

Marshall Memo 676

A Weekly Round-up of Important Ideas and Research in K-12 Education

March 6, 2017

In This Issue:

1. [Instructional coaching is an ideal form of PD – except when it isn't](#)
2. [Carol Ann Tomlinson asks ten questions about personalization](#)
3. [Understanding and taking advantage of cognitive diversity in teams](#)
4. [The Singapore American School plots a new course](#)
5. [Google Classroom as a tool for teachers and faculties](#)
6. Short item: [Anti-bullying resources](#)

Quotes of the Week

“All of life is a series of daring adventures from a secure base. If government can create a framework in which people grow up amid healthy families, nurturing schools, thick communities, and a secure safety net, then they will have the resources and audacity to thrive in a free global economy and a diversifying skills economy.”

David Brooks in his *The New York Times* column, March 3, 2017,
<http://nyti.ms/2m7V4vu>

“People who are most introverted, most stressed, and least adaptable are often being led by those who are most extroverted, least stressed, and most adaptable. You can probably see how this could pose difficulties for everyone.”

Suzanne Johnson Vickberg and Kim Christfort (see item #3)

“Lazy is a symptom of not learning, not a state of being. Teachers who use ‘lazy’ as a descriptor need to peel back the layers, find out what is really happening with their students, and make adjustments in the classroom.”

David Williams, Texas math teacher, in a letter to *Education Week*, March 1, 2017,
<http://bit.ly/2n5ZTmv>

“We may be uncomfortable talking about race, but we can no longer afford to be silent. We have chosen a profession which – like parenting – requires that our comforts come second to those of children.”

Jamilah Pitts in “Don’t Say Nothing” in *Teaching Tolerance*, Fall 2016 (Vol. 54, p. 46-49), <http://bit.ly/2cEgdG8>; spotted in *Education Digest*, March 2017

“My favorite question to ask after listening to problems, concerns, and complaints is, ‘Imagine if things were going perfectly; what would it look like?’”

Dan Rockwell in “3 Things High Performers Hate About Meetings” in *Leadership Freak*, March 3, 2017, <http://bit.ly/2ISN1Qi>

1. Instructional Coaching Is an Ideal Form of PD – Except When It Isn't

In this article in *Theory Into Practice*, Laura Desimone and Katie Pak (University of Pennsylvania) say that for professional development to truly improve teaching and learning, five elements need to be in place: content focus, active learning, sustained duration, collective participation, and alignment. Desimone and Pak believe that when instructional coaches are in synch with these, they can make a very positive contribution in schools – but that's not always the case. Here's their analysis:

- *Content focus* – At its best, PD improves teachers' knowledge and understanding of their literacy, math, or other subject matter and how students learn it best. "Coaching allows both coach and teacher to engage deeply in the subject-matter content of the lesson, whether the focus is on developing assignments, classroom pedagogical approaches, student understanding, or diagnostic assessments," say Desimone and Pak. "Coaches help teachers navigate the tricky world of aligning the design of their lessons and performance tasks with academic standards, while also helping them base their instructional decisions on student diagnostic information."

What can go wrong? Instructional coaches may spend too much time helping teachers with classroom management, overseeing assessments, collecting data, evaluating teachers, meeting with administrators, and doing administrative paperwork and non-instructional tasks. It's also a problem when coaches are not highly proficient in their subject area.

- *Active learning* – PD has the most impact when it gets teachers observing each other, receiving feedback on their own teaching, analyzing their students' work, and making presentations (versus passively sitting through lectures). "Specifically," say Desimone and Pak, "recent research suggests that PD is more successful when teachers have more frequent opportunities to practice what they have learned and receive feedback on it. This feedback is most effective when it is explicit and uses multiple sources of data (e.g., observations, samples of student work)." Teacher learning and improvement are most likely to happen with face-to-face give-and-take with the coach based on a classroom visit, a video of the teacher in action, or work that students have produced.

What can go wrong? Coaching is less effective when it is "unidirectional" – for example, focused on the teacher implementing a mandated curriculum with fidelity – or when the teacher is directed to observe a model lesson taught by a highly effective colleague.

Conversely, coaches can be too nondirective, simply encouraging a teacher's ideas without engaging them in actively constructing new knowledge and thinking through their impact on students.

- *Sustained duration* – PD activities that make a difference extend through an entire school year and involve at least 20 hours of contact time. Instructional coaching usually meets this criterion, with regular classroom visits, one-on-one meetings, grade-level discussions, faculty PD presentations, and analysis of student work.

