

Marshall Memo 161

A Weekly Round-up of Important Ideas and Research in K-12 Education
November 20, 2006

In This Issue:

1. A radical reform plan for new and restructuring schools
2. Piloting an innovative reading assessment for elementary ELL students
3. Do single-sex classrooms and schools produce better results?
4. The “big ideas” of Indian education in Montana
5. Fighting stereotypes about Native Americans
6. Five pedagogical standards for English language learners
7. Checking for understanding with classroom “clickers”
8. Five factors that propel students to success
9. Daily physical exercise for students in North Carolina
10. Grant-writing advice and websites
11. Short item: Formative assessment graphic

Quotes of the Week

“There is no generic American Indian.”

Montana’s Indian Education for All Act (see item #4)

“We do not need to yield to the pessimistic view that schools cannot make powerful differences on a large scale in the lives of children born into poverty.”

Stanley Pogrow (see item #1)

“Retention is tremendously inefficient. It is the equivalent of having a group trying to hike up a mountain and imposing the policy that those who do not make it to the top in a certain amount of time have to start over again from the bottom.”

Stanley Pogrow (*ibid.*)

“Comprehension is like a chemical reaction which can be constrained by too little of any one of the elements necessary in the reaction, even if the others are present in abundant quantities.”

Diane August, David Francis, Han-Ya Annie Hsu, and Catherine Snow (see item #2)

“We have some great teachers who may be teaching the wrong things.”

Tracey Harrill, principal in Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North Carolina

(*Charlotte Observer* article on frequent teacher supervision, November 14, 2006)

“Most consumers of research are not researchers who want to know the truth, but are instead advocates who are convinced of the absolute correctness of their position.”

National Academy of Sciences report: Improving Schooling for Language-Minority Students: A Research Agenda (August & Hakta, 1997, p. 138)

1. A Radical Reform Plan for New and Restructuring Schools

“We do not need to yield to the pessimistic view that schools cannot make powerful differences on a large scale in the lives of children born into poverty,” writes San Francisco State professor Stanley Pogrow in this provocative *Kappan* article. He proceeds to unveil a bold (and admittedly untested) plan for high achievement in new or restructuring urban elementary schools. Pogrow combed the research for school interventions that have produced unusually large gains and brought student achievement to high levels at scale. He found three, and combined them into what he calls “the Hi-Perform School” design. They are:

- *Modularized continuous progress* – Developed by John Champlin in the 1970s (based on Benjamin Bloom’s mastery learning), this intervention tackles the problem of absenteeism, mobility, and widely-varying student achievement levels in urban classrooms. Conventional instruction, grouping, remediation, and retention are inefficient and hit-or-miss, says Pogrow. He’s particularly critical of keeping students back. “Retention is tremendously inefficient,” he writes. “It is the equivalent of having a group trying to hike up a mountain and imposing the policy that those who do not make it to the top in a certain amount of time have to start over again from the bottom.”

The solution? Subdivide the entire elementary reading and math curriculum into a continuum of 40 to 55 sequential modules, test each student, and place him or her at the appropriate skill and knowledge level. As soon as students master the content of their module, they take an exit assessment and, if they are proficient, they move up to the next level. Students who are lagging get extra help from “acceleration coaches,” and students who forge ahead earn access to enrichment opportunities (an attractive feature for parents who feel public schools don’t challenge their children enough). Students spend the rest of the day with their age group, which allows them to develop socially in a stable group of same-age peers.

Modularized continuous progress has major implications for teachers. Each math and reading group has students from several grade levels and its composition is constantly changing. As the year progresses, the demand for different modules is constantly shifting; for example, at the beginning of the year, students’ levels might mean the school needs to offer four sections of Module 4; later in the year, there might be no students at this level, meaning that teachers are constantly being reassigned to meet shifting student needs. “In other words,” explains Pogrow, “teacher assignment flows to where students’ skill needs are, as opposed to the existing system, in which a teacher has a static assigned grade and room and has to cope with a huge range of needs and skill levels.”

