

Marshall Memo 335

A Weekly Round-up of Important Ideas and Research in K-12 Education
May 10, 2010

In This Issue:

1. [Nurturing teachers and making schools learning communities](#)
2. [A career ladder proposal](#)
3. [Should value-added data be used to evaluate teachers?](#)
4. [Daniel Pink on motivation](#)
5. [Cooperative learning as brain-friendly differentiation](#)
6. [Advice on AP courses](#)
7. [Using partner reading to build vocabulary and confidence](#)
8. [Robert Marzano on using nonlinguistic representations](#)
9. Short item: [Inside Mathematics website](#)

Quotes of the Week

“The pathway to high performance is engagement, and the pathway to engagement is a much more autonomous, intrinsically motivated form of behavior.”

Daniel Pink (see item #4)

“Done right, group work can harness the natural propensity of humans to interact, and – most important – make learning for a wide variety of students more engaging, memorable, and equitable.”

Nancy Walser (see item #5)

“For a school to succeed, it must depend on deliberate, ongoing collaboration among teachers who have different strengths and skills.”

Susan Moore Johnson (see item #1)

“If schools are not organized to rely on the strengths of some to improve the performance of others, little will change and students’ opportunity to learn will continue to be determined by the luck of the draw when classroom assignments are made.”

Susan Moore Johnson (*ibid.*)

“Teaching is a complex craft, continually demanding new skills and knowledge, yet most districts’ professional development is superficial and sporadic.”

Susan Moore Johnson and John Papay (see item #2)

1. Nurturing Teachers and Making Schools Learning Communities

In this *Harvard Education Letter* article, education professor Susan Moore Johnson bemoans the isolation of many teachers from their colleagues and catalogs the failure of various attempts to create career ladders, use lead teachers, and dispense merit pay. Johnson is particularly chagrined that the expertise of more than 16,000 National Board-certified teachers is rarely tapped by their schools, largely due to two norms that still rule the profession: autonomy – *I am entitled to work undisturbed* – and egalitarianism – *We are all good teachers*. Over the years, says Johnson, “The flat, uniform career of teaching remained largely unchallenged.”

In interviews with hundreds of new and early-career teachers, Johnson and her colleagues in the Project on the Next Generation of Teachers have found that the reasons for going into teaching remain much the same as in previous generations: “to work with children, to share their love of a subject, and to serve the public good.” But members of the newest cohort of teachers seem less fixated on classroom autonomy and more interested in collaboration. Many hope to extend their impact beyond the classroom, and if they’re not successful with students and can’t stretch their wings within their school, they are likely to transfer or leave the profession entirely.

What can meet the needs of this new generation of educators? Johnson describes several new roles that show promise of differentiating teachers’ careers, scaffolding teachers’ expertise and leadership, and creating learning communities that retain the best teachers and develop schoolwide instructional capacity:

- *Instructional coaches* – The first wave of literacy and math coaches suffered from weak selection processes, fuzzy job descriptions, and inadequate training in how to manage their time and win colleagues’ confidence and trust. “As a result,” says Johnson, “instructional coaches often were rebuffed by fellow teachers, especially veterans, who claimed a right to professional autonomy and questioned the coaches’ expertise and good intentions.” Learning from failure, some schools have done a better job at linking well-chosen, well-trained coaches with clearly defined roles to overall school-improvement efforts and giving them enough time to do their work. “For a school to succeed,” says Johnson, “it must depend on deliberate, ongoing collaboration among teachers who have different strengths and skills.”

- *Consulting teachers* – Peer assistance and review (PAR) programs have been negotiated in a number of districts, including Toledo, Cincinnati, Montgomery County, and Syracuse. Consulting teachers are the key elements in PAR, and there are clear guidelines – at

least five years of successful teaching and a careful selection process. Consulting teachers usually leave the classroom for three years to support and evaluate 10-15 novice and veteran teachers, supporting their improvement and working in panels to recommend reappointment or dismissal. The work of consulting teachers includes direct assistance and unannounced classrooms visits, which challenges the norms of autonomy and egalitarianism. But they have been well received in most districts because they are skilled and highly motivated and their role is carefully designed and supported.

- *Staff development, instructional technology, and assessment data specialists* – These roles are being developed and are less defined than those of instructional coaches and consulting teachers.

