Marshall Memo 492

A Weekly Round-up of Important Ideas and Research in K-12 Education
July 1, 2013

In This Issue:

Quotes of the Week

"Intelligence is the dynamic interplay of abilities, engagement, and the pursuit of personal goals."

Scott Barry Kaufman (see item #7)

"In a system that sorts people as gifted and ungifted, we're sending a message that you either have it or you don't. We're not promoting hard work and discipline."

Scott Barry Kaufman (*ibid.*)

"Before people decide what they think of your message, they decide what they think of *you*."

Amy Cuddy, Matthew Kohut, and John Neffinger (see item #3)

"Most leaders today tend to emphasize their strength, competence, and credentials in the workplace, but that is exactly the wrong approach. Leaders who project strength before establishing trust run the risk of eliciting fear, along with a host of dysfunctional behaviors."

Amy Cuddy, Matthew Kohut, and John Neffinger (*ibid.*)

"Most of what you read about neuroscience in the popular media – particularly about parts of the brain 'lighting up' and what that indicates – vastly oversimplifies how the brain works and is not instructive at all."

Adam Waytz and Malia Mason (see item #1)

"When you see unacceptable behavior, you either act and your rules become reality, or you fail to act and your rules are nothing but hot air."

Fred Jones, discipline guru, in a promotional brochure (June 2013)

1. How Our Minds Really Work (We Think)

"Most of what you read about neuroscience in the popular media – particularly about parts of the brain 'lighting up' and what that indicates – vastly oversimplifies how the brain works and is not instructive at all," say Adam Waytz (Kellogg School of Management) and Malia Mason (Columbia Business School) in this provocative *Harvard Business Review* article. To understand how the mind works, they say, "we must separate fact from fiction, resist facile narratives, and establish a more sophisticated view of brain science."

Recent research has enabled us to see that as many as 15 brain *networks* are at work. "The network-based view isn't nearly as sexy as the current popular view of neuroscience," say Waytz and Mason. "Good neuroscience based on the network view is more complex. Messier. But good science *is* messy." Here is their report (admittedly interim) on how four primary networks operate – and the implications for leaders:

• *The default network* – It controls introspective thought and the ability to envision the past, the future, and alternative realities. The default network activates when people are awake but aren't focused on input from the five senses or any specific goals. This network helps us understand creative thinking and breakthrough innovation, and should make managers value unstructured time as a key factor in innovation. A number of companies, including Google, give employees time to work on what intrigues them, but Waytz and Mason don't think this goes far enough. To take full advantage of the default network, people need to get away from their e-mail, calendars, phones, offices, and colleagues.

• *The reward network* – It controls perceptions of pleasure and displeasure, activated by food, money, praise, and unpleasant experiences. This network helps us understand motivation and incentives. Recent research has shown that money is not always the best incentive; status, social approval, collaboration, transparency, fairness, opportunities to learn, and being able to work on challenging and interesting problems are often more important. "In fact," say Waytz and Mason, "the reward network's strong response to immaterial rewards suggests that money is often a more expensive and less efficient incentive."

• *The affect network* – It controls autonomic and endocrine responses to emotions (blood pressure, heart rate, body temperature). "The brain's affect network seems to know what's going on before we consciously recognize it," say Waytz and Mason. "Feelings inform thoughts, not the other way around." This network helps us understand hunches and gut instincts and the role emotions play in decision-making. "A hunch is not some mystical sixth sense. It's a real neurological response that manifests itself physically… Leaders tend to push away feelings because they think it's best to be dispassionate. But a mounting body of

neurological evidence suggests that emotional impulses should not be ignored. The affect network fast-tracks decision making and helps us process information that may include too many variables." Of course we shouldn't always trust hunches, which are sometimes off base. But they should be heeded. "We now know," say the authors, "that we should try to incorporate these transient feelings into our decision-making process, not push them away."

• *The control network* – It aligns behavior with goals and kicks in when we weigh long-term consequences, control our impulses, and selectively focus our attention. This network helps us understand the benefits and risks of multitasking and how to set and manage priorities. "Whereas other animals react to only immediate needs," say Waytz and Mason, "we can pursue loftier goals… even when they conflict with our immediate needs or contradict our past behavior patterns. The control network is responsible for this flexibility." It shifts the focus from other networks to longer-term goals and aspirations.

