

# Marshall Memo 558

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

October 27, 2014

## In This Issue:

1. [Carol Dweck on growth-mindset organizations](#)
2. [A rationale for annual state testing](#)
3. [Do reading tests measure what we think they're measuring?](#)
4. [What students aren't learning on their iPads](#)
5. [Advice for math teachers gearing up for rigorous standards](#)
6. ["Buddy editing" in a Massachusetts first-grade classroom](#)
7. [Response to Intervention for classroom management](#)
8. [RTI in first grade: when should students move to Tier 2 and 3?](#)
9. [Which are more effective, traditional or online science textbooks?](#)
10. Short item: [Online math resources](#)

## Quotes of the Week

"The fact that, for the first time, the U.S. has what is essentially a national curriculum, equivalent in quality to what is found in the highest scoring countries in the world, means that the focus of leadership can finally shift from arguing about what math to teach, to how best to teach the agreed-upon content to all students."

Steven Leinwand in *Sensible Math: A Guide for School Leaders in the Era of the Common Core* (Heinemann 2012)

"It is unreasonable to ask a professional to change much more than 10 percent a year, but it is unprofessional to change by much less than 10 percent a year."

Steven Leinwand (see item #5)

"Students who are ostensibly 'poor' readers can suddenly comprehend quite well when reading about a subject they know a lot about – even outperforming 'good' readers who lack background knowledge the 'poor' readers possess."

Robert Pondiscio (see item #3)

"The positive impacts of small schools continue to roll in; this initiative appears not to be the disaster that many thought it was. Unfortunately, in education, we rarely have the fortitude to allow interventions to play out and observe results over the long term."

Amber Northern on "The Relative Costs of New York City's New Small Public High Schools of Choice" in *The Education Gadfly*, October 22, 2014 (Vol. 14, #43); the full study is at <http://bit.ly/1v7aj1N>

---

## 1. Carol Dweck on Growth-Mindset Organizations

In this interview in *Harvard Business Review*, Sarah Green asks Stanford professor Carol Dweck about how her ideas apply to corporations. In her early research, Dweck realized that different people have widely divergent reactions to failure. “For some people,” she says, “failure is the end of the world – but for others, it’s this exciting new opportunity.” The key difference, her subsequent work showed, was that people in the latter group usually have a “growth” mindset that helps them thrive on challenges, whereas those with a “fixed” mindset, even if they’ve been very successful, tend to stay within their comfort zone and, when they encounter frustration and difficulty, falter and sometimes go to pieces. They’re worried, *Will I look good? Will I live up to my reputation? Will people think I’m brilliant?*

Can an organization, like a person, have a fixed or growth mindset? Dweck and her colleagues explored this question by asking people to respond to statements like:

- When it comes to being successful, this organization seems to believe that people have a certain amount of talent, and they really can’t do much to change it.

Agreement with statements like this indicated a fixed mindset; disagreement was a sign of a growth mindset. The researchers then looked at people’s job satisfaction, perceptions of organizational culture, levels of collaboration, innovation, and ethical behavior.

“In broad strokes,” says Dweck, “we learned that in each company, there was a real consensus about the mindset. We also learned that a whole constellation of characteristics went with each mindset.” Fixed-mindset companies tended to have a small handful of “star” workers who were highly valued. The rest of the workers worried about failing, pursued fewer innovative projects, kept secrets, cut corners, cheated to try to get ahead, and didn’t feel that superiors had their backs. Supervisors in growth-mindset companies, on the other hand, thought more positively about their employees, rating them as more innovative, willing to take risks, collaborative, and committed to learning and growing, and were more likely to believe people had management potential.

How can an organization promote a growth mindset? There are several key leadership messages, says Dweck:

- We value passion, dedication, growth, and learning, not genius.
- We don’t expect that you’ve arrived here fully formed. We care more that you’re ready to learn.
- We expect that you’ll stretch beyond your comfort zone and take reasonable risks.
- We value process and we reward process – taking on big but reasonable challenges.

