Marshall Memo 555

A Weekly Round-up of Important Ideas and Research in K-12 Education
October 6, 2014

In This Issue:

Quotes of the Week

"Self-questioning, skepticism, and perfectionism are great survival mechanisms for keeping our dumb, imperfect species out of trouble. Do we really want women emulating poker players and race-car drivers, or would society be better off if we dudes took a page from our self-doubting sisters' playbook?"

Skip Griffin in a letter to *The Atlantic*, July/August 2014, responding to the article by Katty Kay and Claire Shipman on the female confidence gap (see Memo 536)

"Though the occasional political firecracker still flares across the night sky, as of mid-2014 it seems likely that most of the forty-six jurisdictions that originally embraced the Common Core State Standards will stick with them."

Chester Finn, Jr. in "In the Common Core Era, Different Kids Need Different Credentials" in *The Education Gadfly*, October 1, 2014 (Vol. 14, #40), http://edexcellence.net/articles/in-the-common-core-era-different-kids-need-different-credentials

"Why should a profession that trades in words and dedicates itself to the transmission of knowledge so often turn out prose that is turgid, soggy, wooden, bloated, clumsy, obscure, unpleasant to read, and impossible to understand?"

Steven Pinker (see item #2)

"Every good teaching idea becomes a bad idea the moment it hardens into orthodoxy."

Robert Pondiscio (see item #4)

"Let's teach them not only to use text as evidence to support claims, but also to let the text move, teach, frustrate, confuse, and compel them."

Mia Hood (see item #5)

1. Another Take on "College and Career Ready"

"As someone who is tasked with teaching students at the moment they arrive in college in a course (first-year writing) that just about every student will take," says author John Warner in this *Inside Higher Ed* article, "let me channel my inner Inigo Montoya regarding 'college and career ready': 'You keep using those words. I do not think they mean what you think they mean.'" Highly skeptical of the Common Core and standardized tests, Warner believes these are the traits that are most important to success in his course, college, and life:

• *Curiosity* – "If I have a curious student, I have a student who will learn things simply because they want to know more about the things they are learning," says Warner. "To me, writing is the pursuit of answers to questions we ask ourselves, and the curious student is well-skilled at asking questions of the world."

• *Self-regulation* – The freedom of college challenges many students who are used to the structures of high school, and "the ones that can manage their own schedules, that can avoid the traps of procrastination and social-life temptations, are simply better prepared to do the work when the work comes."

• *Passion* – "It doesn't much matter what the passion is, and it need not be academic," says Warner. "The only passion that doesn't really help them in my class is a passion for getting good grades."

• *Empathy* – Every assignment in Warner's class "is written to a specific rhetorical situation with a special audience with unique needs, attitudes, and knowledge," he says. "The ability to put oneself in someone else's shoes makes doing this significantly easier."

• *A healthy skepticism of authority* – "In my course, I am asking students to join in an academic conversation that is almost certainly being conducted by people with superior credentials, who hold positions of cultural authority. If students aren't willing to stick their noses into the discussion, they'll never have anything original to contribute."

"Education Reformers Don't Know What 'College Ready' Means" by John Warner in *Inside Higher Ed*, September 29, 2014, http://bit.ly/1xXiS5c

Back to page one

2. Steven Pinker's Tips for Professors (and Others) on Writing Well

In this article in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Steven Pinker (Harvard University) tees off on the way all too many academics write. "Why should a profession that trades in words and dedicates itself to the transmission of knowledge so often turn out prose that is turgid, soggy, wooden, bloated, clumsy, obscure, unpleasant to read, and impossible to understand?" he asks. "Our indifference to how we share the fruits of our intellectual labors is

a betrayal of our calling to enhance the spread of knowledge. In writing badly, we are wasting each other's time, sowing confusion and error, and turning our profession into a laughingstock."

Here's an example from the methods section of a psychology paper: "Participants read assertions whose veracity was either affirmed or denied by the subsequent presentation of an assessment word." Translated, this means, *Participants read sentences, each followed by the word true or false*.

Pinker considers several possible explanations for why so many professors write so badly:

- The bamboozlement theory – Scholars use obscure verbiage to hide the fact that they have nothing to say.
- Insider shorthand – Using jargon saves time and effort.
- Entrenched authority – The journals for which professors write insist on turgid prose.

