English classes in 26 high schools (suburban, urban, and rural; regular public, charter, and private) in 12 states across the U.S. The researchers oriented teachers to the process through an online tutorial and had them do a simulation of how students would experience this novel approach to peer review. Teachers then gave their students a 30-45-minute lesson (provided by the researchers) on giving high-quality feedback, accompanied by a detailed, student-friendly rubric geared to AP English expectations. Students then used Peerceptiv, a web-based rating program (www.peerceptiv.com), to provide anonymous online feedback to essays written by five peers, who then used the feedback to revise their essays. Here were the specific steps:

- Students wrote essays on computers responding to a prompt from the 2013 AP English Language and Composition exam; it involved reading a one-page text and analyzing the author's rhetorical strategies developing the argument, with specific references to the text.
- Students uploaded their essays into the Peerceptiv system.
- The system automatically distributed the essays so that each student received five.
- Students used the rubric to assess their peers' essays on eight domains: thesis, explanation of the author's argument, analysis of the author's rhetorical strategies, evidence for claims, explanation of evidence, organization, control of language, and conventions.
- The rubrics included numerical ratings (e.g., on a 1-7 scale, "How strong is the evidence for each claim about the author's rhetorical strategies?") and open-ended responses (e.g., "Provide feedback on how well the author explained the textual evidence he or she provided").
- After students had completed their five reviews, student authors received two kinds of feedback: open-ended comments from their peer reviewers and scores that reflected the average of all the reviewers' numerical ratings (all anonymous).
- Authors then took an online survey in which they rated the helpfulness of the comments they received.
- Peerceptiv automatically generated individual student grades for the peer review task based on the quality of the essays (as determined by the average of peers' ratings), the quality of the peer reviews, and the on-time completion of all aspects of the task. The quality of peer reviews was calculated by authors' ratings of the helpfulness of

comments and ratings and a statistical comparison of reviewers' ratings with the mean ratings produced by other peers on those same essays. This helped identify anomalous grades (students might have scoped out who their reviewees were and cut their friends some slack).

- Student authors used peer feedback to revise their essays.
- Students and teachers took an online survey on how they felt about the process.

The researchers then compared students' assessments with those of peers who read the same essays, with teacher scores (each teacher rated at least 15 of his or her students' essays), and with those of expert AP essay scorers (who scored a sampling of the essays). Here are the researchers' findings on their three research questions:

• *Did the students tend to agree with one another at sufficiently high levels to produce reliable scores?* By using data generated by Peerceptiv, the researchers saw that the scores given by different students on the same essays were remarkably consistent.

• *What is the extent to which students can accurately judge the quality of their peers' essays?* The researchers compared students' scores with those of their teachers and the trained AP scorers and found the correlations were very high – in fact, higher than what is typically seen between two teachers' ratings of a set of essays. In addition, students' ratings correlated slightly better with those of the expert AP scorers than did the teachers'. "That is," say Schunn, Godley, and DeMartino, "the mean of five student ratings appears to be even more valid than single-teacher ratings. This suggests that if multiple students assess a peer's essay using a well-designed rubric, the average of the students' ratings could potentially be used in place of a teacher-generated grade."

• *What were students' and teachers' perceptions of the peer review process?* Most students and teachers said that using Peerceptiv for peer review was beneficial, with students saying they received good advice from their classmates. Interestingly, students said the most helpful part of the process was seeing successful strategies and weaknesses in other students' essays – in other words, assessing and "teaching" their peers was even more instructive than receiving their peers' feedback. Several other survey findings:

- A majority of students said they had a better sense of what was required on the AP exam.
- A majority felt better prepared for the AP exam.
- A majority didn't think it was fair that peer feedback was part of students' grades.
- A majority thought reviewing five essays was an unreasonable amount of work.
- A minority of students preferred teacher or face-to-face (versus online) feedback.
- A smaller minority of students objected to giving advice to peers and having peers grade their essays.

All but one of the teachers responding to the survey said students definitely learned from and gave helpful feedback to their peers, and all but one teacher felt their students were better prepared for the AP exam after only one round of peer assessment. Of all the teachers, 35 percent wanted to use online peer assessment a few times the next year, and almost 60 percent wanted to use it regularly throughout the year.

As for the workload, the researchers believe that having students score four essays wouldn't detract from the accuracy and helpfulness of the process.

"The Reliability and Validity of Peer Review of Writing in High School AP English Class" by Christian Schunn, Amanda Godley, and Sara DeMartino in *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, July/August 2016 (Vol. 60, #1, p. 13-23), available for purchase at http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/jaal.525/abstract; the authors can be reached at schunn@pitt.edu, agodley@pitt.edu, and smd94@pitt.edu.

Back to page one

5. Helping Adolescents Who Struggle with Writing

In this *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy* article, Kathleen Collins (Pennsylvania State University) and Beth Ferri (Syracuse University) describe a teaching challenge faced by Collins at the beginning of her second year teaching high-school literacy. This was a basic course taken by 9th graders who were not college-bound and many of whom did not speak English at home. Collins asked students to find an article in a newspaper or magazine, discuss it with classmates, and then write an essay giving their reactions to the article.