Pogrow argues that this approach is particularly good for at-risk students because they are always working at a manageable level. “Mastering a small module is an easier, more

manageable and tangible goal for them than is having to succeed at an entire year's work in order to be considered successful and get promoted," he says. "In this approach, students 'pass,' succeed, and get 'promoted' many times during a school year. This breeds a 'can-do' attitude. Much as students in a video game push to move to the next level, students begin to challenge one another to get to the next module and get through as many modules as possible each year." This plan would eliminate the need for remediation, says Pogrow, and would also make retention unnecessary since all students would be moving along a multi-year continuum. He points to impressive research on the high achievement produced by continuous modularized progress.

- *Participation in dramatic and musical productions* – Pogrow's second Hi-Perform component is having all students participate in at least one production each year. He cites research indicating that such activities boost students' confidence and skills – and benefit high-risk students even more than their advantaged peers. Pogrow suggests three guidelines: (a) starting at an agreed-upon grade level, all students participate in at least one production a year (not necessarily for a big audience; some might be for their classmates or classes from another grade); (b) students are involved in all aspects of the production – acting, singing, scripts, set design, etc. – so they have real ownership; and (c) community arts groups and artists are brought in as role models and helpers.

- *Thinking-skill development sequence anchored in HOTS* – Pogrow's third element is based on Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS), a program he developed to foster Socratic dialogue in classrooms. Pogrow argues that HOTS produces larger test score gains than remediation and test prep – as well as gains in overall intellectual and social development. He sees this component unfolding in three stages: (a) In grades K-3, all teachers would use a few basic questioning techniques to get students accustomed to responding to a set of thought-provoking questions; (b) In grades 3-5, students gather in small-group intensive Socratic learning environments for 35 minutes a day; (c) Starting in the middle of grade 4, intensive thinking and problem solving would be integrated into all content learning, including programs like Supermath and Junior Great Books.

Pogrow argues that these three components, which he says could be adapted and customized within schools and districts – would be synergistic: the artistic and Socratic components would spur basic-skill development, and vice-versa – producing very high test scores as well as impressive intellectual and social development. "A sense of understanding transfers across all forms of learning," writes Pogrow. "It produces the basic-skill and academic-content gains emphasized by traditionalists, and it increases the overall individual intellectual and social growth emphasized by progressives. The result is a win-win situation for the differing philosophical traditions – as well as for students and teachers."

Pogrow admits that this design is untested, and thinks it's appropriate only for a start-up or restructuring school with a year's planning time. But he firmly believes that the combination of these three elements would boost students from sub-par levels of achievement to very high levels. He aims to launch ten Hi-Perform elementary schools in several districts, and offers his services to help districts plan, train staff, and set up a communications network for sharing.

“Restructuring High-Poverty Elementary Schools for Success: A Description of the Hi-Perform School Design” by Stanley Pogrow in *Phi Delta Kappan*, November 2006 (Vol. 88, #3, p. 223-229), no e-link available

2. Piloting an Innovative Reading Assessment for Elementary ELL Students

In this intriguing article in *Elementary School Journal*, four researchers describe the development and pilot-testing of a new reading test, the Diagnostic Assessment of Reading Comprehension (DARC). The idea was to design an assessment that minimizes decoding and language demands and gives teachers diagnostic information on the underlying components of reading comprehension.

Why is this important? Because, say the authors, comprehension is made up of several interdependent components that need to be teased apart:

- Decoding skills and word-reading automaticity
- Familiarity with key vocabulary words in the text
- Background knowledge presupposed by the text
- Knowledge of discourse features used in the text
- Interest in the topic
- The ability to draw inferences
- Being able to formulate or see a purpose for reading the text.

To successfully comprehend what they are reading, students need inputs from all these domains; if one area is deficient, the student won't understand. “Comprehension is like a chemical reaction,” say the authors, “which can be constrained by too little of any one of the elements necessary in the reaction, even if the others are present in abundant quantities.”

But which areas are weak and which are strong? This is where standardized tests mostly leave teachers in the dark – which is especially damaging to low-SES and ELL students for whom the stakes are so high. “Sorting out optimal instruction for every learner requires having information about which aspects of reading are causing any child's comprehension breakdown,” say the authors. Hence the DARC.