But Pinker doesn't buy these theories. The real reasons, he believes, are: (a) Academics are constantly looking over their shoulders to make sure they won't be seen as slackers or idiots by their peers; and (b) the *curse of knowledge*: "a difficulty in imagining what it is like for someone else not to know something that you know," says Pinker. "It simply doesn't occur to them that their readers don't know what they know – that those readers haven't mastered the patois or can't divine the missing steps that seem too obvious to mention or have no way to visualize an event that to the writer is as clear as day. And so they don't bother to explain the jargon or spell out the logic or supply the necessary detail."

Pinker has these suggestions for improving writing: [These might apply to many K-12 educators as they communicate with colleagues and parents.]

• *Spell out abbreviations*. "Abbreviations are tempting to thoughtless writers because they can save a few keystrokes every time they have to use the term," he says. "The writers forget that the few seconds they add to their own lives come at the cost of many minutes stolen from their readers."

• *Add a few words of explanation for common technical terms*. "It's not just an act of magnanimity," says Pinker; "a writer who explains technical terms can multiply his readership a thousandfold at the coast of a handful of characters, the literary equivalent of picking up hundred-dollar bills on the sidewalk."

• *Give examples*. Readers smile and lean forward when they see the words, *for example*, *as in*, and *such as*.

• *Use connectors* like *nonetheless* and *moreover* and other writerly tricks to make connections and clarify concepts.

• *Avoid abstractions*. In every field, specialists develop "chunks" that are shorthand for several ideas, and within their field, these are helpful. "As we settle into the clique, it becomes our universe," says Pinker. "We fail to appreciate that it is a tiny bubble in a multiverse of cliques. When we make first contact with the aliens in other universes and jabber at them in our local code, they cannot understand us without a sci-fi universal translator… A commitment to the concrete does more than just ease communication; it can lead to better reasoning."

• *Get feedback and rewrite*. "When Calvin explained to Hobbs, 'With a little practice, writing can be an intimidating and impenetrable fog,' he got it backward," says Pinker. "Fog comes easily to writers; it's the clarity that requires practice… Exorcising the curse of knowledge is no easier. It requires more than just honing one's empathy for the generic reader." Show a draft to a critical friend, re-read your prose after putting it aside for a while, and go through one or two or three more drafts.

"Why Academics Stink at Writing" by Steven Pinker in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 3, 2014 (Vol. LXI, #5, p. B6-B10), http://chronicle.com/article/Why-Academics-Writing-Stinks/148989/. See Memo 550 for another article by Pinker on improving writing.

Back to page one

3. Richard Allington on Three Ineffective Reading Instruction Practices

(Originally titled "Reading Moves: What Not to Do")

In this *Educational Leadership* article, Richard Allington (University of Tennessee) seeks to correct three common classroom errors:

• *Overemphasizing oral reading* – The ultimate goal of literacy instruction is independent (mostly silent) reading with good comprehension, says Allington. Yet many teachers have students doing a lot of oral reading. Silent and oral reading are different processes, he says, and proficiency at one doesn't have much impact on the other. A 2009 study found that emphasizing oral reading produces students who can read more quickly and accurately but don't make gains in silent reading comprehension.

In addition, teachers tend to have their best students doing more silent reading while struggling students do more oral reading. Since most people can read much faster to themselves than they can when reading aloud, the result is low-achieving students reading fewer than half as many words a day as good readers. "This deficit in sheer reading volume is exactly the opposite of what lagging readers need," he observes.

• *Interrupting students as they read* – Allington says many teachers correct students as they read aloud, breaking their momentum and often interfering with comprehension. There are two important differences in the way struggling and proficient readers are interrupted. Teachers tend to cut in on their weaker readers immediately, sometimes before they finish saying a word incorrectly, and they mostly correct surface-level features ("That *e* is a silent *e*. Try again") rather than addressing meaning. With more-proficient students, teachers tend to wait longer before interrupting, sometimes till the end of the sentence or the page, and these students are encouraged to self-monitor ("Does that make sense to you?").

