Marshall Memo 453

A Weekly Round-up of Important Ideas and Research in K-12 Education
September 24, 2012

In This Issue:

Quotes of the Week

"My point here is that even under ideal circumstances, public-school teaching is one of the hardest jobs a person can do. Most sensible people know that."

Garret Keizer in "Getting Schooled: The Re-education of an American Teacher" in *Harper's Magazine*, September 2011, http://harpers.org/archive/2011/09/0083591

"To design a school curriculum backwards from the goal of autonomous transfer requires a deliberate and transparent plan for helping the student rely less and less on teacher hand-holding and scaffolds."

Jay McTighe and Grant Wiggins (see item #5)

"Presidents fail because not to fail would require, in the age of modern communications and global responsibilities, a range of native talents and learned skills no real person has ever possessed. These include 'smarts' in the normal sense – the analytical ability to cope with the stream of short- and long-term decisions that come at a president nonstop… A president needs rhetorical clarity and eloquence, so that he can explain to publics at home and around the world the intent behind his actions… A president needs empathy and emotional intelligence… He needs to be confident but not arrogant; open-minded but not a weather vane; resolute but still adaptable; historically minded but highly alert to the present; visionary but practical; personally disciplined but not a prig or martinet. He should be physically fit, disease-resistant, and capable of being fully alert at a moment's notice when the phone rings at 3 a.m. – yet also able to sleep each night, despite unremitting tension and without chemical aids. Ideally he would be self-aware enough that, in the center of a system that treats him as emperor-god, he could still recognize his own defects and try to offset them."

James Fallows in "Obama Explained", *The Atlantic*, March 2012, http://bit.ly/NXnjSW

1. The MET Project Combines Three Measures for Teacher Evaluation

In this *Education Next* article, Harvard professor Thomas Kane describes the work of the Gates-funded Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) project, which, under his direction, is "searching for tools to save the world from perfunctory teacher evaluation." MET's 2012 report recommends that three tools should be used to evaluate teachers – test-score gains, classroom observations, and student surveys – to compensate for the built-in weaknesses of each. Here is Kane's analysis of their strengths and shortcomings:

• *Test-score gains* – Looking at a teacher's track record of producing student-achievement gains is better than the other two measures at signaling whether a teacher will get similar gains in the future, especially if the same test is used. The correlation between a teacher's value-added in one year with another is .48 in math and .36 in English language arts. Interestingly, MET researchers found that gains on lower-level multiple-choice tests correlated well with gains on higher-level constructed-response tests and with students' success in non-cognitive areas. But value-added analysis of test scores has significant weaknesses: only about one quarter of teachers work in grades with standardized ELA and math tests; the scores that are available don't provide much help in improving classroom practices; and ELA scores are considerably less reliable than math scores.

• *Classroom observations* – The MET researchers hired and trained observers and studied the efficacy of six different rubrics to score 7,500 classroom videotapes. Observation of lessons did better than the other two measures at improving classroom practice, especially if the observers were well trained and honest with their feedback. But lesson evaluations have numerous disadvantages: the evidence of impact on student achievement is unproven; classroom creativity may be stifled if teachers feel they have to conform to one rubric's definition of good teaching; there's considerable variation in ratings from lesson to lesson and observer to observer; and getting several observations by several different observers, which MET considers essential to reliability, is expensive.

• *Student surveys* – MET researchers administered the Tripod survey to students in grades 4-9 (see item #3 below), making sure students trusted that their feedback was confidential. The questions, developed by Ron Ferguson of Harvard and his colleagues, ask students to rate their teachers on a 5-4-3-2-1 scale on specific, observable characteristics, for example:

- In this class, we learn to correct our mistakes.
- Our class stays busy and does not waste time.

- Everybody knows what they should be doing and learning in this class.

Data from the surveys showed that students see clear differences among teachers, and ratings of teachers were quite consistent across different groups of students (.66 correlation). Students' evaluations of their teachers were a better predictor of ELA and math achievement gains than classroom observations, but not as robust as value-added test-score analysis. "Even if the typical student is less discerning than a trained adult," says Kane, "the ability to average over many students (rather than one or two adults), and having students experience 180 days of instruction (rather than observe two or three lessons), obviously improves reliability." Student surveys have the additional advantage of being quite inexpensive.