- We reward tenacity and grit.
- We reward teamwork.

“So the companies that are thriving are the ones that give this message,” Dweck reports. “And also, my research has shown, contrary to popular opinion, you don’t praise talent. You don’t praise ability. You praise process... People who are praised for talent now worry about doing the next thing, about taking on the hard task, and not looking talented, tarnishing that reputation for brilliance.”

Hiring is obviously crucial – looking less at pedigree than potential, passion for learning, and ability to collaborate. This often means hiring from within. Mentoring and support are also important – putting considerable resources into helping employees grow and develop.

“Talent: How Companies Can Profit from a ‘Growth Mindset’” in *Harvard Business Review*, November 2014 (Vol. 92, #11, p. 28-29); this link contains an interview with Carol Dweck: <http://hbr.org/2014/11/how-companies-can-profit-from-a-growth-mindset/ar/1>

*[Back to page one](#)*

## **2. A Rationale for Annual State Testing**

In this *Education Gadfly* article, Andy Smarick takes note of recent push-back against annual high-stakes testing (Randi Weingarten, former president Bill Clinton, two bills pending in the U.S. House of Representatives) and suggests the following reasons for continuing to give formal assessments every year:

- It says that every student matters.
- It clarifies the standards for each grade level (what gets tested gets taught).
- It gives schools the data to celebrate successes.
- It spotlights economic, racial, and subgroup achievement gaps.
- It allows teachers and school leaders to follow all students’ progress and not be blindsided by bad news about failing students if tests are given less frequently.
- It helps schools tailor interventions for underperforming students, subjects, and grades.
- It gives families the information they need to make the case for necessary changes.
- It prevents schools from “hiding” less-effective teachers in non-tested grades.

“In Defense of Annual Testing” by Andy Smarick in *The Education Gadfly*, October 22, 2014 (Vol. 14, #43), <http://edexcellence.net/articles/in-defense-of-annual-testing>

*[Back to page one](#)*

## **3. Do Reading Tests Measure What We Think They’re Measuring?**

In this *Education Gadfly* article, Robert Pondiscio says, “A test can tell you whether a student has learned to add unlike fractions, can determine the hypotenuse of a triangle, or understands the causes of the Civil War... But reading comprehension is not a skill or body of content that can be taught... Students who are ostensibly ‘poor’ readers can suddenly

comprehend quite well when reading about a subject they know a lot about – even outperforming ‘good’ readers who lack background knowledge the ‘poor’ readers possess.”

After students learn to decode – a skill that *can* be taught and tested – Pondiscio believes that “Students who score well on reading tests are those who have a lot of prior knowledge about a wide range of subjects... That’s the wellspring of mature reading comprehension – not ‘skills’ like making inferences and finding the main idea that do not transfer from one knowledge domain to another.”

“That is why,” Pondiscio continues, “affluent children who enjoy the benefit of educated parents, language-rich homes, and ample opportunities for growth and enrichment come to school primed to do well on reading tests – and why reading scores are hard to move... By treating reading as a collection of content-neutral skills, we make reading tests a minefield for both kids and teachers.” Reading tests are “instructionally insensitive” – they’re only weakly linked to the reading-skill instruction that teachers do in their classrooms. It’s not surprising that NAEP achievement in fourth-grade math has steadily improved but reading – taught by the same teachers – has been on a flat trajectory.

This year’s New York State fifth- and sixth-grade reading tests had passages on BMX bike racing, sailing, the horses and donkeys used to pull carts of ore out of mines, and sea turtles using the Earth’s magnetic field to navigate. Pondiscio quotes the New York State Education Department’s advice for working with students who do poorly: “To help students succeed with questions measuring RI.6.1, instruction can focus on building students’ ability to comprehend grade-level complex texts and identifying specific, relevant evidence that supports an analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text.”

This approach, says Pondiscio, is not likely to improve students’ ability to make meaning of another reading passage with unfamiliar content. Reading tests based on traditional pedagogy, he insists, push teachers “to waste precious time on low-yield activities (practicing inferring; finding the main idea, etc.) that would be better spent building knowledge across subjects.” Holding teachers accountable for student achievement on current reading tests, he says, is “Kafkaesque.”