This pattern creates two types of readers, says Allington: "good readers who self-regulate, and struggling readers who stop after almost every word and look up at their teacher for a cue. These differences are not inherent in the struggling readers; rather, they're caused by variations in where teachers direct the students' attention. Good readers learn to pay attention to making sense; struggling readers learn to focus on letters and sounds while paying almost no attention to making sense of what they read."

• *Asking low-level questions* – Most of the reading questions in classrooms and textbook manuals are low-level interrogations of literal, trivial details that don't improve reading comprehension, says Allington. The most-effective teachers ask higher-order questions, have "literate conversations" with their students, and get them writing about what they've read. The problem is that many teachers aren't skilled at doing this.

Allington has the following suggestions:

- Use oral reading selectively. "By the middle of 1st grade, most reading should be done silently," he says.
- After silent reading, monitor comprehension by having students re-tell or write.
- When students are reading aloud, "consciously bite your tongue," waiting at least until a complete sentence is read.
- When responding to students' errors, encourage self-monitoring and self-regulation.
- Have students turn, pair, and share after reading and work to develop discussion skills. "Don't be surprised if many students appear confused or incompetent when you first integrate paired discussions into instruction," says Allington. "Be patient; nothing worthwhile is easy to accomplish."
- Explicitly teach discussion skills – for example, prompting students to say, "I disagree, and here's why."
- Gradually increase the amount of time students are engaged in literate discussion.

"Reading Moves: What Not to Do" by Richard Allington in *Educational Leadership*, October 2014 (Vol. 72, #2, p. 16-21), http://bit.ly/1rSau1T; Allington can be reached at rallingt@utk.edu

Back to page one

4. Two Misconceptions About Close Reading

"Every good teaching idea becomes a bad idea the moment it hardens into orthodoxy," says Robert Pondiscio in this article in *The Education Gadfly*. He believes there's a danger of that happening to close reading.

According to literacy expert Timothy Shanahan (University of Illinois/Chicago), close reading is "an intensive analysis of a piece of text, in order to come to terms with what it says, how it says it, and what it means." Close reading immerses students in challenging texts that stretch their abilities, which, says Pondiscio, "requires supporting students via multiple readings, providing vocabulary, working in pairs or groups, and posing questions designed to lead students to understand the text, among other techniques." David Liben of Student Achievement Partners says, "When close reading is done well, you have weak readers who never would have had the chance to deal with rich, complex text in the ballgame, grasping it, learning from it, and feeling good about it."

But this powerful classroom practice can go off the rails if teachers (a) over-use it, and (b) have students close-read without drawing on background knowledge. On (a), only a small part of reading instruction should involve close reading, says Pondiscio. "There's little to be gained in 'practicing' close reading on any ol' text as long as it's sufficiently difficult. The

work we put in front of kids should be worth the time it takes to read them repeatedly and thoughtfully. If the work isn't stimulating, it's unlikely to stick."

On (b), some teachers are being advised to have students close-read a text as if they know nothing about the subject matter. "This seems crazy to me," says cognitive scientist Daniel Willingham. "It doesn't just seem crazy," says Pondiscio. "It *is* crazy. It's impossible not to bring your prior knowledge to reading… Writing is not interpretive dance. When authors commit words to paper, they do so expressly to create associations in the reader's mind… Students may lack background knowledge to fully appreciate a work of literature or an historical document. But it does no good whatsoever to keep them in a state of ignorance on purpose, let alone make a virtue of it."

So close reading should be used sparingly and strategically, concludes Pondiscio, and teachers should draw on and build students' knowledge every time they use it.

"How to Kill Reading Achievement" by Robert Pondiscio in *The Education Gadfly*, October 1, 2014 (Vol. 14, #40), http://edexcellence.net/blog-types/common-core-watch

Back to page one

5. Are We Having Students Focus Too Much on Finding Evidence in Texts?

In this article in *Education Week*, Mia Hood (Teachers College Columbia and Relay Graduate School of Education) worries that when students are asked to search for *evidence* in a text, they may be missing out on a broader understanding and enjoyment of what they read. "What does the evidence say?" asked one student in a group of eighth-graders reading Jerry Spinelli's novel, *Stargirl*, and students dutifully thumbed through looking for a relevant quote. This is in line with Common Core's injunction to "cite specific textual evidence when writing or speaking to support conclusions drawn from the text."