What can go wrong? If coaches have only occasional contact with a teacher, or if their intervention is provided only once or twice a year, their impact is much less significant.

- *Collective participation* – PD is most effective when it involves groups of teachers at the same grade, subject, or school in interactive learning communities. Coaches can play an important role facilitating discussions of progress monitoring, effective classroom strategies, student work and data, and curriculum unit and lesson planning. “The presence of the coach in these grade-level meetings,” say Desimone and Pak, “is useful when teachers look for expert opinion in navigating the technical challenges of implementing new instructional approaches or in gaining deeper understanding of ways to reconstruct their practice.” Coaches can also lead study groups, cross-grade sharing, and early-morning “community circles” where teachers form networks, question one another, and collectively engage in discussions of the effectiveness of specific classroom practices.

What can go wrong? Lack of common planning time for teacher teams is the most common roadblock. [Another problem is singleton teachers who don't have any same-subject colleagues in their building – see Memo 675 for one possible solution.]

- *Alignment* – “When PD is integrated explicitly into teachers' daily instructional routines,” say Desimone and Pak, “it is more likely to be effective... rather than leaving it up to the teacher to integrate new ideas and strategies into their teaching.” Instructional coaches are ideally positioned to be thought partners and hand-holders for teachers and teams as they integrate unfamiliar practices with district and school goals and materials. Coaches can also take into account teachers' values and beliefs and help teachers balance the multiple demands being made on them.

What can go wrong? Coaches' work is sometimes not in synch with district or school priorities, or coaches may disagree with those priorities or not be skilled in prioritizing what they are asking teachers to do. In these cases, teachers can be whipsawed between listening to their coach and following district mandates – not a formula for teacher sanity or improving teaching and learning.

“Instructional Coaching as High-Quality Professional Development” by Laura Desimone and Katie Pak in *Theory Into Practice*, Winter 2017 (Vol. 56, #1, p. 3-12), available for purchase at <http://bit.ly/2n66ld3>; Pak can be reached at kpak@gse.upenn.edu.

[Back to page one](#)

2. Carol Ann Tomlinson Asks Ten Questions About Personalization

(Originally titled “Let’s Celebrate Personalization – But Not Too Fast”)

In this *Educational Leadership* article, differentiation guru Carol Ann Tomlinson (University of Virginia/Charlottesville) applauds the ideals of personalized learning. “Personalization is a kind of differentiation – or perhaps multiple kinds,” she says. “The dialogue about personalization gives me hope. On the other hand, it also gives me pause... We don’t yet have much evidence that ‘personalization’ works – or for whom, or under what circumstances.” To get it right, she believes ten questions need to be addressed:

- *Why personalized learning?* “If your school focused significantly on personalized learning for several months,” she asks, “what would an observer see after that time that he or she wouldn’t see now?”

- *How much of the curriculum will be learned?* Do the mechanisms of personalized learning (perhaps self-paced computer programs) convey a standard curriculum at a different pace for different students? Do students have choices of individualized projects or independent study within a general curriculum framework? Or is it “anything, anywhere, anytime learning,” with students determining what, when, and how they learn?

- *When is personalization most effective?* Is it more appropriate for some K-12 grades than others? For some subjects? At certain times in the school day? How much is too much?

- *Is personalization suitable for all students?* For students learning English for the first time? Students struggling with reading? Students who lack background knowledge? Students with weak attention spans? Students who are academically advanced? Will those students get the resources, guidance, and personal attention they need?

- *How will old and new paradigms coexist?* Imposing personalization by fiat is unwise, but how will the shift be handled? “If teachers can opt in or out,” asks Tomlinson, “is it acceptable for all 2nd grade teachers to volunteer but only half of the 3rd grade teachers? Will it work if the math department signs on but the science department doesn’t?”

- *What supports do teachers need?* Many teachers will require extensive training and support. “Educators may need guidance on logistical issues,” says Tomlinson, “like how to orchestrate a classroom in which multiple things are happening simultaneously, give more than one set of directions, or monitor student progress. Imagine, for instance, trying to move from teaching mathematical algorithms to the whole class to serving as an effective coach for 30 students who receive their mathematical input from adaptive technologies, but still need teacher involvement in their learning.”

- *Who will help teachers retool?* Principals will need to provide sustained, high-quality PD to support these shifts in beliefs, thinking, and practice – and it will need to be personalized because teachers are all over the learning curve.