Be warned: this is an unconventional reading assessment. It's a simplified version of one developed by Potts and Peterson in 1985, which had students read three sentences with a mixture of real and made-up words and then answer several true/false questions. An example:

- A jal is larger than a toc.
- A toc is larger than a pony.
- A beaver is larger than a caz.

Using the information in the text and general knowledge, students can line up the items from largest to smallest: jal > toc > pony > beaver > caz. The assessment asks students a series of true-false questions probing four different comprehension skills:

• *A jal is larger than a toc.* A text memory question, which tests information explicitly mentioned in the text.

- *A jal is larger than a pony.* A text inferencing question, which requires integrating information across propositions in the text without using prior knowledge (i.e., a jal is larger than a toc; a toc is larger than a pony).

- *A pony is larger than a beaver.* A question requiring prior knowledge, not the information from the text.

- *A toc is larger than a beaver.* A knowledge integration question that requires integrating prior knowledge (ponies are larger than beavers) with a text-based fact (a toc is larger than a pony).

The DARC took this basic idea and used highly decodable vocabulary to make it accessible to elementary ELL students – but maintained a sophisticated inferencing and knowledge integration component. An example:

- *Maria likes to eat fruit.*

- *Most of all she likes to eat orkers.*

- *An orker is like an orange.*

- *But an orker is bigger than an orange.*

The authors did three pilot studies of the DARC and concluded the following:

- The DARC can be used with children as young as kindergarteners.

- The simple yes/no, true/false response format adequately reflects comprehension.

- The four types of comprehension (text memory, text inferencing, background knowledge, and knowledge integration) can be measured independently.

- The DARC spotlights children’s comprehension capacities that are not shown in tests with a greater decoding, syntax, and vocabulary load.

In the pilot studies, some children who scored poorly on the Stanford 9 or the WLPB passage comprehension measure did well on the DARC. This showed that their poor performance on standardized tests indicates difficulties in other areas (word decoding or vocabulary, perhaps) and not with real comprehension. Thus, the authors conclude, the DARC could save lots of time and motion in classrooms by revealing if students are strong in real comprehension skills and don’t need more work in that area.

The DARC needs refinement, the authors acknowledge, but they are excited about its potential to give valuable diagnostic information to classroom teachers and make the teaching of reading more efficient and effective, especially for disadvantaged and ELL students.

“Assessing Reading Comprehension in Bilinguals” by Diane August, David Francis, Han-Ya Annie Hsu, and Catherine Snow in *Elementary School Journal*, November 2006 (Vol. 107, #2, p. 221-238), no e-link available

3. Do Single-Sex Classrooms and Schools Produce Better Results?

In this 44-page paper, University of Arizona researcher Gerald Bracey reviews the research on single-sex classrooms and schools. First, he spells out the reasons that proponents think that all-boy and all-girl education is superior:

- It increases the enrollment of girls in courses they often avoid in coeducational settings.
- It improves girls’ self-concept and self-esteem.

- For adolescents, it reduces hormonal distractions.
- It allows for better control of boys' behavior.
- It increases the achievement of at-risk students of both sexes.
- It reduces or removes sex-based stereotypes and improves gender equity.
- It improves achievement by paying attention to pedagogically significant gender differences, especially in brain function.

Bracey examined the copious research on this topic (2,221 studies) and found that it is “mostly flawed by failure to control for important variables such as class, financial privilege, selective admissions, religious values, prior learning, or ethnicity.” Only 40 studies were methodologically sound, according to the American Institutes for Research (AIR), and their conclusions are equivocal. “The findings do not form a coherent body,” Bracey concludes, “and therefore the single recommendation possible is that a series of specific questions should be asked of any proposal for single-sex schools or classes:”

- What are the cognitive, affective, and behavioral goals of the program? Gender equity? Differential brain function? Recruitment of girls into curriculum areas historically avoided? Higher test scores?
- Has the program been well thought through? What might be lost if coeducation were generally abandoned? What are the costs and tradeoffs of establishing a single-sex school or class? Are single-sex schools or classes the *best* way to accomplish the goals?
- Have proponents thought through the policy obstacles that might lie in the way of or conflict with the stated goals?
- Does the proposal take into account key factors that studies show have worked in successful single-sex programs?
- Did the program originate inside or outside the school? There is a long and sorry history of attempts to impose educational change of many kinds from without.
- Does the school administration truly believe in the efficacy of single-sex education? Has the faculty bought in? Have the parents?
- Will a program of professional development built around the goals of the program be provided for administration and faculty?
- Is there a sound plan to evaluate the outcomes of the program with respect to its real goals?