One girl, captain of the freshman volleyball team and quite fluent in spoken English (her native language was Spanish), turned in an essay reacting to a *Readers Digest* article on gun control. The problem was that she had copied the first sentence of every paragraph from the article and strung them together with words and short phrases to create a piece of writing that resembled an essay. A male student, quarterback of the junior varsity football team, was also a frequent and articulate participant in class discussions, but he failed to bring in an article. Collins gave him several to look over and he chose a sports column from *The Washington Post*, but when he turned in his paper, it had "S.A." at the top and nothing else.

How was Collins supposed to deal with these students? Punish the girl for plagiarism? Refer her to be tested for a learning disability? Get her E.S.L. support? Was the boy being defiant and noncompliant, or did he have some sort of learning problem that needed diagnosis and treatment? Were these students' deficits cognitive, linguistic, or ethical? Finally, should they both be given failing grades for the assignment?

None of the above, say Collins and Ferri. Instead, a situation like this needs to be approached from a different perspective that "helps us disrupt deficit thinking, view students with disabilities as a cultural minority group marginalized by normative school structures, and shift the object of remediation from 'defective' students to inaccessible school structures and practices." Making this shift, they say, "is increasingly a matter of great urgency" because when struggling students are labeled as disabled and pulled out of regular classes, they miss out on core instruction and fall further and further behind. What these two students have is a *literacy* problem, say the authors, and like most other students in the same boat, they really need high-quality literacy instruction and additional support. Here is what Collins and Ferri say the most effective teachers do:

• *Clearly communicate that every student belongs*. Having established this, the challenge is designing the learning environment so everyone can succeed. "When students

identified as having difficulty with academic literacy are included and supported," say Collins and Ferri, "it sends a message to the rest of the class that everyone is valued and that everyone is a vital member of the classroom community…. [W]hen a teacher gives up on students, it is not long afterward that the students will often give up on themselves."

• *Presume competence*. It's important to believe that all students, even those who struggle with academic writing or some other literacy skill, have something valuable to contribute and want to participate. Teachers then need to find ways to support them in expanding their beachhead of competence while addressing weaknesses. In the case of the girl who copied from *Readers Digest*, the teacher might see it as her attempt to scaffold herself into a new form of discourse, creating writing that was more essay-like than what she could produce on her own – but it's also clear that she needs help in taking the next step. The boy who turned in a blank paper wasn't defiant but stuck on this assignment and in need of help to compete the task. And indeed, Collins reports, "after being provided with the opportunity to map out his ideas visually prior to writing, and then use this map to orally explain his ideas to his peers, he was able to independently draft a coherent essay.

• *See the student-task gap*. "Struggle is not a characteristic of individual learners," say Collins and Ferri; "a struggling reader or writer is one who is experiencing a mismatch between their preferred literacy mode and the one they are being asked to communicate with in school." Teachers need to know their students well and look for ways to tweak assignments so students can bridge the gap. Collins concluded that in this case, her essay assignment was flawed: students needed a broader range of newspaper and magazine articles to choose from, and more options in how to write their essays, perhaps including the use of technology.

Implementing these steps is a major shift from the status quo in many schools and asks a lot of educators, acknowledge Collins and Ferri. It means that teachers "actively choose to reject deficit thinking and its attendant assignment of deficit, deviance, or defiance… It requires rethinking and questioning the centrality and expectation of normalcy and homogeneity in classrooms and schools. Specifically, it requires that teachers and teacher educators take up different habits of mind and consider how to support the meaningful participation of students who come to us with an array of literacies, which may or not include facility with written academic literacy." By adopting these precepts, "literacy teachers have the opportunity to play a particularly important role in resisting educational sorting, disrupting patterns of exclusion, and shaping students' subsequent life opportunities."

"Literacy Education and Disability Studies: Re-envisioning Struggling Students" by Kathleen Collins and Beth Ferri in *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, July/August 2016 (Vol. 60, #1, p. 7-12), available for purchase at http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/jaal.552/abstract; Collins can be reached at Kathleen@psu.edu.

Back to page one

If you have feedback or suggestions, 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 45 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
- 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.
- A collection of "classic" articles from all 12 years

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
Center for Performance Assessment Newsletter
District Administration
Ed. Magazine
Education Digest
Education Gadfly
Education Next
Education Week
Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis
Educational Horizons
Educational Leadership
Educational Researcher
Edutopia
Elementary School Journal
Essential Teacher
Go Teach
Harvard Business Review
Harvard Educational Review
Independent School
Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy
Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk (JESPAR)
Journal of Staff Development
Kappa Delta Pi Record
Knowledge Quest
Literacy Today
Middle School Journal
Peabody Journal of Education
Perspectives
Phi Delta Kappan
Principal
Principal Leadership
Principal's Research Review
Reading Research Quarterly
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 Journal of the Learning Sciences
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 Magazine
Wharton Leadership Digest