The Common Core State Standards strongly suggest that knowledge should be coherently and sequentially built within and across grades. But content knowledge is not specified in the standards. “As a practical matter,” says Pondiscio, “standards don’t drive classroom practice. Tests do... Nothing in reading tests – both as currently conceived or anticipated under Common Core – encourages schools or teachers to make urgently needed, long-term investments in coherent knowledge building from grade to grade that will drive language proficiency... [R]eading is not a subject. It’s a *verb*. It’s long past time to recognize that reading tests don’t measure what we think they do.”

What is to be done? Pondiscio lists several options, none of which he believes are likely to happen:

- Test reading every year but make the tests low-stakes.
- Test decoding up to grade 4.

- Substitute curriculum-based tests with reading passages based on topics taught in school.

“Let’s Tell the Truth: High-Stakes Tests Damage Reading Instruction” by Robert Pondiscio in *The Education Gadfly*, October 22, 2014 (Vol. 14, #43), <http://edexcellence.net/articles/lets-tell-the-truth-high-stakes-tests-damage-reading-instruction>

[\*Back to page one\*](#)

#### **4. What Students Aren’t Learning On Their iPads**

In this *Education Week* article, Benjamin Herold reports that the reading achievement gap between advantaged and disadvantaged students may be greater than previously believed because researchers haven’t taken into account SES-based differences in online reading skills. Donald Leu (University of Connecticut) just completed a study of seventh graders (“The New Literacies of Online Research and Comprehension: Rethinking the Reading Achievement Gap”) and found the gap between upper- and lower-income groups is large, amounting to a full year’s worth of learning.

“We need to regularly and consistently show students how to use three critical skills,” says Leu: “Being able to identify the author of information; being able to evaluate the expertise of the author; and being able to evaluate the point of view that’s being expressed on the Web page. The first two are almost never taught. The third tends to be taught, but with offline information, in the form of narratives.”

Leu is concerned that a lot of technology activity in schools – for example, bring your own device programs and the use of apps on iPads – is not addressing this cluster of skills. “Typically these apps are teaching offline reading skills, such as word recognition or vocabulary,” he says. “They’re not teaching critical evaluation of sources on a Web page, or effective e-mail communication, or how to synthesize information from multiple websites to draw a conclusion.”

“Literacy Skills for the Web Showing Gap” by Benjamin Herold in *Education Week*, October 15, 2014 (Vol. 34, #8, p. 1, 11), [www.edweek.org](http://www.edweek.org)

[\*Back to page one\*](#)

#### **5. Advice for Math Teachers Gearing Up for Rigorous Standards**

“Many of us chose mathematics teaching because it was always so neat and clean,” says math consultant Steven Leinwand in this *Mathematics Teacher* article. “Almost always, we arrived at only one numerical answer by using one right procedure that could be easily graded either right or wrong... But, oh, how things have changed!” He offers the following postulates for math teachers adjusting to ambitious new standards:

- *We are being asked to teach in distinctly different ways from how we were taught.*

Parents tend to parent the way they were parented, and teachers tend to teach as they were taught. “We build on what is familiar because the familiar ‘feels right,’” says Leinwand. But the new expectations are unfamiliar territory for many teachers. “We need to increase

opportunities for collegial classroom visits,” he advises, “and we need to increase our reliance on videotapes of what the distinctly different forms of pedagogy look like.”

• *The traditional curriculum was designed to meet societal needs that no longer exist.* New math standards were developed because “society’s needs and expectations for schools have shifted radically,” says Leinwand. “Schools cannot remain perpetuators of the bell curve, where only *some* were expected to survive and *even fewer* to truly thrive; education must be a springboard from which all must attain higher levels.”