When the control network is in charge, the trade-off is that the default, reward, and affect networks are deemphasized. "The soccer player so intent on getting off a winning shot may not notice a wide-open teammate who could score more easily if he were passed the ball," say the authors. "The player may also fail to realize that time is running out – ignoring an entirely separate and more critical priority because he's so focused on shooting."

This speaks to the importance of limiting the number of strategic objectives so our brains aren't overloaded and confused. Multitasking is over-rated, say Waytz and Mason. "E-mails, meetings, texts, tweets, phone calls, news – the unstructured, continuous, fractured nature of modern work is a tremendous burden on the control network and consumes a huge amount of the brain's energy. The resulting mental fatigue takes its toll in the form of mistakes, shallow thinking, and impaired self-regulation. When overwhelmed, the control network loses the proverbial reins, and our behavior is driven by immediate, situational cues instead of shaped with our priorities in mind."

A leader's success, conclude Waytz and Mason, "requires, first and foremost, creating just a few clear priorities and gathering the courage to eliminate or outsource less important tasks and goals. Executives must also reset their expectations for what constitutes a viable workload, basing them on a realistic understanding of what their brains can handle." It's also short-sighted to think it's smart to run a "lean" organization that overloads workers. "The more leaders ask their workers to focus on, the worse those employees will perform."

"Your Brain at Work: What a New Approach to Neuroscience Can Teach Us About Management" by Adam Waytz and Malia Mason in *Harvard Business Review*, July/August 2013 (Vol. 91, #7/8, p. 102-111), no e-link available

Back to page one

2. Six Principles of Persuasion

In this *Harvard Business Review* interview by Sarah Cliffe, Arizona State University professor emeritus and consultant Robert Cialdini shares what he has learned about persuading others:

• *Liking* – If people feel warmly about you because you and they have things in

common (or they think you like them), they're more persuadable. Social networks such as Facebook are powerful ways of finding what we have in common with others and creating informal connections.

• *Reciprocity* – People tend to return favors. "Get in the habit of helping people out," says Cialdini, "and – this part's really important – don't wave it away when people thank you. Don't say, 'Oh, no big deal.' We're given serious persuasive power immediately after someone thanks us."

• *Social proof* – People tend to do what they see other people doing, especially people with whom they have a lot in common. "Peers are often more convincing than executives when we're deciding what we should do," says Cialdini. In addition, "When people see themselves as part of a larger group that has a shared identity, they are willing to take steps they wouldn't take for their individual interests."

• *Commitment and consistency* – People want to be consistent, or at least look like they are. If you make a voluntary, public promise, you'll try to keep it – especially if it's in writing. It's also helpful to be asked about specific next steps you'll take and set up a time to check on progress.

• *Authority* – Most people defer to experts and those with power. The problem is that if a leader pulls rank or toots his or her own horn, it can turn people off. The trick is to get others to promote your ideas or your authority. This is especially important for women, since there are cultural norms expecting more modesty from women than from men. "Because of this bias," says Cialdini, "women will do better in organizations where managers are expected to advance the case for their people – where that's the cultural norm."

• *Fear of loss* – When change is in the air, people fear what they might lose, and a good way to persuade them is to show them what they will lose if things *don't* change.

"The Uses (and Abuses) of Influence" – An interview with Robert Cialdini by Sarah Cliffe in *Harvard Business Review*, July/August 2013 (Vol. 91, #7/8, p. 76-81), no e-link available

Back to page one

3. Projecting Warmth and Strength As a Leader

In this intriguing *Harvard Business Review* article, Amy Cuddy (Harvard Business School) and Matthew Kohut and Jon Neffinger (KNP Communications) address an age-old question of leadership: Is it better to be loved or feared? The answer for leaders, say Cuddy, Kohut, and Neffinger, is to project both warmth *and* competence – but that doesn't come naturally to most people. The authors recommend a one-two punch: start with warmth, closely followed by competence.

It turns out that more than 90 percent of our social judgment upon meeting someone new comes from two areas:

- The person's warmth, communion, and trustworthiness – *What are his or her intentions toward me?*
- The person's strength, agency, and competence – *Is he or she capable of acting on those intentions?*

Interestingly, most people think it's important to project strength to others – but what they look for in others is warmth. "Most leaders today tend to emphasize their strength, competence, and credentials in the workplace, but that is exactly the wrong approach," say the authors. "Leaders who project strength before establishing trust run the risk of eliciting fear, along with a host of dysfunctional behaviors. Fear can undermine cognitive potential, creativity, and problem-solving, and cause employees to get stuck and even disengage."