"I don't dispute the letter or the spirit of this," says Hood, "but it seems like our focus on evidence has altered the way we see text. We've come to see text as evidence, and only evidence… Imagine reading along in a novel, already anticipating the question you'll be required to answer, the thesis statement you'll eventually develop, or the comment you'll make in discussion and be required to 'back up' with evidence. This is reading the way squirrels put away nuts for the long winter ahead. This is reading to stock evidence, to prepare for the question, the assignment, the discussion." What's missing, Hood believes, is a broader approach to reading that "elicits thinking and draws out new ideas, curiosities, frustrations, causes, and sometimes even pursuits."

Hood's concern is that if students are taught to constantly search for text evidence, they may miss out on emotional responses triggered by what they read and a broader sense of why a text matters. "If we want to prepare students for college and career," she concludes, "let's teach them the full range of reading required of us in college and career. Let's teach them to read for real and relevant purposes and also to return to the text to search for evidence when they must. Let's teach them not only to use text as evidence to support claims, but also to let the text move, teach, frustrate, confuse, and compel them."

"Isn't Reading About More Than 'Evidence'?" by Mia Hood in *Education Week*, October 1, 2014 (Vol. 34, #6, p. 24-25), www.edweek.org

Back to page one

6. The Importance of Good Learning Targets

(Originally titled "Learning Targets on Parade")

In this *Educational Leadership* article, Susan Brookhart and Connie Moss (Duquesne University) say that ideally, learning goals help students know what they're supposed to be learning, why it's important, and what their work will look like when they're done. But teachers' learning targets don't always accomplish this. Here's an example of flawed goals for a unit on literary language. The overall goal: *Students will learn that point of view and figurative language help tell a story*. Two daily lesson targets:

- The students will put examples of figurative language on cards and sort them according to type.
- The students will identify two examples of simile and two examples of metaphor in *Julie of the Wolves*.

These are okay activities, say Brookhart and Moss, but what's missing is students knowing what they're going to learn. Here are better goals for lessons in the same unit:

- I can define simile and recognize examples in literature.
- I can define metaphor and recognize examples in literature.
- I can explain how metaphors and similes enhanced the storytelling.
- I can describe and identify examples of different points of view.
- I can explain how the point of view affected the story.

Note that these tell what students will *learn* rather than what they will *do* and are part of a clear progression toward larger unit goals and understandings. "Each day, students should know what new content they're learning and how they're sharpening their skills," say Brookhart and Moss. "Are they learning a new concept? Extending understanding by building on a previous concept? Combining concepts to form more sophisticated understandings? Practicing a skill for accuracy and fluency? Applying a skill they already know to new content?"

Brookhart and Moss say that components of effective learning targets will:

- Describe exactly what students will learn by the end of the day's lesson.
- Use language students can understand.
- Be stated from the point of view of a student who has yet to master the knowledge or skill being taught.
- Contain a performance of understanding that translates the description into action – what students will do, make, say, or write during the lesson.
- Include student look-fors or criteria for success in terms that describe mastery of the learning target, not a score or grade.

Here are daily learning targets for a second-grade unit on subtracting with double digits:

- I can subtract a one-digit number from a two-digit number without regrouping, using cubes.
- I can subtract a one-digit number from a two-digit number without regrouping, without using cubes.
- I can subtract a one-digit number from a two-digit number with regrouping, using cubes. One of the criteria for success in this lesson was, I use regrouping when the problem needs it, and I don't use regrouping if it doesn't.
- I can subtract a one-digit number from a two-digit number with regrouping, without using cubes.
- I can subtract a two-digit number from a two-digit number with regrouping.

Here are the lesson goals for a unit on the federal bureaucracy. The goals: To help students understand the complexity of Washington's government; realize that some agencies are more subject to partisan politics than others; and be able to identify various workers' roles and the budget involved in each type of agency and understand where federal taxes go.

- Lesson 1: Learning the characteristics of a bureaucracy and three agencies of the federal government.
- Lesson 2: Learning the makeup and responsibilities of the Executive Office of the President.
- Lesson 3: Learning the makeup and responsibilities of the cabinet departments and their relationship to the Executive Office of the President.
- Lesson 4: Learning the makeup and responsibilities of three types of independent agencies.
- Lesson 5: Learning how to analyze certain issues facing the U.S. and relate them to the appropriate type of independent agency.
- Lesson 6: Comparing and contrasting private business management with the management of federal agencies.
- Lesson 7: Extending those ideas by evaluating whether bureaucracy is the most effective way to organize and manage government functions.
- Lesson 8: Learning that various taxes are levied to fund various parts of the federal bureaucracy.