“Separate But Superior? A Review of Issues and Data Bearing on Single-Sex Education” by Gerald Bracey, November 2006, Education Policy Research Unit, Arizona State University http://eps1.asu.edu/epru/epru_2006_Research_Writing.htm

4. The “Big Ideas” of Indian Education in Montana

In this cover article in the November *Kappan*, former teacher Bobby Ann Starnes reports on Montana’s 1999 Indian Education for All Act, which requires teaching Native American history and culture to all students in the state. The law does not have a specific curriculum, but is driven by seven “essential understandings,” which form the basis for social

studies standards that are supposed to be infused into existing classroom curriculum. These understandings are worth quoting verbatim both on their own merits and as thoughtful exemplars of “big ideas” in Understanding by Design curriculum units:

- *Essential Understanding 1* – There is great diversity among the 12 tribal Nations of Montana in their languages, cultures, histories, and governments. Each Nation has a distinct and unique cultural heritage that contributes to modern Montana.

- *Essential Understanding 2* – There is great diversity among individual American Indians as identity is developed, defined, and redefined by entities, organizations, and people. A continuum of Indian identity, unique to each individual, ranges from assimilated to traditional. There is no generic American Indian.

- *Essential Understanding 3* – The ideologies of Native traditional beliefs and spirituality persist into modern-day life as tribal cultures, traditions, and languages are still practiced by many American Indian people and are incorporated into how tribes govern and manage their affairs. Additionally, each tribe has its own oral histories, which are as valid as written histories. These histories predate the “discovery” of North America.

- *Essential Understanding 4* – Reservations are lands that have been reserved by the tribes for their own use through treaties, statutes, and executive orders and were not “given” to them. The principle that land should be acquired from the Indians only through their consent with treaties involved three assumptions: (a) Both parties to treaties were sovereign powers; (b) Indian tribes had some form of transferable title to the land; and (c) Acquisition of Indian lands was solely a government matter not to be left to individual colonists.

- *Essential Understanding 5* – Federal Indian policies, put into place throughout American history, have affected Indian people and still shape who they are today. Much of Indian history can be related through several major federal policy periods: Colonization, Treaty, Allotment, Boarding School, Tribal Reorganization, Termination, and Self-determination.

- *Essential Understanding 6* – History is a story most often related through the subjective experience of the teller. With the inclusion of more and varied voices, histories are being rediscovered and revised. History told from an Indian perspective frequently conflicts with the stories mainstream historians tell.

- *Essential Understanding 7* – Under the American legal system, Indian tribes have sovereign powers, separate and independent from the federal and state governments. However, the extent and breadth of tribal sovereignty is not the same for each tribe.

“Montana’s Indian Education for All: Toward an Education Worthy of American Ideals” by Bobby Ann Starnes in *Phi Delta Kappan*, November 2002 (Vol. 88, #3, p. 184-192), no e-link available

5. Fighting Stereotypes About Native Americans

“Stereotyping is a poor substitute for getting to know individuals at a more intimate, meaningful level,” writes Montana State University professor Walter Fleming in this *Kappan* article. He goes on to puncture seven persistent myths about Native Americans:

• *Myth 1: Native Americans prefer to be called Native Americans.* Fleming (himself a Native American) says there is no universal consensus on this. He uses Native, Native American, Indian, and American Indian interchangeably, sometimes in the same sentence. But these terms are all oversimplifications of 500 different cultural beliefs and practices within the continent, so Fleming tries to refer to the specific tribe when it's known.

• *Myth 2: Indians get special privileges.* Treaties granted Native Americans certain health and educational benefits in return for land, and some Natives do not pay state taxes because their reservations are not part of their states (although they still pay federal income taxes). But Fleming argues that these and other "privileges" are similar to advantages enjoyed by many other groups of Americans, including the children of Vietnam veterans and many college students.