- *What will be demanded of principals?* Can they move from a compliance mode to being coaches of semi-autonomous teachers with lots of autonomous students? “How can a school leader handle inevitable discouragement with and overt resistance to personalized

practices?” asks Tomlinson. “And if personalization suggests that the individual is at the center of all decisions, how does the building leader consistently model personalization for *teachers*?”

- *How about parents?* Even those who choose a school that embraces personalization will need to be brought up to speed on the exact details for their children: What are the standards for quality work? How should parents support their children’s learning? How will teachers communicate with them on progress? And what about state standards?

- *What are the implications for the school environment?* This includes scheduling classes, class assignments for students, grading, discipline, class rankings, teacher evaluation, the use of classroom and library/media space, and the role of technology, materials, and support personnel.

We will fulfill the hopeful promise of personalization, Tomlinson concludes, “by deep thinking, informed planning, and wise leadership exercised reflectively and persistently, site by site, classroom by classroom. I hope we have that in us.”

“Let’s Celebrate Personalization – But Not Too Fast” by Carol Ann Tomlinson in *Educational Leadership*, March 2017 (Vol. 74, #6, p. 10-15), <http://bit.ly/2lPqOFx>; Tomlinson can be reached at cat3y@virginia.edu.

[*Back to page one*](#)

3. Understanding and Taking Advantage of Cognitive Diversity in Teams

“Organizations aren’t getting the performance they need from their teams,” say Suzanne Johnson Vickberg and Kim Christfort (Deloitte) in this *Harvard Business Review* article. One big reason, they believe, is that leaders “fail to effectively tap diverse work styles and perspectives... Some managers just don’t recognize how profound the differences between their people are; others don’t know how to manage the gaps and tensions or understand the costs of not doing so. As a result, some of the best ideas go unheard or unrealized, and performance suffers.”

To address this challenge, Deloitte worked with psychologists to identify four distinct work styles: Pioneers, Guardians, Drivers, and Integrators. These cognitive styles are different from other personality inventories like Myers-Briggs, which Vickberg and Christfort believe are not tailored to the workplace and rely too much on personal introspection. Interestingly, the psychologist they relied on was Helen Fisher, who is best known for her work scoping out compatibilities among romantic partners. Some details on the Deloitte styles:

- *Pioneers* - “Blazing trails.” Pioneers are outgoing, focused on the big picture, spontaneous, drawn to risk, adaptable, and imaginative. They are energized by brainstorming, spontaneity, trying new things, and enthusiasm – and alienated by rules and structure, the word *no*, and a focus on process. On teams, they spark energy and imagination.
- *Guardians* – “Better together.” Guardians are diplomatic, empathetic, traditional, relationship-oriented, intrinsically motivated, and non-confrontational. They are

energized by collaboration, communication, trust, and respect – and alienated by politics, conflict, and inflexibility. On teams, they bring order and rigor.

- *Drivers* – “Focus.” Drivers are logical, quantitative, focused, competitive, experimental, and deeply curious. They are energized by solving problems, directness, and winning – and alienated by indecision, inefficiency, and lack of focus. On teams, they generate momentum.
- *Integrators* – “Do it right.” Integrators are methodical, reserved, detail-oriented, practical, structured, and loyal. They are energized by organization, predictability, consistency, and a detailed plan – and alienated by disorder, time pressure, ambiguity, and uncertainty. On teams, they help draw people together and get consensus.

“Each of us is a composite of the four work styles,” say Vickberg and Christfort, “though most people’s behavior and thinking are closely aligned with one or two. All the styles bring useful perspectives and distinctive approaches to generating ideas, making decisions, and solving problems.”

The potential for conflict among team members with different work styles is always there, say the authors – for example, if a Guardian presents a detailed plan line by line, a Pioneer may feel it’s a forced march and want to lay out a completely different plan, which annoys the Guardian. Drivers love to debate, but Integrators abhor anything that feels like conflict, which can create tension and misunderstanding, especially if there are nonverbal signals like eye-rolling. But if team members are educated on the four styles, they have a common language for discussing similarities and differences and understanding how people experience the same events in different ways. “Groups come to appreciate why certain times feel so challenging (that is, which perspectives and approaches are at odds),” say Vickberg and Christfort, “and they also begin to recognize the potential power in their differences.”