Kane uses the analogy of the way his 6-year-old son picks a team of superheroes with different strengths: the way to deal with the various strengths and weaknesses of these three approaches to teacher evaluation is to *use all three*. Combining test-score analysis, classroom observation, and student surveys produces evaluations that are less volatile and have greater predictive power. Plotting predictive power against reliability (see the graph in the linked article below), combined ratings are significantly better than any single measure. The MET team weighted the three tools .758, .042, and .200 respectively. (Although classroom observations were given the least weight, the team hopes that feedback to teachers will end up being an important contributor to improved teaching and learning.) "The use of multiple measures not only spreads the risk but also provides opportunities to detect manipulation or gaming," says Kane. It also allows administrators to take a closer look when results from the three tools don't line up – for example, a teacher might be using unconventional classroom methods that don't produce high rubric scores, but still show high student achievement value-added.

"Capturing the Dimensions of Effective Teaching" by Thomas Kane in *Education Next*, Fall 2012 (Vol. 12, #4, p. 34-41),
http://educationnext.org/capturing-the-dimensions-of-effective-teaching

Back to page one

2. Cincinnati's Intensive Teacher-Evaluation System Gets Results

In this *Education Next* article, Eric Taylor (Stanford University doctoral student) and John Tyler (Brown University professor) report on their research on evaluations of mid-career Cincinnati teachers using multiple, highly structured classroom observations by experienced peer teachers and administrators. Their aim was to see if giving teachers specific, individualized information about their work would improve teaching and learning by:

- Holding up a mirror to teachers about what they do in the classroom;
- Encouraging teachers to analyze their practice; and
- Creating conversations with colleagues about effective practices.

Looking at student-achievement results, Taylor and Tyler found that students did markedly better on standardized math tests (up 4.5 percentile points) the year teachers were evaluated, and continued to improve in the next few years. The biggest gains were made by teachers whose performance was weakest beforehand. Taylor and Tyler believe this shows teachers can

still make dramatic improvements after their formative years in the classroom – and that improved teacher evaluation may be a new portal for teacher professional development.

Cincinnati's Teacher Evaluation System (TES), begun in 2000-01, involves four classroom observations during the year (this occurs every five years for tenured teachers). Three observations are conducted by a trained peer evaluator from another school and one by the building principal or another administrator. Teachers are told which week the first evaluation will take place; the others are unannounced. Evaluators use a modification of Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching rubric, scoring teachers on a 4-3-2-1 scale. Teachers receive written feedback on each observation and meet with the observer at least once during their evaluation year. At the end of the year, teachers receive a summative score in each of the domains of the rubric, and these can have job consequences.

Taylor and Tyler report that the summative Cincinnati scores show some of the same "leniency" as teacher evaluation across the country: 90 percent of teachers get summative scores in the top two performance levels. But the detailed rubric scores are less lenient, with more scores at Level 2 and 1. "We hypothesize that this micro-level evaluation feedback is more important to lasting improvements than the final, overall TES scores," say the authors.

Taylor and Tyler raise some sobering questions: the infrequency of Cincinnati's evaluations (every five years), the expense of training the peer evaluators, and the loss of those high-performing teachers to their students when they are doing peer evaluations. But the authors argue that the net effect is positive, since each peer evaluator is having a very positive effect on 10-15 teachers a year and the gains continue for several years.

"American public schools have been under new pressure from regulators and constituents to improve teacher performance," conclude Taylor and Tyler. "To date, the discussion has focused primarily on evaluation systems as sorting mechanisms, a means to identify the lowest-performing teachers for selective termination… In recent years, the consensus among policymakers and researchers has been that after the first few years on the job, teacher performance, at least as measured by student test-score growth, cannot be improved… Our work suggests optimism that, while costly, well-structured evaluation systems can not only serve this sorting purpose but can also enhance education through improvements in teacher effectiveness."

"Can Teacher Evaluation Improve Teaching?" by Eric Taylor and John Tyler in *Education Next*, Fall 2012 (Vol. 12, #4, p. 78-84),
http://educationnext.org/can-teacher-evaluation-improve-teaching/

Back to page one

3. Using Student Survey Data As Part of Teachers' Evaluations

In this thoughtful article in *The Atlantic*, Amanda Ripley reports on the increasing use of anonymous student surveys as one factor in teachers' evaluations. Last school year, about 250,000 students took surveys designed to capture what they thought of their teachers and the classroom culture they created. Research has shown, says Ripley, that "if you asked kids the right questions, they could identify, with uncanny accuracy, their most – and least – effective

teachers… Their survey answers, it turned out, were more reliable than any other known measure of teacher performance – including classroom observations and student test-score growth."