• *Myth 3: American Indians are a dying race.* The census of 1900 counted about 237,000 Native Americans, Eskimo, and Aleut peoples. But a 2003 count found about 4,400,000 American Indians and Alaska Natives in combination with one or more other races.

• *Myth 4: American Indians are easily identifiable.* Not true, says Fleming; some are blond-haired and blue-eyed, and some have the features of African Americans. "It is best not to make assumptions about ethnic identity solely from outward appearance," writes Fleming. "Even if the child is Native, he or she is first an individual."

• *Myth 5: All American Indians live on a reservation.* In some western states, including Montana, South Dakota, Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah, most Native people live on or near an Indian reservation, but nationwide, this is not the case. In all, 57% of American Indians and Alaska Natives live in metropolitan areas.

• *Myth 6: Native people intuitively know their culture and history.* Some teachers call on American Indian students to share their past, assuming this will give them a chance to shine in front of their peers. But many Native children haven't learned about their native culture, and others have been taught not to share certain information with those outside their tribe or not to try to "outshine" their peers – so it's best for teachers not to put Indian children on the spot.

• *Myth 7: American Indians feel honored by Indian mascots.* Not so. In fact, many are offended by these mascots. In an attempt to put the shoe on the other foot, some Indian activists took the Cleveland Indians mascot, Chief Wahoo (with his caricatured fire-engine-red skin, buck teeth, and huge grin) and replicated it for imaginary Cleveland Asians, Cleveland Africans, and Cleveland Hispanics baseball teams. "There would be no question that African Americans, Hispanics, and people of Asian descent would find these logos extremely objectionable," says Fleming. "So why, in the face of obvious objections from Native people and their assertion that they do not feel 'honored,' is this symbol allowed to represent the Cleveland baseball team?"

Fleming closes with a plea to avoid stereotypes of all kinds because they define an individual by attributes ascribed to the group as a whole. "[T]he stereotype that American Indians are doomed to become alcoholics obviously colors one's impression of the many who do not drink alcohol at all," he writes. "So, too, the stereotype of all American Indians as

‘spiritual’ – even though this may be perceived as a positive image – does not encompass the beliefs or practices of all individuals.”

“The challenge for educators is how we get beyond stereotypes,” he says, and this means going beyond “a sidebar to a social studies text or including a Native American unit around Thanksgiving.” He suggests (borrowing from John Watts) the following guidelines for teachers of American Indian students:

- Practice personal warmth plus high expectations.
- Respect cultural differences.
- Learn the cultural resources of your students.
- Develop multiple instructional approaches.
- Be aware of the ways you ask questions.
- Remember that some students do not like to be “spotlighted” in front of a group.
- Be aware of proximity preferences – how close is comfortable?

“Myths and Stereotypes About Native Americans” by Walter Fleming in *Phi Delta Kappan*, November 2002 (Vol. 88, #3, p. 213-217), no e-link available

6. Five Pedagogical Standards for English Language Learners

In this article in *Language Learner*, the magazine of the National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE), University of Hawaii professor Lois Yamauchi shares five principles for effectively teaching students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds (these were developed at the Center for Research of Education, Diversity, and Excellence at the University of California/Berkeley):

- *Joint productive activity* – Teachers and students collaborate to produce tangible and intangible products, for example, a school play, a model of a volcano, or a community service project.
- *Language and literacy development* – Students get practice reading, writing, listening, and speaking in science, math, and social studies classes, not just in language arts.
- *Contextualization* – New information is connected to students’ prior knowledge and experiences from home, community, and school. Both “on the fly” and carefully planned connections to prior knowledge are effective.
- *Challenging activities* – Students are pushed beyond rote memorization and engage regularly in complex thinking, including analyzing, synthesizing, and applying information – going beyond the “who,” “what,” and “how” to the “why” and becoming more aware of their own learning.
- *Instructional conversation* – Much teaching takes place in teacher-student and student-student dialogue. Ideally, says Yamauchi, students talk more than the teacher and the teacher listens carefully to assess student understanding.