Johnson closes with two recent developments that threaten these nascent efforts to redesign the profession:

- The use of value-added methods to dismiss ineffective teachers has, she says, “led some policy makers to ignore the importance of building the school as a learning organization. These reformers contend that the problems of schooling can be solved with a steady supply of smart and committed individuals, each teaching for just a few years... In this scenario, schools will be staffed like summer camps with waves of eager recruits giving their best before moving on... However, even if schools could attract and retain such teachers, there would always be a need to support and develop those with less experience, knowledge, and skill. If schools are not organized to rely on the strengths of some to improve the performance of others, little will change and students’ opportunity to learn will continue to be determined by the luck of the draw when classroom assignments are made.”

- Looming budget cuts threaten to kill promising new initiatives in the cradle. “If this happens,” says Johnson, “teachers again will be left to rely on their own wits and wisdom, rather than benefiting from the knowledge and expertise of their colleagues. Again, students will pay the price.”

“Once a Teacher, Always a Teacher?” by Susan Moore Johnson in the *Harvard Education Letter*, May/June 2010 (Vol. 26, #3, p. 8, 6-7) <http://www.hepg.org/hel/article/467>

[Back to page one](#)

2. A Career-Ladder Proposal

(Originally titled “Merit Pay for a New Generation”)

In this thoughtful *Educational Leadership* article, Harvard professor Susan Moore Johnson and graduate student John Papay describe past attempts to use merit pay to improve instruction and attract higher-caliber teachers – it’s been tried a number of times and never worked. They acknowledge that we now have better sources of information on individual teachers’ impact, but believe the current rage for merit pay will repeat past mistakes. “A district is far better positioned today than it was 20 years ago to identify its best teachers and engage them in improving the work of colleagues,” they write. “However, few districts do so. Most pay-for-performance plans remain free-standing, unaligned with the district’s goals for

students, the staffing needs of schools, and the career aspirations of teachers. Policymakers and administrators, responding to short-term demands for better test scores, have often overlooked the importance of making schools places where teachers can succeed with all students and can build professionally rewarding, financially sustainable careers. They have failed to join the potential of pay with the power of teaching's intrinsic rewards – doing meaningful work, watching students learn and grow, and collaborating with others to achieve a greater good.”

To address these problems, Johnson and Papay propose a Tiered Pay-and-Career Structure. Here's how it works:

- *Four tiers of career growth* – The goal is to attract strong candidates to teaching, support their development over time, and offer incentives to outstanding teachers who improve instruction outside their own classrooms.

- Tier I – Probationary teachers;
- Tier II – Tenured teachers (achieving this is not an easy or automatic process);
- Tier III – Master teachers (as documented by evaluations, student results, and parent satisfaction) who act as models and mentors to colleagues and serve as grade-level team leaders, department heads, or school data analysts; most continue to teach full-time;
- Tier IV – Outstanding teachers who are relieved of classroom duties to take on broader responsibilities: induction of new teachers, peer evaluation, and introducing new curriculum initiatives.

Moving up a tier would bring substantial jumps in pay, and there would be annual step increases within each tier to encourage loyalty and retention.

- *A learning and development fund* – This is designed to get teachers learning new skills and taking on additional responsibilities throughout their careers. “Teaching is a complex craft continually demanding new skills and knowledge,” say Johnson and Papay, “yet most districts’ professional development is superficial and sporadic. Meanwhile, huge sums of money meant to reward learning are tied up in the lanes of a district’s salary scale.” The fund would gradually move money from automatic step increases to investing in training immediately relevant to teachers’ classrooms. Each year, a committee of teachers and administrators would decide on the highest-impact areas for professional training. This fund would also support Tier III and IV master teachers.

- *Short-term, local incentives for special situations* – For example, attracting special-education teachers to fill a shortage, assembling faculty for a school turnaround, or paying bonuses for special accomplishments.

Johnson and Papay believe their plan would give prospective teachers a clear career pathway, improve support for rookies, assure competent teachers a steady income, and give exceptional teachers an exciting career ladder and the prospect of higher pay. Several factors would need to be in place for the plan to succeed: (a) collaboration among teachers, union leaders, administrators, and school boards; (b) a fair and transparent decision-making process; (c) on-going monitoring and leadership; (d) improved techniques for evaluating teachers; and (e) gathering evidence that it improves student learning.

“Merit Pay for a New Generation” by Susan Moore Johnson and John Papay in *Educational Leadership*, May 2010 (Vol. 67, #8, p. 48-52); this article can be purchased at http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational_leadership/current_issue.aspx. The authors can be reached at susan_moore_johnson@gse.harvard.edu and john_papay@mail.harvard.edu.