• *It is unreasonable to ask a professional to change much more than 10 percent a year, but it is unprofessional to change by much less than 10 percent a year.* Changing one-tenth of one’s practice is about the right amount to ask of ourselves, says Leinwand – “large enough to represent real and significant change but small enough to be manageable.” This might be revamping one curriculum unit a year, changing questioning techniques, or introducing math journals. “Even the most radical proponent of reform should be satisfied with a change of this magnitude in our mathematics classes,” he contends, “and our most cautious and tradition-bound colleagues should be able to retain a real sense of control over such a rate of change.”

• *If you don’t feel inadequate, you’re probably not doing the job.* Just think what math teachers are being asked to do, says Leinwand:

- Use manipulatives and pictures much more frequently.
- Get students regularly working in groups.
- Work with heterogeneous groups.
- Focus on problems, communication, applications, and interdisciplinary work.
- Put more emphasis on statistics, geometry, and discrete mathematics.
- Use assessments that are more authentic and complex.

“Feeling overwhelmed by this torrent of change is neither a weakness nor a lack of professionalism,” he says. “It is an entirely rational response... We must select a few areas of focus and balance the fear and worries we understandably have in some areas with the pride and accomplishment and success we find in other areas. We must accept the inevitability of a sense of inadequacy and use it to stimulate the ongoing growth and learning that characterize the true professional.”

[Note that this article was published before the Common Core, referencing the NCTM standards, but the ideas are still relevant today. K.M.]

“Four Teacher-Friendly Postulates for Thriving in a Sea of Change” by Steven Leinwand in *Mathematics Teacher*, May 2007 (Vol. 100, #9, p. 582-583),

<http://steveleinwand.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/FourPostulatesforChange.pdf>

[\*Back to page one\*](#)

## **6. “Buddy Editing” in a Massachusetts First-Grade Classroom**

In this *Harvard Educational Review* article, veteran Massachusetts teacher Jessie Auger describes how she teaches writing in her first-grade classroom: “I strive to create an environment in which my students are able to do what writers do – to wrestle with the challenges of getting their ideas out of their bodies, onto the page, and into the world. In a

bilingual school where twenty-one of the twenty-five children in my English literacy class speak an English largely influenced by Spanish, this is a demanding but exhilarating endeavor.” Every morning Auger’s students spend an hour working on their writing. “They move purposefully about the room looking through books and poems,” she says, “searching the walls for words they need, consulting dictionaries and encyclopedias for information, discussing ideas with each other, seeking out help with a drawing, or working quietly on their own.”

For years, Auger tried to expose students to correct grammar and spelling through visuals in the classroom, conversations, and literature. She would ask, “Does that look right?” and “Does that sound right?” but noticed that students who didn’t come to school with a strong background in academic English were not helped by her questions. She also tried targeting a few errors to address with the class, based on an analysis of their writing. But she decided this approach “delegates a disproportionate amount of power to me as the teacher and reinforces that I, rather than the children themselves, am the real expert.” Auger also found it impossible to conduct enough one-on-one conferences with students to make a difference. These unsuccessful approaches left her with a question: “How can I structure opportunities for student learning about writing so that the students take the reins of their own learning, side by side with their peers, and forge their own trails?”

What she ultimately discovered was that “buddy editing” was not only manageable but highly effective. “[W]hen I provide students with the tools, environment, structure, and access to the subject matter they need to carry out the task,” says Auger, “independent peer editing is an example of what young learners can do and, in fact, are inclined to do on their own.” She is not heavily involved as they follow their curiosity and work with their peers to create pieces of original writing.

Buddy editing starts in September, when she teaches students how to edit their work. Working with students individually and modeling examples for the whole class, Auger has students reread what they’ve written to be sure they’re satisfied that it says what they wanted to say, doesn’t have gaps, and is comprehensible to the audience. In October and November, she explicitly teaches students how to edit a buddy’s work. One approach is role-playing with a student in front of the class, showing how to sit side by side, read the words out loud together, and pause to clarify or correct. An important ground rule is that only the author can use the eraser and pencil to make changes and that revisions happen only after discussion and careful consideration. She also models prompts like “I don’t understand that part,” “I think we can find that word on the short vowel chart,” and “Why did you draw the rabbit on this page?” Auger encourages students to get into frank (and civil) discussions when they disagree.