Several school districts are experimenting with student surveys and deciding whether the results should be used for high-stakes decisions about teachers – pay, promotion, or dismissal. Ripley was given permission to observe the survey process in the Washington, D.C. schools, a district that is also using more-intensive classroom visits and student test-score gains as part of the evaluation process. Use of test scores hasn't been well received by teachers in D.C. and other districts. "Most teachers do not consider test-score data a fair measure of what students have learned," says Ripley. "Complex algorithms that adjust for students' income and race have made test-score assessments more fair – but are widely resented, contested, or misunderstood by teachers." In addition, only about 15% of D.C. teachers have test-score data, begging the question of how the other 85% will be judged. Even if all teachers had value-added data, there's the question of how the feedback will help improve instruction. Surveys, on the other hand, "focus on the means, not the ends," says Ripley, "giving teachers tangible ideas about what they can fix right now, straight from the minds of the people who sit in front of them all day long."

A decade ago, Harvard economics professor Ron Ferguson began to study the black-white achievement gap in Shaker Heights, Ohio. He suspected that important forces were at work in classrooms that teachers were unaware of, and began to administer early versions of student surveys. To his surprise, students of all racial groups had quite similar assessments of their teachers. "In one classroom, kids said they worked hard, paid attention, and corrected their mistakes," says Ripley. " They liked being there, and they believed that the teacher cared about them. In the next classroom, the very same kids reported that the teacher had trouble explaining things and didn't notice when students failed to understand a lesson." School officials in Shaker Heights found the data exceptionally helpful, but back at Harvard, other academicians ignored Ferguson's work.

Then the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) Project, headed by Ferguson's colleague Thomas Kane (see summary #1 above), decided to use a shorter version of the student survey as one of three factors in its study of teacher evaluation. Looking at the data, MET researchers found that math teachers who received the highest ratings from their students delivered about six additional months of achievement. "Students were better than trained adult observers at evaluating teachers," says Ripley. "This wasn't because they were smarter but because they had months to form an opinion, as opposed to 30 minutes. And there were dozens of them, as opposed to a single principal. Even if one kid had a grudge against a teacher or just blew off the survey, his response alone couldn't sway the average."

Ferguson looked at 199,000 surveys and found that fewer than half of one percent of students show evidence of not taking the questions seriously. The overwhelming majority of students find the questions interesting; in addition, students can't always tell which is the "right" answer, so even students who are trying to ding a teacher might not know how to do so.

Student survey data turn out to be much less volatile than test-score gains; they deliver clear feedback to teachers across classrooms and from year to year.

A large part of the validity of surveys lies in the questions Ferguson and his colleagues have written and revised over the years. Students are not asked whether they *like* their teachers or whether their teachers are *nice*. Instead, they are asked to rate their teachers anonymously on five-point scale with statements like these:

- Students in this class treat the teacher with respect.
- My classmates behave the way my teacher wants them to.
- Our class stays busy and doesn't waste time.
- In this class, we learn a lot almost every day.
- In this class, we learn to correct our mistakes.

Ferguson's and MET's research shows that caring is not the most important correlate of student achievement (as many teachers believe); what lines up with student achievement gains is control over the classroom and academic rigor and challenge. "As most of us remember from our own school days," says Ripley, "those two conditions did not always coexist: some teachers had high levels of control, but low levels of rigor."

Having attained academic visibility via MET, student surveys have become a hot item in the national teacher-evaluation debate. Last year, Memphis became the first district to tie student survey data to teacher evaluation (counting 5 percent). The New Teacher Project used student surveys to evaluate 460 of the program's 1,006 teachers. In Pittsburgh, all students took the survey last year, and the district may override union objections and use the data as part of teachers' evaluations. Thomas Kane advocates counting survey data for 20-30 percent of teachers' evaluations – a big enough proportion to be taken seriously but not so large that teachers are tempted to game the system by pandering to students or pressuring them to give high ratings.

Ferguson is discouraged by how few teachers look at their survey data – only about one-third so far. Perhaps more teachers would if the stakes were higher. He urges school districts to give the survey multiple times before making it count toward high-stakes evaluations.

Interestingly, Ferguson and other Harvard professors are evaluated partly on student surveys, which are a factor in salary discussions and promotion reviews. He says he dreads looking at the data after every course he teaches, but admits there are areas where he has made changes in his pedagogy in response to student feedback – and others where he's flat-out rejected students' suggestions.