"A growing body of research," they continue, "suggests that the way to influence – and to lead – is to begin with warmth. Warmth is the conduit of influence: It facilitates trust and the communication and absorption of ideas… Prioritizing warmth helps you connect immediately with those around you, demonstrating that you hear them, understand them, and can be trusted by them… Without a foundation of trust, people in the organization may comply outwardly with a leader's wishes, but they're much less likely to conform privately – to adopt the values, culture, and mission of the organization in a sincere, lasting way."

How does a leader project warmth in a way that doesn't seem phony? Cuddy, Kohut, and Neffinger suggest the following:

- Don't speak too loudly. Talking at a lower pitch conveys the feeling of confiding and trusting. It's also helpful to share an appropriate personal story.
- Validate people's feelings. "Before people decide what they think of your message, they decide what they think of *you*," say the authors.
- Smile. People can see through a false smile; it helps to think of positive things and focus on one person in the group. Genuine smiles are self-reinforcing, both for you and for others.

And how does a leader project strength?

- Feel in command. "Warmth may be harder to fake, but confidence is harder to talk yourself into," say Cuddy, Kohut, and Neffinger. If you feel like an imposter, others will feel it. Hold your body in a way that expresses confidence, facing directly toward people you're talking to, and avoid cutting gestures, a furrowed brow, or an elevated chin. Balance your weight primarily on one hip to avoid appearing rigid or tense. Tilt your head slightly and keep your hands open and welcoming.
- Stand up straight. "It is hard to overstate the importance of good posture in projecting authority and an intention to be taken seriously," say the authors. This doesn't mean standing rigidly at attention, military style. "It just means reaching your full height, using your muscles to straighten the S-curve in your spine rather than slouching."
- Be poised. "When you move, move deliberately and precisely to a specific spot rather than casting your limbs about loose-jointedly," say the authors. "And when you are finished moving, be still. Twitching, fidgeting, or other visual static sends the signal that you're not in control. Stillness demonstrates calm."

"Is It Better to Be Loved or Feared?" by Amy Cuddy, Matthew Kohut, and Jon Neffinger in *Harvard Business Review*, July/August 2013 (Vol. 91, #7/8, p. 54-61), no e-link available

Back to page one

4. The Motivation Provided by Having a Partner and Being Part of a Team

In this *Harvard Business Review* interview by Scott Berinato, Kansas State University kinesiology professor Brandon Irwin reports some interesting findings on motivation and coaching that may apply to K-12 schools. He had people perform abdominal "planks" (lying face down, keeping your body straight, lifting yourself up on your elbows, and holding that position as long as you can) under three different conditions:

- The first group did planks alone.
- The second group had a partner who was an expert at planks but remained silent.
- The third group had an expert partner who offered lots of encouragement: "Come on. You can do it. You got this."

The second and third groups – plankers with partners – did better than those who were solo, but those with silent partners did better than those with encouraging partners (33 percent versus 22 percent better). Why? Irwin says having a higher-performing partner is clearly motivating – people are competitive. But the motivational chatter may be seen as condescending or be mistaken for the partners encouraging *themselves*, suggesting that maybe they weren't better after all. Words of encouragement might have worked if the partners addressed them by name. What works best of all is leading by quiet example and addressing people's needs directly.

In another study involving stationary bicycles, Irwin and his colleagues confirmed that people with high-performing partners improved twice as much as solo bikers. The researchers also discovered another factor that was even more powerful: bikers who were told their performance was contributing to a team score increased their performance threefold. "What we think is that the feeling of being indispensable, which results from the shared goal, makes you work harder, especially when you know you're the weaker link of the team," says Irwin. "The bond becomes stronger." Similarly, when people compete as part of a relay team (in track or swimming), they are usually faster than when they race alone.

Irwin also experimented with monetary incentives (a chance to win an $80 gym membership) and found this made people perform *worse*. Why? He thinks it's because this created competing goals – help the team or win the membership – and distracted people from the more powerful motivation.