A couple of months into the year, students are busily writing on their own. When they finish a piece, they use a checklist to make sure it’s in good shape (spelling, capitals, end punctuation, artwork) and then ask for a Buddy Editor. Auger chooses a partner for each student, trying to put together different combinations of students and pair students with different levels of writing and illustrating proficiency. Each dyad settles onto the rug with a clipboard, pencil, eraser, and editing checklist and works on editing both pieces. Auger

believes it's important for the buddy editing sessions to be reciprocal – it's not about a more-proficient student going through a classmate's work correcting errors. "Hearing one's written words spoken by another voice allows one to gain a new perspective on the work," she says. "My hope is that the editor will benefit as much as the author."

As students buddy-edit, Auger cruises around the classroom listening in and picking up examples of dialogue to share later with the whole group. Of course it's impossible for her to observe all the editing conferences, and this leaves her in the dark about a lot of what's going on. To extend her range, she periodically has a colleague videotape a complete editing session to get insights on how things are going and pick up teaching points she wants to make in class discussions. The article has a ten-page description of an editing discussion between two students drawn from one of the videos.

Not all the editing sessions are as substantive as this one, she admits. Some focus only on correcting errors, others are little more than reading each piece aloud. "What matters most to me," she says, "... is not that the punctuation is all corrected or that a confusing story line is completely untangled. What I want is for both students to turn their full attention to the piece of work, to each other, and to the process of constructing knowledge together. My hope is that they will appropriate the experiences of becoming readers and writers in my classroom toward their own learning interests."

At the end of each day's writing hour, two children read their work aloud to the class, hold up their illustrations, and ask for questions or comments. "This sharing time," says Auger, "is a primary way for my students to learn to talk about writing and to respect their classmates' original texts." She insists that students go beyond saying, "I like your story" and point out specific features of the story – for example, "I like when the bear started singing because I didn't think that was going to happen and it was funny." She also has students ask questions about narrative coherence, style, grammar, vocabulary, author's intent, artwork, and readers' responses.

"Social exchange between two young writers is critical as they construct their understanding of the elements of good writing," Auger concludes. "What they do for each other as peers is something I cannot provide them as an adult. They view the pieces of writing through similar experiences, interests, and developmental understandings. Their work together is a true negotiation of the form, function, and particulars of language. This is how students learn best: wrestling with the elements of subject matter in which they are invested for a real purpose. They raise their own questions, make their own observations, and employ their own ideas in the process of working together."

During buddy editing time, "there is no adult telling children what they should notice, how they should make changes, or which words to fix," she says. "It can be difficult as teachers to allow this level of independence among our students because we are faced with great pressure to move them quickly from one task to another, pushing them to acquire isolated skills in order to attain grade-level expectations. We feel compelled to tell students how to spell words, where to add punctuation, and how to clarify a confusing narrative. However, an extensive body of research, along with my own experience, has taught me that telling students

is the least effective way for them to learn, not to mention the least exciting. So, though messy and unnerving as it may be to allow students to generate their own questions, devise their own investigative routes, and come to their own conclusions, it is the only way to foster genuine intellectual growth and ownership of the learning process.”

“The Author Has the Last Word: Buddy Editing in a First-Grade Classroom” by Jessie Auger in *Harvard Educational Review*, Fall 2014 (Vol. 84, #3, p. 367-384),

<http://her.hepg.org/content/657344324372234v/>

[\*Back to page one\*](#)

## **7. Response to Intervention for Classroom Management**

“Poor classroom management results in lost instructional time, feelings of inadequacy, and stress,” say Kristin Sayeski (University of Georgia) and Monica Brown (University of Nevada/Las Vegas) in this article in *Teaching Exceptional Children*. “In addition, special educators often have the responsibility of behavior change as a primary goal of instruction.” Sayeski and Brown believe RTI is an effective structure for addressing this challenge:

- Tier 1 – Preventive classroom management, including high teacher expectations, clearly communicated rules and norms, established routines and procedures, efficient use of classroom time, stimulating instruction with high levels of student engagement, and positive teacher-student rapport.