[Back to page one](#)

3. Should Value-Added Data Be Used to Evaluate Teachers?

(Originally titled “Using Value-Added Measures to Evaluate Teachers”)

In this *Educational Leadership* research summary, California researcher Jane David looks at the evidence on evaluating teachers based on the value they add to student achievement. She cites several concerns:

- Student absenteeism during the year can skew results;
- Students at different achievement levels progress at different rates;
- Some classrooms are dumping-grounds for troubled students;
- End-of-year tests may not be comparable from year to year;
- Studies show year-to-year differences in even the most effective teachers;
- Value-added analysis is complex and expensive.

Are value-added measures more accurate than traditional teacher evaluations conducted by principals? Several studies have found that principals’ ratings produce almost identical results.

The bottom line: so far, there is no evidence that value-added evaluations yield better information than traditional evaluations or will bring about improvements in teaching and learning. David sums up: “The complexity and uncertainty of measuring student achievement growth and deciding how much responsibility for gains to attribute to the teacher argue against using such measures for high-stakes decisions about individuals.” Multiple measures are needed, she says, to measure teacher effectiveness in ways that will “identify the specific supports teachers need to improve their practice.”

“Using Value-Added Measures to Evaluate Teachers” by Jane David in *Educational Leadership*, May 2010 (Vol. 67, #8, p. 81-82); this article can be purchased at http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational_leadership/current_issue.aspx. David can be reached at jld@bayarearesearch.org.

[Back to page one](#)

4. Daniel Pink on Motivation

In this *EDGE* interview, Daniel Pink (author of the recent book, *Drive: The Surprising Truth About What Motivates Us*, Riverhead, 2009) describes three motivational “operating systems” for humans:

- Motivation 1.0 – Basic biological drives, including hunger, thirst, and reproduction;
- Motivation 2.0 – An “upgrade” that included if/then, carrot-and-stick rewards and punishments for certain economic and interpersonal behaviors; this worked well for a long time, says Pink, fueling the Industrial Revolution.

- Motivation 3.0 – This additional upgrade involved autonomy, mastery, and purpose, which became necessary when the 19th-century motivators no longer worked for 20th- and 21st-century tasks with more complex, conceptual, creative thinking. New challenges required that we “fundamentally rethink things,” says Pink, “not to be nicer and kinder, but to be more effective and more productive.”

What are the implications of Motivation 3.0 for teacher merit pay? Pink believes pay-for-performance is a bad idea. Instead, he recommends raising teachers’ base pay and making it easier to dismiss ineffective teachers. “I think that’s a pretty fair bargain that’s going to do a lot more for learning than some kind of elaborate metric system or turning classes into test prep academies,” he says.

To increase teachers’ motivation and effectiveness, Pink recommends zeroing in on the three key elements of Motivation 3.0: autonomy, mastery, and purpose. He recommends that schools do an “autonomy audit” – ask how much control teachers have, on a 1-to-10 scale, over time, the team they work with, the tasks they perform, and the techniques they use. In most schools, such an audit would reveal that teachers have less autonomy than any other white-collar professionals in the U.S. “What it shows to me,” says Pink, “is that the policy makers don’t trust teachers. They feel like teachers have to be controlled or they’ll go spinning wildly out of control, when in fact I actually start with a different presumption: that the vast majority of teachers want to do great work, that they entered the teaching profession in order to make a difference in the world, and if you simply give them the tools and get out of their way, the vast majority of them are going to do extraordinary things.”

How would this work? Pink cites a company in Australia that periodically gives its software developers 24 hours in which they can work in any way they wish as long as they show the results to the rest of the company at the end of the 24 hours. They call these FedEx Days because they have to deliver something overnight. “It turns out that this one day of intense autonomy has delivered this whole array of fixes for existing software and a whole array of ideas for new software that would have otherwise never emerged,” says Pink. It’s not pay for performance; it’s undiluted autonomy with accountability. In a school, it might be 24 hours in which teachers could work individually or as teams to come up with ideas for a new class, a new pedagogical technique, or a school-reform idea and present it to their colleagues. “I think the teachers would do some amazing things with a FedEx Day,” he says. “The pathway to high performance is engagement, and the pathway to engagement is a much more autonomous, intrinsically motivated form of behavior.”

Pink applies this logic to assigning homework, which he says suffers from a belief among teachers, parents, and students that if it’s not drudgery and a little painful, it’s not rigorous and doesn’t add value. To get instructional benefit from homework, he suggests, teachers should give students more autonomy and make sure they know the purpose. Then they’ll be engaged and work toward mastery. The same goes for classroom work: get students working on more independent projects and choosing their reading matter.