"If the teacher is the only one who understands where learning should be headed," say Brookhart and Moss, "students are flying blind. Writing the goal on the board is not enough; students should have the target in mind as they work and ask themselves how what they're doing will help them hit the target."

"Learning Targets on Parade" by Susan Brookhart and Connie Moss in *Educational Leadership*, October 2014 (Vol. 72, #2, p. 28-33), http://bit.ly/ZrdYyz; the authors can be reached at susanbrookart@bresnan.net and moss@castl.duq.edu.

Back to page one

7. Moving Toward Sanity with Grades

In this *Change Leaders* article, Douglas Reeves acknowledges the need for radical

changes in grading policies and suggests four incremental shifts that might prevent some of the usual tensions between teachers, students, and parents:

• *Make concessions to tradition*. Parents and colleges will still get GPAs based on the traditional scale from 4.0 to zero. Students will still get letter grades.

• *Shift to a 4-3-2-1-0 grading scale*. This gets away from the serious downsides of the 100-point scale, especially when it comes to zeroes, and is easy for students and parents to understand.

• *Insist that teachers give fair warning*. "Any prospective grades of F, D, or C should result in a call, e-mail, or note to parents at least two weeks before the end of the grading period," says Reeves, "warning parents of the possible grades and specifying what is necessary to improve the results. Teachers don't want kids to fail, and these conversations are much easier to have before the grades are delivered than afterwards." Why a warning for a C? We all need to get past the idea that C work is "average," he says. C work is not okay. It needs serious improvement.

• *Require appropriate consequences for missing or unacceptable student work*. Low grades as punishments have never worked, says Reeves. The best consequence is students having to *do the work*. "Some schools do this during lunch," he says, "others before and after school, others during prescribed 'catch-up' periods. But in every case, appropriate consequences lead to fewer failures, better behavior, and less stress for teachers, parents, and students."

"Preventing This Year's Grading Crisis Before It's Too Late" by Douglas Reeves in *Change Leaders*, September 23, 2014, http://www.changeleaders.com/#!blog/cmgs; Reeves can be reached at http://www.changeleaders.com/#!blog/cmgs.

Back to page one

8. Can Evolution Coexist with Religion in the Classroom?

In this *New York Times* article, David Barash, a professor of evolutionary biology at the University of Washington, says that every year around this time, he gives his students The Talk about evolution and religion. "It's irresponsible to teach biology without evolution," he says. "Teaching biology without evolution would be like teaching chemistry without molecules, or physics without mass and energy… and yet many students worry about reconciling their beliefs with evolutionary science."

The commonly accepted way out of this difficulty has been the NOMA argument – non-overlapping magisteria – which says that religion and evolution are perfectly compatible. According to this view, God could have used evolution by natural selection to produce everything on earth. It would seem that only hard-line fundamentalists, who insist that everything was created in a single day, would object to this approach. Stephen Jay Gould was a notable champion of NOMA, and Barash publicly disagreed with him. Gould said Barash was forcing a painful and unnecessary choice, while Barash said Gould was too accommodating and ran the risk of misrepresenting both science and religion.

As evolutionary science has developed, says Barash, "the available space for religious faith has narrowed." Here are three issues he addresses in The Talk, much to the discomfort of some students:

• *Complexity* – William Paley's 19th-century argument against evolution was that the existence of a structure as complex as a watch means there must be a watchmaker, and the existence of highly complex organisms means there must be a supernatural creator. "Since Darwin, however, we have come to understand that an entirely natural and undirected process, namely random variation plus natural selection, contains all that is needed to generate extraordinary levels of non-randomness," says Barash. "Living things are indeed wonderfully complex, but altogether within the range of a statistically powerful, entirely mechanical phenomenon."