- Tier 2 – First-line interventions, including changes to academic instruction (tutoring, literacy lab, review supports), positive reinforcement system, token economy, behavior contracts, remedial intervention, contingency system (loss of privileges, time out, group contingency), home-school note system, and surface management techniques (see below).

- Tier 3 – Intensive, individualized interventions, including functional behavioral assessments, behavior intervention plan, self-monitoring strategies, daily student evaluation, social skills instruction, support groups (study skills, anger management, grief counseling), goal setting and monitoring, crisis management or safety plan, and functional assessment checklist for teachers.

Sayeski and Brown present a list of surface management techniques based on the work of Redl and Winemann (1952). These can be very helpful dealing with minor behavioral infractions:

- Planned ignoring – for example, pencil-tapping may stop when it’s not reinforced;
- Signal interference – ringing a wind chime or flicking the lights to cue students to change their behavior.
- Proximity and touch – moving closer to or lightly touching a student can be a reminder to refocus, refrain, and reengage.
- Using students’ interests – changing examples to reflect student interests can reel them back in, or asking, “Ben, what did you think of the story?”
- Hypodermic affection – A student who is having a bad day can reboot if the teacher shows kindness in a way that’s more than skin deep.
- Using humor – Being funny can defuse a power struggle.

- Hurdle help – Saying “Let’s look at the first problem together” or “Tell me where you are on this assignment” can shift the focus from behavior to instruction.
- Interpretation – A statement like “She did this in response to your action” can clarify the meaning of an event and help a student develop a more rational view of the situation.
- Regrouping – Moving students around in the classroom can help address unwanted behaviors: “I am moving you because the two of you are always talking” or “Today, we are switching partners in order to practice our new strategy.”
- Restructuring – Changing an activity that’s not going as planned.
- Direct appeal – A reminder of the rules will sometimes get students back on track.
- Authoritative *verboten* – A clear “No!” without lecturing, nagging, or rationale.
- Limiting space and tools – During modeling, it’s helpful if students have limited stuff within reach to distract them.
- Antiseptic bouncing – Sending an off-task student out of the room on a neutral errand.
- Permission – Deciding not to make a big deal of an unwanted behavior, which may end up extinguishing it.
- Promises and rewards – These are best delivered randomly or at unexpected times. Sayeski and Brown advise against the overuse of extrinsic rewards.

“Developing a Classroom Management Plan Using a Tiered Approach” by Kristin Sayeski and Monica Brown in *Teaching Exceptional Children*, November/December 2014 (Vol. 47, #2, p. 119-127), <http://bit.ly/1xCwK19>. Sayeski can be reached at [ksayeski@uga.edu](mailto:ksayeski@uga.edu).

[\*Back to page one\*](#)

## **8. RTI in First Grade: When to Move to Tier 2 and 3?**

In this article in *Exceptional Children*, Stephanie Al Otaiba (Southern Methodist University) and six colleagues report on their study of Response to Intervention in 34 first-grade reading classes. The researchers compared two approaches:

- Standard RTI – Teachers gave Tier 1 instruction to all students, assessed progress after eight weeks, and then provided Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions for students who were not successful.
- Dynamic RTI – Teachers did an initial assessment of students and provided immediate Tier 2 or Tier 3 interventions for students who had the weakest reading skills.

The study found that students who received dynamic RTI instruction got off to a much faster start, their advantages increased during the school year, and they ended the study with significantly higher reading performance than students who received standard RTI. “Based on our findings and prior research,” the authors conclude, “there appears converging evidence indicating that it is possible to identify, at the start of first grade, which children will need the most intensive intervention.”