Pink also says that students should set learning goals at the beginning of a semester and then do a self-assessment at the end, zeroing in on whether they achieved mastery and what needs more work. This approach is common in athletics and music – clear goals, lots of practice, constant feedback and ongoing self-assessment. This is far preferable to “outsourcing the evaluation and feedback to teachers,” he says.

What can teachers do about passive, disengaged, sullen students? Pink recommends finding an area of their lives where they *are* engaged – perhaps a sport, an orchestra, or a church group – and using it to gain insights about what makes them tick. It’s also important, he says, to tear down the barriers between the classroom and the real world and get students working on real problems with real consequences. What the research says, he concludes, is that “if you want people to perform at a high level, especially for complicated things, they have to be self-directed, they have to be able to move towards mastery, and they have to have a purpose for what they’re doing.”

“The Pathway to High Performance: An Interview with Author Daniel Pink” in *EDge*, May/June 2010 (Vol. 5, #5, p. 3-18), no e-link for non-subscribers

[Back to page one](#)

5. Cooperative Learning As Brain-Friendly Differentiation

“Done right, group work can harness the natural propensity of humans to interact,” says Massachusetts educator Nancy Walser in this *Harvard Education Letter* article, “and – most important – make learning for a wide variety of students more engaging, memorable, and equitable. While it is more difficult to do than traditional lecturing, teachers say, most of the hard work is in the preparation, and the payoffs make the time invested well worth it.”

Done right is the key phrase in the paragraph above. According to Johns Hopkins University researcher Robert Slavin, the key is having a group task and individual accountability. “When the group’s task is to ensure that every group member learns something,” he says, “it is in the interests of every group member to spend time explaining concepts to his or her group mates.”

Walser believes that the instructional power of done-right small-group collaborative learning comes from three sources:

- Identifying and working out different viewpoints;
- Synthesizing and vocalizing one’s own knowledge;
- Extending one’s knowledge through hearing the ideas of others.

This brings about what neuroscientists call “consolidation” – converting information that’s rattling around in students’ short-term working memory into their permanent memories. Consolidation is much more effective than “cramming”, which is often done when students are bored, anxious, or afraid. Positive cooperative learning groups create the opposite atmosphere, boosting students’ self-esteem, improving intergroup relationships, including English language learners and students with disabilities, and ameliorating students’ negative attitudes toward school.

Cooperative learning also reduces two factors known to inhibit learning – fear of making mistakes and getting discouraged. With the right pre-teaching and structure, says California teacher and neuroscientist Judy Willis, small-group learning decreases the fear of making mistakes in front of the whole class, which increases participation and perseverance with challenging material. Willis allocates 50 percent of classroom time to group work, assigning roles so each student is an expert at something – for example, stopping the group to summarize or making a chart for a class presentation.

Willis is systematic about cooperative learning. She teaches group skills in the opening weeks of school (how to explain things, receive feedback, stay on task, encourage contributions, and monitor group-mates’ understanding), plans units backwards (“What do I want them to know?”), pre-teaches skills (students can’t join groups until they answer questions from their notes or reading), and keeps track of group and individual progress. “There needs to be accountability, [otherwise] some will goof off,” she says. “Some will feel they have to do all the work – plenty of things can go wrong.”

Rachel Otty, a Cambridge (Mass.) high-school history teacher, is careful when she forms cooperative groups at the beginning of each year. She starts with the more distractible students and builds heterogeneous 3- or 4-person groups around them, making sure that each group has a member who is task-oriented, shy, and outgoing, and that all students have at least one person with whom they can work cooperatively. Otty also gives students a rubric explaining how individual effort and group work will be graded.

Teachers need to pay attention to the social and academic status of their students, says Michigan State University professor Helen Featherstone. High-status students may ignore or reject ideas from low-status students, and low-status students may assume that the “smart” students know better and pull back from participating in group discussions, even if they have good ideas.

A crucial part of planning for successful cooperative learning groups is coming up with an “ill-structured task,” says Walser. Student groups work best when they are asked to wrestle with a problem to which there is no right answer, that requires the use of higher-level thinking, and that forces them to work together to get the answer. Three examples:

- Coming up with an equation that can be used to buy different lengths of shoelaces for different types of shoes;
- Debating whether Andrew Jackson should have been impeached;
- Reading the charges against men leveled by feminists in the 1848 Declaration of Sentiments and comparing them to statistics on the status of men and women in the U.S. today.