• *Centrality* – Darwin challenged the traditional view that human beings were distinct from and superior to all other forms of life. "No more," says Barash. "The most potent take-home message of evolution is the not-so-simple fact that, even though species are identifiable (just as individuals generally are), there is an underlying linkage among them – literally and phylogenetically." Humans are part of the animal kingdom, "natural as can be and indistinguishable from the rest of the living world at the level of structure as well as physiological mechanism."

• *Theodicy* – Evolution also pushes us to confront the contradiction between belief in an omnipresent, omnibenevolent God and the fact of random horrors on earth – predation, parasitism, fratricide, infanticide, disease, pain, war, and genocide. "The more we know of evolution," says Barash, "the more unavoidable is the conclusion that living things, including human beings, are produced by a natural, totally amoral process, with no indication of a benevolent, controlling creator."

As he concludes The Talk, Barash reassures his students that they don't have to abandon their religious beliefs to inform themselves about biology and pass his course. But religious students will have to "undertake some challenging mental gymnastic routines," he says. "And while I respect their beliefs, the entire point of The Talk is to make clear that, at least for this biologist, it is no longer acceptable for science to be the one doing those routines, as Professor Gould and NOMA have insisted we do."

"God, Darwin, and My College Biology Class" by David Barash in *The New York Times*, September 28, 2014, http://nyti.ms/1t0auk7

Back to page one

9. A Virginia School Teaches Innovation K-12

In this article in *Independent School*, educators Chris Lundberg and Ken Seward say that "we can take solace in the fact that we don't have to solve the world's problems. What we *do* have to do is give our students the tools they will need to be able to solve them one day." But how can a school graduate students who have the ability and the drive to be innovators? Inspired by a 2011 article by Google vice president Susan Wojcicki, The Steward School in Virginia committed itself to these eight pillars of innovation:

• *Have a mission that matters*. "If you think the mission doesn't matter, try telling a ninth-grader that she's learning about cell mutation," say Lundberg and Seward. "Then tell the same ninth-grader that she's figuring out how to stop cancer in its tracks. See which topic makes her eyes light up." The school defined three broad areas – health and wellness, energy and resources, and the natural and built environment – and challenged faculty members to connect portions of their teaching to innovation in one or more.

• *Think big but start small*. Rather than issuing a top-down edict, the school asked for volunteers to begin integrating innovation and creative problem-solving into their courses. "An algebra lesson on calculating slope, for example, was transformed when a teacher proposed partnering with the nonprofit RAMPS to design a wheelchair ramp for one of its clients," say Lundberg and Seward. Gradually other teachers picked up the challenge.

• *Strive for continual innovation, but not perfection*. To get students to worry less about grades, the school introduced a yearlong problem that all students at all levels could address through their regular courses and extracurriculars.

• *Look for ideas everywhere*. Students and teachers were encouraged to "hijack instruction time" for offbeat, interesting projects.

• *Share everything*. The Steward School brought in a visiting scholar to spur the innovation curriculum, and gave back to the community by hosting teacher training, summer camps, and a lecture series.

• *Spark with imagination, fuel with data*. In the school's innovation lab, windows and walls double as whiteboards, and they're packed with scribbled ideas. "To complement their creativity, we know we have to give them the facts and figures that can help separate the good ideas from the great ones," say Lundberg and Seward. "Those numbers are delivered in the form of online resources, books, field trips, special programming, and Q&As with visiting innovators."

• *Be an open platform*. This is the equivalent of a technology company giving away its source code. "[I]nnovation thrives in an environment of openness, where we can all contribute our best work," say the authors.

• *Never fail to fail*. "If, as educators, we stop asking each individual child to deliver the 'right' answer," they say, "and instead ask a team of children to work together to deliver the 'best' answer, we'll go a long way toward eliminating the stigma of delivering the 'wrong' one."

"Education for Innovation" by Chris Lundberg and Ken Seward in *Independent School*, Fall 2014 (Vol. 74, #1, p. 80-86), no e-link available

Back to page one

10. Short Item:

Character website – Character Lab http://characterlab.org/character/ is a nonprofit website with material on social-emotional learning, including growth mindset, belonging, pro-social purpose, curiosity, gratitude, grit, optimism, self-control, social intelligence, and zest.

Back to page one

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 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
Independent School
Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk (JESPAR)
Journal of Staff Development
Kappa Delta Pi Record
Knowledge Quest
Middle School Journal
NASSP Journal
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