“To Wait in Tier 1 or Intervene Immediately: A Randomized Experiment Examining First-Grade Response to Intervention in Reading” by Stephanie Al Otaiba, Carol Connor, Jessica

Folsom, Jeanne Wanzek, Luana Greulich, Christopher Schatschneider, and Richard Wagner in *Exceptional Children*, October 2014 (Vol. 8, #1, p. 11-27),

<http://ecx.sagepub.com/content/81/1/11.abstract>

[Back to page one](#)

## 9. Which Are More Effective, Traditional or Online Science Textbooks?

In this article in *Educational Researcher*, Jared Robinson, Lane Fischer, David Wiley, and John Hilton III (Brigham Young University) report on their study comparing students who used traditional science textbooks with students who used open- source, online textbooks. The researchers found that students who used open-source textbooks scored .65 points higher on end-of-year state standardized science tests than students using traditional textbooks.

“Although the effect size of the gains was relatively small, and not consistent across all textbooks,” the authors conclude, “the finding that open textbooks can be as effective or even slightly more effective than their traditional counterparts has important considerations in terms of school district policy in a climate of finite educational funding.” They call for further research on the impact of online materials on teaching and learning.

“The Impact of Open Textbooks on Secondary Science Learning Outcomes” by Jared Robinson, Land Fischer, David Wiley, and John Hilton III in *Educational Researcher*, October 2014 (Vol. 43, #7, p. 341-351),

<http://edr.sagepub.com/content/early/2014/09/15/0013189X14550275.abstract>

[Back to page one](#)

## 10. Short Item:

**Online math resources** – Math guru Steve Leinwand has recently updated an extensive list of free math resources – see [www.steveleinwand.com](http://www.steveleinwand.com), click on Publications, and scroll down to Great Online Math Resources.

[Back to page one](#)

© Copyright 2014 Marshall Memo LLC

***Do you have feedback? Is anything missing?***

*If you have comments or suggestions, if you saw an article or web item in the last week that you think should have been summarized, or if you would like to suggest additional publications that should be covered by the Marshall Memo, please e-mail: [kim.marshall48@gmail.com](mailto: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 43 years' experience as a teacher, principal, central office administrator, and writer, lightens the load of busy educators by serving as their "designated reader."

To produce the Marshall Memo, Kim subscribes to 64 carefully-chosen publications (see list to the right), sifts through more than a hundred articles each week, and selects 5-10 that have the greatest potential to improve teaching, leadership, and learning. He then writes a brief summary of each article, pulls out several striking quotes, provides e-links to full articles when available, and e-mails the Memo to subscribers every Monday evening (with occasional breaks; there are 50 issues a year).

## ***Subscriptions:***

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

## ***Website:***

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

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

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

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

## ***Core list of publications covered***

Those read this week are underlined.

American Educational Research Journal  
American Educator  
American Journal of Education  
American School Board Journal  
AMLE Magazine  
ASCA School Counselor  
ASCD SmartBrief/Public Education NewsBlast  
Better: Evidence-Based Education  
Center for Performance Assessment Newsletter  
District Administration  
Ed. Magazine  
Education Digest  
Education Gadfly  
Education Next  
Education Week  
Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis  
Educational Horizons  
Educational Leadership  
Educational Researcher  
Elementary School Journal  
Essential Teacher  
Go Teach  
Harvard Business Review  
Harvard Education Letter  
Harvard Educational Review  
Independent School  
Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk (JESPAR)  
Journal of Staff Development  
Kappa Delta Pi Record  
Knowledge Quest  
Middle School Journal  
NASSP Journal  
Perspectives  
Phi Delta Kappan  
Principal  
Principal Leadership  
Principal's Research Review  
Reading Research Quarterly  
Reading Today  
Responsive Classroom Newsletter  
Rethinking Schools  
Review of Educational Research  
School Administrator  
School Library Journal  
Teacher  
Teachers College Record  
Teaching Children Mathematics  
Teaching Exceptional Children/Exceptional Children  
The Atlantic  
The Chronicle of Higher Education  
The District Management Journal  
The Journal of the Learning Sciences  
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