The Deloitte team went on to create a questionnaire to identify the four styles, ran experiments with more than 100,000 people in different settings, and began to advise leaders on how to understand team members’ styles and maximize positive interaction among them. Here are some take-aways from their work so far:

• *Pull your opposites together.* Guardians and Drivers are different but share a focus on results. But Guardians and Pioneers are true opposites, as are Integrators and Drivers, and there’s potential for conflict when opposites interact in meetings. Here are some actual statements:

- A Driver about an Integrator: “I find it exhausting to do all the small talk to make everyone feel good about working together. I just want to get things done, give honest and direct feedback, and move forward. Having to worry about sensitive feelings slows me down.”
- An Integrator about a Driver: “I need to process things to get the contextual background for the big picture. Drivers often speak in code or thought fragments that we need to translate.”

- A Guardian about Pioneers: “I’m always thinking about how I’m going to implement something... and while the Pioneers have great ideas, they typically can’t be bothered with discussing how to execute them. But, if the outcome doesn’t match their vision, they’re frustrated.”
- A Pioneer about a Guardian: “I have great difficulty time adjusting to a Guardian’s style. I am decisive and like to generate ideas without judgment. Guardians can come across as judgmental, and they don’t allow creativity to flow.”

With time and effort, say Vickberg and Christfort, these differences can be understood and seen as advantages – for example, a Pioneer coming to value the thoroughness of a Guardian in making sure that a new idea is thought through and implemented carefully. “This is really about generating productive friction,” they say. “Think Lennon and McCartney, Serena and Venus, Steve Jobs and Steve Wozniak. Differences are what make such collaborations powerful.”

- *Elevate the “tokens” on your team.* This is especially important on teams where one style is heavily represented – for example, seven of 10 members are assertive and outspoken Drivers. If the leader doesn’t make a conscious effort to amplify the voices of minority styles, there can be a “cascade” effect, with the dominant style charging ahead and the counterbalancing styles not being included. “Momentum builds for various reasons,” say Vickberg and Christfort: “Reputational cascades generally result from a fear of looking bad or of being punished for disagreeing, and informational cascades can occur when people assume that early speakers know something others don’t. Either way, you end up with self-censoring and groupthink, which means the team doesn’t benefit from its diverse perspectives.”

Team leaders might (a) encourage minority style members to speak up early in a meeting; (b) go round-robin around the table so everyone speaks; (c) brainstorm to get diverse ideas into the discussion; (d) invite everyone to “think like” a particular style or act as the devil’s advocate by voicing an unheard approach; (e) prepare a team member for a discussion in advance; or (f) have them present their ideas in writing, rather than having to fight for the floor in the meeting.

- *Pay close attention to your sensitive introverts.* These team members, most often Guardians or Quiet Integrators, are at the greatest risk of being drowned out in a lively discussion dominated by Pioneers or Drivers – and the risk is especially high when group leaders are Pioneers or Drivers (as is often the case). “People who are most introverted, most stressed, and least adaptable are often being led by those who are most extroverted, least stressed, and most adaptable,” say Vickberg and Christfort. “You can probably see how this could pose difficulties for everyone.”

Questions at this point, they say, might be, “Why bother catering to sensitive introverts? Shouldn’t people be able to adapt and manage their stress? To speak up even when it’s difficult? Maybe you simply don’t want those who can’t.” But the authors believe Guardians and Integrators have valuable contributions to offer, and leaders need to make a special effort to ensure their voices are heard. This means slowing the pace of meetings,

reducing information overload, explicitly inviting a quieter member to contribute at a particular point in a meeting, putting less emphasis on group work, providing quieter and more private work environments, running interference for the introverts so they can be heard, and being explicit with the whole team about the importance of learning from mistakes.

The authors conclude by sharing that they themselves have diametrically opposite work styles. Kim Christfort is a Pioneer with a dose of Driver, who “values expansive thinking and rapid advancement,” while Suzanne Johnson Vickberg is a Guardian and a quiet Integrator who “processes things deeply, insists on rigor, and can’t be rushed.” When they started working together, they say, “things didn’t always go smoothly for us, but with time we’ve realized how much stronger we are working together. Suzanne knows that Kim’s always got the big picture in mind, and Kim trusts that Suzanne has considered every detail. And as the team’s leader, Kim has created a protective enclave that allows Suzanne to take cover and do what she does best. Our partnership is better for it, and so is our team.”