“Unleashing the ‘Brain Power’ of Groups in the Classroom: The Neuroscience Behind Collaborative Work” by Nancy Walser in the *Harvard Education Letter*, May/June 2010 (Vol. 26, #3, p. 1-3, 6) <http://www.hepg.org/hel/article/465>

[Back to page one](#)

6. Advice on AP Courses

In this *Harvard Education Letter* interview by Lucy Hood, astronomy professor Philip Sadler shares some insights from a new book he co-edited, *AP: A Critical Examination of the Advanced Placement Program* (Harvard Education Press, 2010):

- *Benefits from taking AP courses* – Sadler says these include getting turned on to a particular field, delving more deeply into subject matter, getting into the college of one’s choice, and getting financial aid or scholarships, getting a leg up on introductory college courses, and using AP calculus to do better in college science courses.

- *The myth that taking AP courses is enough* – Sadler says that students who take science AP courses and fail the AP exams don’t do any better in college science courses than those who haven’t taken AP courses. For students who aren’t going to succeed in AP courses, it makes more sense to take advanced courses. In addition, this would save their high schools valuable resources since AP courses are expensive to run (small classes, highly qualified teachers, specialized lab equipment).

- *Alternatives to AP* – Some elite public and private schools are replacing AP courses with second-year courses involving in-depth study of certain topics because they think they can do a better job covering advanced material than following AP curriculums. And some high schools are teaming up with nearby colleges and community colleges that allow students to take introductory college courses for full credit.

- *Drawbacks of AP* – Sadler says that some high-school students take an AP course and then never take a college course in that area. While high-school teachers can do a good job teaching the fundamentals, Sadler believes that they’re usually less aware of the latest research and are less likely to entice students in continuing in the field than a college professor. He also thinks students should get college credit only for scoring 4 or 5 on an AP exam.

- *The myth of early graduation* – Sadler says that students who take AP courses in high school rarely go through college in three years, so there’s little economic advantage.

- *Advice for high-school principals* – Sadler says these are the key points for administrators to bear in mind:

- Make sure your AP courses are high-quality – well-prepared teachers who have gone through professional development in AP and have the resources to teach the course.
- Have a mechanism to ensure that students are prepared to take each AP course.
- Require that all students who enroll in an AP course take the AP exam.
- Monitor AP exam results. “That’s the only way an administrator is going to know whether the course is successful or not,” says Sadler. “The grade that the teacher gives to students is not highly correlated with the AP exam score. The grades that teachers give are not a proxy or a replacement for AP exam scores.”

“Putting AP to the Test: New Research Assesses the Advanced Placement Program” – An interview with Philip Sadler by Lucy Hood in the *Harvard Education Letter*, May/June 2010 (Vol. 26, #3, p. 4-5) <http://www.hepg.org/hel/article/466>

[Back to page one](#)

7. Using Partner Reading to Build Vocabulary and Confidence

In this article in *The Reading Teacher*, National-Louis University/Chicago instructors Donna Ogle and Amy Correa-Kovtun suggest ways to help English-language learners read challenging informational material, especially science and social studies textbooks. For starters, the authors present five research-based classroom priorities:

- Students should read daily from materials at their instructional or independent levels.
- Students need regular opportunities to talk and use academic vocabulary to make concepts their own and internalize new ways of expressing ideas.
- Students should ask and answer their own questions, understanding and taking ownership of their own learning.
- Factual knowledge is important to content learning, but students also need regular opportunities to think at higher levels, reflecting and sharing points of view to clarify their ideas and deepen their understanding.
- Students need to be guided in using informational texts, which includes using text features and structures and making notes of new ideas.

To operationalize this in classrooms, Ogle and Correa-Kovtun created the “Partner Reading and Content, Too” (PRC2) routine. They have teachers locate easy-to-read children’s books on a particular curriculum unit (for example, a science unit on simple machines) and match the books to students’ reading levels. Teachers then pair students of similar reading levels and interests, explain the purpose of partner reading (to deepen their understanding of the unit content and practice using important academic vocabulary), model the process, and have them follow these steps (the whole routine lasts 20-30 minutes):

- Partners preview the whole book.
- For each two-page spread, both partners first read the pages silently to get a sense of the text.
- Partners choose a page and reread their page to prepare for oral reading
- Partners think of a question to ask their partner, for example, What was most important? Why? Explain. What was most interesting? Why? Explain. What connections can you make? Explain. What could the author make clearer? Explain.
- Each partner reads a page orally and then asks his or her partner a question.
- Partners then talk about the text, which gives them ownership of the academic vocabulary and concepts.
- Partners switch roles – reader and listener – as they read section by section.
- Each partner adds words to a personal vocabulary notebook.