Would any of this work in an office or school situation? Irwin believes group cohesion is a key motivational factor – feeling that your efforts are important to your team's success.

"If You Want to Motivate Someone, Shut Up Already" – An Interview with Brandon Irwin by Scott Berinato in *Harvard Business Review*, July/August 2013 (Vol. 91, #7/8, p. 24-25), no e-link available

Back to page one

5. Building a Culture of Continuous Improvement

In this *Harvard Business Review* article, Kaiser Permanente CEO George Halvorson says the cultural value that unifies the 180,000 staff members in this huge health-care organization is continuous improvement. He lists three key conditions:

• People must understand and embrace the concept that small improvements compound to make big differences.

• People must love improving "both because they are passionate about the importance of their work," says Halvorson, "and because it feels so good to move to a new level of performance."

• People must have enough confidence in their colleagues to believe that the organization is capable of making progress.

"You have to keep reminding the organization how capable it is," he says. Every Friday afternoon, he sends a message to all employees celebrating a performance improvement, a piece of successful research, or a new award. For example, he touted the fact that fewer than 1 percent of hospitalized patients at Kaiser Permanente had pressure ulcers, compared with 7 percent nationwide, and commended a nurse in the northwest region who invented an automated insulin drip calculator that replaced the cumbersome, error-prone method they had used before.

"In some cultures," Halvorson concludes, "transparent measures like these are a burden. The culture you want is one that welcomes them. Build a culture of continuous improvement, and it will serve your organizational goals. It will also be a force for good in the world."

"The Culture to Cultivate" by George Halvorson in *Harvard Business Review*, July/August 2013 (Vol. 91, #7/8, p. 34), no e-link available

Back to page one

6. More Information on PARCC and Smarter Balanced Assessments

In this interview with Nancy Walser in *Harvard Education Letter*, assessment expert Joan Herman (currently with CRESST), shares important information on the upcoming Common Core tests:

• *A more-transparent process* – Both consortia are using evidence-centered design, starting with 4-5 claims about student learning in each subject (for example, that students can read and understand increasingly complex texts), defining assessment targets, and creating item specifications.

• *Difficulty* – The new tests "will definitely be harder, but they should be more interesting," says Herman. "There should be a lot of use of authentic texts and authentic, real-world problems." Students will be asked to synthesize information, reason mathematically, conduct research, integrate multiple sources, write coherent explanations, communicate effectively, and make reasoned arguments. Educators need to prepare the public for a drop in scores, arguing that the tests measure what is needed to be ready for college, work, and life and the results can help students meet those goals.

• *Comparisons* – Herman says the two tests will be quite similar. Both will be taken on computers (with multimedia features and accommodations) and scored almost immediately. Students will answer multiple-choice, short-answer, and other types of questions. Both end-of-year tests will include a performance task, and so will the PARCC mid-year tests. Smarter

Balanced tests will be adaptive (adjusting questions based on students' answers) while PARCC tests will all have common questions.

• *On schedule* – Herman believes the tests will be ready for implementation in the spring of 2014. They won't be perfect and there will undoubtedly be glitches, she says, but "Let's not let the perfect be the enemy of the good."

• *Challenges* – Crafting performance tasks is difficult, says Herman. Students' prior knowledge varies, and year-to-year comparability is tough.

• *Misuse* – "I worry about results being used in value-added models for teacher evaluation," she says. Results can give useful information on the achievement of schools and individual students, but she doesn't think they should be used to make fine-grained distinctions between schools, teachers, and individual students. "Any score is an estimate."

"Assessing the New Common Core Tests: An Interview with Joan L. Herman" by Nancy Walser in *Harvard Education Letter*, July/August 2013 (Vol. 29, #4, p. 8, 6-7), www.edletter.org.

Back to page one

7. What Is Intelligence – and Can We Spot It?

In this interview with Andrea Hilbert in *Psychology Today*, Scott Barry Kaufman recalls that when he was in ninth grade, a substitute teacher in his special-education class pulled him aside and asked, "Why are you here?" Kaufman had been in special ed from the start – as a baby, he had ear infections and developed central auditory processing disorder, fell behind other kids, and was pigeonholed as learning disabled. Gradually, he outgrew his disability, and the substitute's question flipped a switch. Kaufman is now a professor of cognitive science at NYU. "How many people are falling into the cracks of the system?" he asks. "What are people really capable of? My scientific journey has been to understand that." That's why he wrote *Ungifted: Intelligence Redefined – The Truth About Talent, Practice, Creativity, and The Many Paths to Greatness* (Basic Books, 2013).