“Pioneers, Drivers, Integrators, and Guardians” by Suzanne Johnson Vickberg and Kim Christfort in *Harvard Business Review*, March-April 2017 (Vol. 95, #2, p. 50-59), <https://hbr.org/2017/03/the-new-science-of-team-chemistry>

[Back to page one](#)

4. The Singapore American School Plots a New Course

In this article in *Independent School*, Timothy Stuart, Mona Stuart, and Chip Kimball (Singapore American School) describe their PreK-12 school’s ambitious effort to be “a world leader in education, cultivating exceptional thinkers, prepared for the future.” The change process was tempered by the fear of disrupting what had made the school successful up to that point. The key questions asked by the board and leadership team: Who do we want to be as a school? What kind of learning do we want to provide for our students? and What do we want to be known for?

The first year of the process focused on reading research, working with several consultants, and sending teams of teachers and administrators on a worldwide hunt for the key ingredients in schools “on the cutting edge of teaching and learning.” Singapore American School educators visited more than 100 schools in seven countries and returned brimming with enthusiasm, ideas, and a sense of urgency about changing some outdated practices in their school. One of the most memorable take-aways was a statement by the principal of a top-rated high school in Finland. Asked what drove him and his colleagues to keep pushing for improvement despite their excellent track record, he said, “Oh, you didn’t notice the Nokia headquarters just down the street? Every day we drive past the Nokia offices to get to work. It serves as a strong reminder of what will happen to our school if we don’t change. If we don’t change, what and how our students learn will become like Nokia, a successful company that almost overnight became irrelevant in the 21st century.”

“Through our research,” say Stuart, Stuart, and Kimball, “we wanted to discover schools that were both progressive in design and excellent in outcome. We found that innovation alone is not the secret sauce of teaching and learning.” After months of discussion and soul-searching, the school’s leadership team decided on three “strategic anchors:”

- A culture of excellence: Every student learns at high levels
- A culture of extraordinary care: Every student is known and advocated for
- A culture of possibilities: Every student personalizes their learning

Reflecting on the school visits, the leadership team focused on two overarching themes and some of the elements underpinning them:

- *High-quality instruction* – Teachers in the best schools took collective responsibility for student learning; actively collaborated; set crystal-clear learning targets; established common expectations for learning; provided students with timely feedback; acted on the information from assessments to differentiate learning through intervention and acceleration; and used varied instructional strategies to meet the needs of all students.

- *Student ownership* – Teachers in the best schools developed partnerships with students in the learning process. “Students had a voice in what they learned,” say Stuart, Stuart, and Kimball, “and could produce an expected plan for their learning that included how they would demonstrate their proficiency. Teachers honored their students’ unique attributes, developed positive relationships focused on each child’s strengths and passions, and provided personalized learning structures.”

Over the next three years, the Singapore American School’s leaders produced scores of recommendations and struggled to reduce them to a lean, do-able strategic plan. “We put everything on the table,” say Stuart, Stuart, and Kimball, “willing to sacrifice the sacred cows and ask the hard questions: If we were to design a new school today, what would it look like? Given everything that we have read and seen, what can we implement that would positively and dramatically impact student learning in our school? What are our constraints, and how immovable are they? Asking and answering these questions was difficult and often emotional, getting at the heart of what we held most dear.” In the end, the school decided on five core initiatives:

- *Professional learning communities* – Teacher team meetings are focused on learning; committed to continuous improvement; answer the four PLC questions (What do we want students to learn? How will we know they are learning? What will we do if they are having difficulty? What will we do for students who are proficient?) and apply those answers to students’ individual contexts; use structures to support intervention and extension for students; and use structures to support effective PLC collaboration.

- *Standards-based learning* – The school defines desired student learning objectives (DSLOs) and assessments measuring essential learning outcomes for curriculum units and detailed learning progressions; teachers gather evidence of student learning for each DSLO; assessments are valid, reliable, and fair; grading and reporting of student learning is standards-based; and structures support a standards-based approach.

- *High-impact instructional practices* – The most effective classroom practices are used to explicitly teach the DSLOs; students regularly engage in inquiry to deepen learning; students engage in experiential learning, including service learning; practices and programs allow for personalization of learning; and structures exist and are used to support high-impact instructional practices.

- *Pastoral care* – A culture of extraordinary care supports all students; programs help students develop social and emotional wellness; advisory programs ensure that every student is known, connected, and cared for; students are supported through major transitions (entering, moving from one division to another, and leaving); and structures exist and are used to support pastoral care.

- *Systems supporting learning* – With service excellence as a lens, all departments “collaborate to create and improve effective and integrated schoolwide systems to ensure adults have the capacity to support students and learning.”