Because each pair of students is at the same reading level, they are much less hesitant to read out loud and shyness is not a problem. The teacher circulates to monitor and correct.

At the end of partner reading time, the teacher convenes the whole class for a few minutes of sharing insights and questions. Ogle and Correa-Kovtun report that ELLs, who are often hesitant to participate in whole-class discussion, are much more willing to do so after their partner reading time.

What does Partner Reading and Content, Too accomplish? Ogle and Correa-Kovtun list the following:

- It increases students' actual reading of appropriate content materials at each student's reading level.
- It provides a setting in which students ask and answer their own questions and take control over their learning.
- The process of partner questioning supports students as they extend their "academic talk" and think at higher levels.
- The process introduces students to a variety of informational texts and helps them learn to use the structure and features of these materials.

"Supporting English-Language Learners and Struggling Readers in Content Literacy with the 'Partner Reading and Content, Too' Routine" by Donna Ogle and Amy Correa-Kovtun in *The Reading Teacher*, April 2010 (Vol. 63, #7, p. 532-542), no e-link available; the authors can be reached at dogle@nl.edu and amy.correa@nl.edu.

[*Back to page one*](#)

8. Robert Marzano on Using Nonlinguistic Representations

(Originally titled "Representing Knowledge Nonlinguistically")

In this *Educational Leadership* article, researcher/author Robert Marzano distinguishes between two ways that teachers explain content to students: linguistically (using words) and nonlinguistically. Marzano says the latter is used less frequently in classrooms, and lists five things teachers should bear in mind to get the most out of this potentially powerful medium:

- Nonlinguistic teaching comes in many forms – graphic organizers, sketches, stick figures and symbols, concept maps, flowcharts, dramatizations, and computerized simulations – and the key is picking the right one for the content being taught – for example, a flowchart might be best for describing how to balance an equation.

- Nonlinguistic representations must convey the most important information. For example, if a student draws stick figures of the main characters in a story but doesn't depict the actions that occur, not much would be added to learning.

- Students should be asked to explain. Presenting their nonlinguistic work to classmates promotes greater understanding and reveals errors and missing elements.

- Nonlinguistic representations are time-consuming. This means they should be used strategically, and when they are used, teachers should give students enough time to do them well.

- Students should revise. Nonlinguistic representations sometimes contain errors, and teachers should give students a chance to improve their work after checking other sources.

"Representing Knowledge Nonlinguistically" by Robert Marzano in *Educational Leadership*, May 2010 (Vol. 67, #8, p. 84-86); this article can be purchased at http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational_leadership/current_issue.aspx.

[*Back to page one*](#)

9. Short Item:

Inside Math website – This free website, developed by the Noyce Foundation’s Silicon Valley Mathematics Initiative, has videos of innovative classroom practices, rich mathematical tasks, full sets of student work, and interviews with teachers and students:

<http://www.insidemathematics.org/>

[Back to page one](#)

© Copyright 2010 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.marshall8@verizon.net

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 37 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 44 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 about 50 issues a year).

Subscriptions:

Individual subscriptions are \$50 for the school year. Rates decline steeply for multiple readers within the same organization. See the website for these rates and information on paying by check or credit card.

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
- What readers say
- About Kim Marshall (including links to articles)
- A free sample issue

Marshall Memo subscribers have access to the Members' Area of the website, which has:

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

Publications covered

Those read this week are underlined.

American Educator
American Journal of Education
American School Board Journal
ASCD, CEC SmartBriefs, Daily EdNews
Catalyst Chicago
Ed. Magazine
EDge
Education Digest
Education Gadfly
Education Next
Education Week
Educational Leadership
Educational Researcher
Edutopia
Elementary School Journal
Essential Teacher (TESOL)
Harvard Business Review
Harvard Education Letter
Harvard Educational Review
JESPAR
Journal of Staff Development
Language Learner (NABE)
Middle Ground
Middle School Journal
New York Times
Newsweek
PEN Weekly NewsBlast
Phi Delta Kappan
Principal
Principal Leadership
Principal's Research Review
Reading Research Quarterly
Reading Today
Rethinking Schools
Review of Educational Research
Teachers College Record
The Atlantic Monthly
The Chronicle of Higher Education
The Language Educator
The Learning Principal
The New Yorker
The Reading Teacher
Theory Into Practice
Tools for Schools