"Intelligence is the dynamic interplay of abilities, engagement, and the pursuit of personal goals," says Kaufman. "We all have things that capture our attention, and we ignore the things we're not interested in. Skills are strengthened through projects that are personally meaningful, so you can't really understand what someone is capable of achieving intellectually unless you know their goals and give them a long period of time to actually engage… A lot of students get very dejected by the end of high school, thinking their life is over when it hasn't even started."

Kaufman is not a fan of a "general" and "honors" curriculum in high school. "In a system that sorts people as gifted and ungifted, we're sending a message that you either have it or you don't," he says. "We're not promoting hard work and discipline. I believe in teaching a general set of skills that you can apply no matter what your dream is, no matter what you want to do in life. Schools that are project-based do that and make all their students feel that they're making a valuable contribution."

What about competition? "People would benefit if we compared ourselves only to our past selves and our future selves," says Kaufman. "That's the healthiest way of achieving your goals: Staying focused on what you need to do to get there."

"*Ungifted* and Talented" – An Interview with Scott Barry Kaufman by Andrea Hilbert in *Psychology Today*, August 2013 (Vol. 46, #4, p. 10),

Back to page one

8. Moving from Race-Based to Class-Based Affirmative Action

In this *New York Times* column, David Brooks says the recent U.S. Supreme Court decision (*Fisher v. University of Texas*) is "another small signal that the era of explicitly race-based affirmative action is coming to an end." Why? Brooks believes it's because three things have changed:

• Economic inequality is now more important than race as a source of disadvantage. A recent study found that fifty years ago, the black/white test-score gap was twice as large as the rich/poor gap. Now the opposite is true: the income gap is almost twice as large as the race gap.

• The ethnic makeup of the U.S. is now a mosaic of ethnic and racial groups from all over the world, with varying degrees of advantage and disadvantage.

• We now have more data on college applicants and can base admissions decisions on more than simple SAT scores and grade-point averages.

The question we should be asking, says Brooks, is what challenges a college applicant has faced – his or her *speed of ascent*. "A student who's risen from an economic catastrophe to achieve a B-plus average has more speed of ascent than the child of law professors who has an A average," he says. "The first student may be more expensive to teach. She may not write as many big alumni checks. But she'll reflect more credit on her school and society."

"Speed of Ascent" by David Brooks in *The New York Times*, June 25, 2013
http://www.nytimes.com/2013/06/25/opinion/brooks-speed-of-ascent.html?_r=0

Back to page one

9. Questions on the Gettysburg Address at Four Levels of Rigor

A short video from the New York City Department of Education's Common Core Library (see link below) suggests questions on President Lincoln's Gettysburg Address at four "Depth of Knowledge" levels. (Depth of Knowledge, by Webb et al., integrates and simplifies the revised Bloom's Taxonomy and the Hess Cognitive Rigor Matrix.) The questions are appropriate to ninth and tenth grade and draw on Common Core standards 1, 2, and 6.

• *Level 1: Recall and Reproduction* – What date is Lincoln referring to as "Fourscore and seven years ago"?

• *Level 2: Skills, Concepts, and Basic Reasoning* – What is the connection between "Fourscore and seven years" and the argument Lincoln is trying to make?

• *Level 3: Strategic Thinking and Complex Reasoning* – Lincoln's address lays out a thesis and argument in support of equality. Analyze his line of reasoning and the evidence he uses to advance his point of view.

• *Level 4: Extended Thinking* – Draw on additional related sources to write a research paper that discusses the role war plays in nation building.