“Wild and Thoughtful Innovation: The Singapore American School Journey” by Timothy Stuart, Mona Stuart, and Chip Kimball in *Independent School*, Spring 2017 (Vol. 76, #3, p. 78-86), no e-link available

[*Back to page one*](#)

5. Google Classroom as a Tool for Teachers and Faculties

In this article in *Virginia Journal of Education*, DeWayne Harrell sings the praises of Google Classroom <https://edu.google.com/products/productivity-tools/classroom/> as a free technology tool that fosters research, creativity, and collaboration in classrooms and can bring about a positive shift in faculty collegiality and school climate. Here are some of the features Harrell and his colleagues have found helpful in their Virginia elementary school:

- Students can view assignments and due dates for the day, week, and month.
- The teacher can publish links to websites and videos for all students to use.
- The teacher can give feedback to students paperlessly.
- Teachers can communicate with students individually or collectively to plan activities and spur collaboration.
- Students can share and discuss specific questions with their teacher.
- Students can collaborate and share with classmates on assignments and projects.
- Several features are helpful for shy, introverted students who may not speak up in class.
- Students can see updates of their grades on all assignments.
- The platform can also be used in faculty meetings.

“Google Classroom allows students to be the owners of their own education under the umbrella of the classroom,” Harrell concludes. “Yes, educators will still be responsible for creating and adapting lessons, sharing knowledge, and giving direction, but the process becomes more of an arrangement where the students are part of the agreement.”

“Beyond Surfing: Using Google Classroom Can Help Students Be More Creative and Collaborative” by DeWayne Harrell in *Virginia Journal of Education*, November 2016 (Vol. 110, p. 16-17), <http://bit.ly/2maXM1q>; spotted in *Education Digest*, March 2017

[Back to page one](#)

6. Short Item:

Anti-bullying resources – The Harvard Graduate School of Education’s *Usable Knowledge* has launched “One and All” with strategies to protect students, help them reject bullying, and build communities in which everyone thrives:

<http://www.gse.harvard.edu/uk/one-and-all>. Resources so far: Widening the definition of bullying; a conversation about how to honestly confront racial trauma and facilitate conversations about racially tinged events in the news; and one ELL teacher’s first-hand experience as an ELL student.

[Back to page one](#)

© Copyright 2017 Marshall Memo LLC

*If you have feedback or suggestions,
please e-mail kim.marshall48@gmail.com*

About the Marshall Memo

Mission and focus:

This weekly memo is designed to keep principals, teachers, superintendents, and others very well-informed on current research and effective practices in K-12 education. Kim Marshall, drawing on 45 years' experience as a teacher, principal, central office administrator, and writer, lightens the load of busy educators by serving as their "designated reader."

To produce the Marshall Memo, Kim subscribes to 60 carefully-chosen publications (see list to the right), sifts through more than a hundred articles each week, and selects 5-10 that have the greatest potential to improve teaching, leadership, and learning. He then writes a brief summary of each article, pulls out several striking quotes, provides e-links to full articles when available, and e-mails the Memo to subscribers every Monday evening (with occasional breaks; there are 50 issues a year).

Subscriptions:

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

Website:

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

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

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

- The current issue (in Word or PDF)
- All back issues and podcasts
- An archive of all articles so far, searchable by topic, title, author, source, level, etc.
- A collection of "classic" articles from all issues

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
Communiqué
Ed. Magazine
Education Digest
Education Next
Education Update
Education Week
Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis
Educational Horizons
Educational Leadership
Educational Researcher
Edutopia
Elementary School Journal
English Journal
Essential Teacher
Exceptional Children
Go Teach
Harvard Business Review
Harvard Educational Review
Independent School
Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy
Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk (JESPAR)
Kappa Delta Pi Record
Knowledge Quest
Literacy Today
Mathematics Teaching in the Middle School
Middle School Journal
Phi Delta Kappan
Principal
Principal Leadership
Principal's Research Review
Reading Research Quarterly
Responsive Classroom Newsletter
Rethinking Schools
Review of Educational Research
School Administrator
School Library Journal
Teachers College Record
Teaching Children Mathematics
Teaching Exceptional Children
The Atlantic
The Chronicle of Higher Education
The District Management Journal
The Education Gadfly
The Journal of the Learning Sciences
The Language Educator
The Learning Professional
The New York Times
The New Yorker
The Reading Teacher
Theory Into Practice
Time Magazine