“Improving Education for Native Hawaiian Students Using the Five Standards for Effective Pedagogy” by Lois Yamauchi in *Language Learner*, September/October 2006 (Vol. 1, #1, p. 17-19); this website has more information: <http://gse.berkeley.edu/research/crede/>.

7. Checking for Understanding with Classroom “Clickers”

This *Education Week* article describes how teachers in Canton, Ohio have students use individual electronic devices to give in-class feedback on whether they understand what’s being taught. For example, algebra teacher Jim Pukys asks his students to find the value of a function; they work out the answer, choose from several options on the screens of their devices, and transmit them electronically to his computer. Within seconds, an image appears on a screen at the front of the class showing that two-thirds of the class picked the right answer. Not good enough, Pukys decides, and goes over the problem again in greater detail.

“As a teacher, you find that in any class there are two or three kids who can get every answer, and those are the kids you hear from,” says Pukys. With the personal response devices, he can “hear” from every student and make during-class corrections in his teaching, or give a quick after-class tutorial to a few students who don’t understand. Some students hate the system, like one 8th-grader who keyed “IDK, IDC” (I don’t know, I don’t care) into the system. But Pukys says most students are excited to get the quick feedback and invested in improving their work. They are also motivated by the fact that they have individual screen names that allow Pukys to keep track of their responses.

This kind of in-classroom “dipstick” checking for understanding, sometimes called formative assessment, is distinct from more formal, every 6-9-week interim or benchmark testing. Dipstick/formative assessments provide earlier warning of learning problems and give teachers a chance to clear up confusion and misconceptions before they compound and become entrenched. Canton school officials are convinced that their system (TI-Navigator linked to graphing calculators, costing about \$9,500 per classroom and funded by a grant) is responsible for strong gains in student achievement among middle-school students over the last two years.

“Technology Helps Teachers Home In On Student Needs” by Sean Cavanagh in *Education Week*, November 15, 2006 (Vol. 26, #12, p. 10-11), no free e-link available

8. Five Factors That Propel Children to Success

This *Education Week* article describes a new report, “Every Child, Every Promise: Turning Failure Into Action,” which posits five developmental assets that are correlated with later success for children 6-17:

- Caring relationships with adults both in and out of school;
- Safe families, schools, and communities and the chance to engage in constructive activities, such as after-school clubs and teams;
- A healthy start and healthy development, including regular medical checkups, good nutrition, and daily physical activities;
- Effective education for marketable skills and lifelong learning, including a positive school climate, a school culture that emphasizes academic achievement, reading for pleasure, and friends who value being a good student;
- Opportunities to make a difference through helping others.

The study found that children who get 75 percent or more of the indicators in at least four of the categories were much more likely to be successful, as measured by getting mostly A's in school, social competence, avoiding violence, and frequency of volunteering. Making sure that students get these assets is therefore an investment in their futures.

“U.S. Seen As Falling Short on Basic Supports for Children” by Lynn Olson in *Education Week*, November 15, 2006 (Vol. 26, #12, p. 14), no free e-link available

9. Daily Physical Exercise for Students in North Carolina

This article in *Teacher Magazine* reports on the way North Carolina schools are requiring students to engage in daily aerobic exercise in their classrooms and other non-gym settings. Richfield School in rural Stanly County has students take brief daily breaks for Tae Bo, jumping jacks, dancing at their desks, or a brisk walk around the campus. “Testing and accountability are essential,” says principal Chris Lineberry, “but the purpose of school is not testing. We would like to see healthful living become as common as reading.” Lineberry has been tracking students’ body mass index, and after only a year of daily exercise, he has seen the numbers drop at every grade level.

Concerned about growing childhood obesity, North Carolina recently mandated 30 minutes of daily exercise and disseminated recommended “energizers” – classroom activities that combine math, reading, science, and social studies with exercise – for example, solving a math problem and then doing that number of jumping jacks, or, in primary-grade language arts, squatting for vowels and standing straight for consonants.