New York City Department of Education Common Core Library, Depth of Knowledge Video on Gettysburg Address:
http://schools.nyc.gov/Academics/CommonCoreLibrary/ProfessionalLearning/DOK/default.htm
Here is a link to the Webb Depth of Knowledge matrix:
http://schools.nyc.gov/NR/rdonlyres/522E69CC-02E3-4871-BC48-BB575AA49E27/0/WebbsDOK.pdf
Back to page one

10. More on Value-Added Evaluation of Teachers

In this *Harvard Educational Review* article, Kimberlee Callister Everson, Erika Feinauer, and Richard Sudweeks (Brigham Young University) raise serious concerns about value-added evaluation of individual teachers. Such calculations "create estimates of teacher effectiveness that are relative to all other teachers at the school, district, or state levels," say the authors. "These comparisons are a misguided venture, as they essentially hold the teacher responsible for how they are estimated to teach students they never encounter." Everson, Feinauer, and Sudweeks also raise concerns about non-random assignment of students to teachers' classrooms, the fact that teachers may be more effective in one setting than another, the negative impact value-added evaluation might have on teacher collaboration, and other methodological problems.

So what should be used for teacher evaluation? "A teacher should be held accountable only for the job she was hired to do," say the authors. They suggest focusing on gains made with the students teachers actually teach – what they call propensity score-based estimates, focusing on this question: "Did a particular teacher do what he was hired to do?" However, the authors acknowledge several weaknesses in this model, especially if it's used for high-stakes decisions on teachers.

"If the right information is available," they conclude, "linking teachers to test scores may be reasonable. High-quality tests do measure part of the learning process, and good teaching should predict higher scores, all else being equal. Unfortunately, all else is never equal, and tests are not always high quality. In some subjects, reliable and valid tests are not even available. The information that would be required to completely separate a teacher's impact on test scores, including student and home variables, differences in resources across classrooms, and school-level inputs to student achievement, will never be available." For high-stakes decisions about teachers, they conclude, test scores should not be used at all.

"Rethinking Teacher Evaluation: A Conversation About Statistical Inferences and Value-Added Models" by Kimberlee Callister Everson, Erika Feinauer, and Richard Sudweeks in *Harvard Educational Review*, Summer 2013 (Vol. 83, #2, p. 349-370), no e-link available
Back to page one

11. Suggestions for Improving Teacher Evaluation

In this *Harvard Educational Review* article, Heather Hill (Harvard University) and Pam Grossman (Stanford University) raise three concerns about recent state and district innovations in teacher evaluation. First, they believe most classroom observation instruments are generic and don't focus on important content-specific aspects of teaching. Second, they say evaluations are mostly done by generalists and seldom include content experts (for example, math instructional coaches). And third, they don't think teachers are observed often enough to get the kind of specific, actionable feedback necessary to improve daily instruction (few principals make more than two or three classroom visits a year, so months pass before a follow-up visit is made).

What are the alternatives? Hill and Grossman suggest evaluating struggling teachers more frequently and effective teachers only once every two or three years. They also call for improving the content expertise of principals and enlisting instructional coaches and department heads in the process wherever possible. Finally, they suggest focusing evaluation on a limited number of skills and practices that need improvement and delivering prepared "feedback bundles" to teachers in post-observation conferences – rich descriptions of a desired practice, perhaps a video clip, curriculum materials, and the names of other teachers who might be helpful.

"Learning from Teacher Observations: Challenges and Opportunities Posed by New Teacher Evaluation Systems" by Heather Hill and Pam Grossman in *Harvard Educational Review*, Summer 2013 (Vol. 83, #2, p. 371-384), no e-link available

Back to page one

Do you have feedback? Is anything missing?

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

About the Marshall Memo

Mission and focus:

This weekly memo is designed to keep principals, teachers, superintendents, and others very well-informed on current research and effective practices in K-12 education. Kim Marshall, drawing on 42 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
ASCA School Counselor
ASCD SmartBrief/Public Education NewsBlast
Better Evidence-Based Education
Center for Performance Assessment Newsletter
District Administration
ED Magazine
Education Digest
Education Gadfly
Education Next
Education Update/Curriculum Update
Education Week
Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis
Educational Horizons
Educational Leadership
Educational Researcher
Edutopia
Elementary School Journal
Essential Teacher
Go Teach
Harvard Business Review
Harvard Education Letter
Harvard Educational Review
Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk (JESPAR)
Journal of Staff Development
Kappa Delta Pi Record
Knowledge Quest
Middle Ground
Middle School Journal
NASSP Journal
NJEA Review
Perspectives
Phi Delta Kappan
Principal
Principal Leadership
Principal's Research Review
Reading Research Quarterly
Reading Today
Responsive Classroom Newsletter
Rethinking Schools
Review of Educational Research
School Administrator
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