“Aerobic Instruction: For a Growing Number of Students, Working Out Isn’t Just for Gym Class” by Bruce Buchanan in *Teacher Magazine*, November/December 2006 (Vol. XVIII, #3, p. 9), no e-link available

10. Grant Writing Advice and Websites

This *Teacher Magazine* feature includes several pieces of advice from David Bauer, a former teacher, on applying for funding:

- *Focus on ends, not means.* For example, rather than asking for new playground equipment, sell potential funders on a strategy to promote physical activity and cut down on obesity.
- *Target funders strategically.* For example, insurance companies might be receptive to a program that reduces obesity in the community.
- *Think local.* Corporations give where they live, says Bauer. He recommends searching the local Chamber of Commerce for lists of local and regional companies.
- *Avoid the ‘g’ word.* Asking a funding target to “give” can lead to rejection. Instead, pitch your proposal as an *investment* that will produce results.
- *Don’t send the same proposal to multiple organizations.* Customize your proposal to reflect the priorities of each institution and its past grant-making record.

The article also includes three websites that educators might check out to get funding for classroom and curriculum projects:

- David Bauer’s website: <http://www.dgbauer.com/links.htm> which includes links to resources for finding public and private donors.
- Joe Mizereck’s site: <http://www.GrantsAlert.com>; this former teacher monitors grant-listing services and compiles opportunities.
- The Foundation Center: <http://www.foundationcenter.org>; this site has a free tool to search for foundations (and also a subscription feature).

“Requests Granted” by Hollice Fisher in *Teacher Magazine*, November/December 2006 (Vol. XVIII, #3, p. 17), no e-link available

11. Short Item:

Formative assessment graphic – In the latest in a continuing series of advertisements in *Education Week*, New Hampshire testing executive Stuart Kahl proposes a new graphic to put instruction and formative assessment in perspective. Note that by “formative” Kahl means in-the-classroom, “dipstick” assessments, not interim/benchmark assessments (about which he continues to be extremely skeptical, saying they are usually summative assessments in sheep’s clothing). See what you think: <http://www.measuredprogress.org/balanced.pdf>

“A Balanced Assessment System: A Different Perspective” by Stuart Kahl, Measured Progress advertisement, *Education Week*, November 15, 2006 (Vol. 28, #12, p. 9)

© Copyright 2006 Kim Marshall

Do you have feedback? Is anything missing?

If you have comments or suggestions, if you saw an article or web item in the last week that you think should have been summarized, or if you would like to suggest additional publications that should be covered by the Marshall Memo, please e-mail: kim.marshall8@verizon.net

About the Marshall Memo

Mission and focus:

This weekly memo is designed to keep principals, teachers, superintendents, and others very well-informed on current research and effective practices in K-12 education. Kim Marshall, drawing on 36 years' experience as a teacher, principal, central office administrator, and writer, lightens the load of busy educators by serving as their "designated reader."

To produce the Marshall Memo, Kim subscribes to 44 carefully-chosen publications (see list to the right), sifts through scores of 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 (with occasional breaks; there were 50 issues in 2004-05).

Subscriptions:

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

Website:

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

- How to subscribe or renew
- Why the Marshall Memo?
- Publications read
- Article selection criteria
- Topics covered
- Headlines for all issues
- What readers say
- About Kim Marshall (including links to articles)
- A free sample issue

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

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

Publications covered

Those read this week are underlined.

American Educator
American School Board Journal
ASCD SmartBrief
Atlantic Monthly
Catalyst Chicago
CommonWealth Magazine
Ed. Magazine
EDge
Education Digest
Education Gadfly
Education Next
Education Update
Education Week
Educational Leadership
Educational Researcher
Edutopia
Elementary School Journal
Essential Teacher (TESOL)
Harvard Business Review
Harvard Education Letter
Harvard Educational Review
JESPAR
Jimmy Kilpatrick
Journal of Staff Development
Language Learner (NABE)
Middle Ground
Middle School Journal
NASSP Bulletin
New York Times
New Yorker
Newsweek
PEN Weekly NewsBlast
Phi Delta Kappan
Principal
Principal Leadership
Principal's Research Review
Reading Research Quarterly
Reading Today
Rethinking Schools
Review of Educational Research
Teacher Magazine
Teachers College Record
Theory Into Practice
Times Educational Supplement