What matters with surveys – in universities and K-12 schools – is the quality of the questions, how carefully the surveys are administered (students have to be sure their comments are anonymous), and what instructors do with the data. Ferguson's research shows little variation between students' opinions across racial lines and between students who got high grades and low grades. But more-affluent students tend to be more critical of their teachers than students from lower-SES homes. Ferguson also believes students as young as kindergarten

give quite reliable data if the questions are read aloud and their regular teacher is not in the classroom.

How do students react to being asked to evaluate their teachers? Almost all take the surveys seriously. "They should've done this since I was in eighth grade," said one D.C. high-school student. But there's some skepticism about how the results will be used. Another high-school student in the nation's capital said, "Everybody knows the good teachers from the ones who don't really want to be in the job… I care about the change the results bring. If I come back in five years and some crappy teacher is still sitting at that crappy desk, then what was the point of the survey?"

"Why Kids Should Grade Teachers" by Amanda Ripley in *The Atlantic*, October 2012, http://bit.ly/RNtChK

Back to page one

4. Dealing with Eight Types of Difficult and Resistant Staff

In this helpful article in *Principal*, John Eller (St. Cloud State University) and Sheila Eller (a Minnesota elementary principal) suggest strategies for working with negative staff members who, even if they are small in number, can have a major impact on morale and school effectiveness. The authors suggest analyzing why a person might be resistant to change (Are they losing something important? Have they had negative experiences with change in the past?) and choosing which venue is best for addressing their resistance to change. If it's a face-to-face "difficult conversation", Eller and Eller say it's important to set a serious tone, clearly describe the problem with specific examples, tell the person exactly what needs to be changed or addressed, and describe how you will follow up. "The most successful difficult conversations are well planned, clear, and let the employee know that the principal means business," they say.

Eller and Eller go on to describe eight types of difficult and resistant colleagues and possible strategies with each:

• *Underminers* – Characteristics: Say they will comply when they're with you, then criticize and fail to implement behind your back. Strategies: Give everyone a chance to share concerns in private and public; check on implementation in their classrooms; confront noncompliance in a difficult conversation.

• *Contrarians* – Characteristics: Believe that if they don't speak up, no one else will; ignore other perspectives. Strategies: Structure pro-and-con discussions with all staff about new ideas; ask that an idea or strategy be discussed with respect to its impact on teaching and learning; confront the behavior in a difficult conversation.

• *Recruiters* – Characteristics: Try to win over others to their point of view; drop the names of those who, they say, agree with them. Strategies: Help others develop the strength to resist being recruited; challenge recruiters to be specific about those who supposedly agree with them; confront the behavior in a difficult conversation.

• *The challenged* – Characteristics: Believe they're doing a good job and don't need to change; cover up their lack of knowledge. Strategies: Ask them specific questions to see if they

truly understand what's being proposed; determine what information is missing and provide opportunities for them to learn the required skills, which might include coaching, peer modeling, and conferencing.

• *Retired on the job* – Characteristics: Are open about not being motivated to change or improve. Strategies: Say you understand their situation but state your expectations about the work that is required; follow up with classroom visits.

• *Resident experts* – Characteristics: Broadcast their knowledge about every issue; when they make mistakes, blame others or outside circumstances; make excuses when you want to observe them implementing new ideas or techniques. Strategies: Privately ask them specific questions to assess their knowledge; hold them accountable when they make errors; confront the behavior in a difficult conversation.

• *Unelected representatives* – Characteristics: Claim to represent a group or viewpoint without others' permission. Strategies: Ask the colleagues they claim to represent if they are in agreement; confront the behavior in a difficult conversation; conduct open conversations about the issues in which everyone has a chance to speak.

• *Whiners and complainers* – Characteristics: Find fault with everything; fail to take responsibility for issues in their classrooms or professional practice; go overboard in talking about issues and problems. Strategies: Hold pro-and-con conversations in which positive ideas as well as concerns are aired; confront in a difficult conversation; don't accept irrational explanations; ask them to reframe the situation and reduce the melodrama.

"Working Productively with Difficult and Resistant Staff" by John Eller and Sheila Eller in *Principal*, September/October 2012 (Vol. 92, #1, p. 28-31), www.naesp.org

Back to page one

5. McTighe and Wiggins on Implementing the Common Core Standards

In this privately circulated paper, backwards-design gurus Jay McTighe and Grant Wiggins draw on their recent work with school districts to suggest five big ideas about how the Common Core State Standards translate to classroom practice. "We highlight potential misconceptions in working with the standards," they say, "and offer recommendations for designing a coherent curriculum and assessment system for realizing their promise."

• *Big Idea #1: The Common Core Standards need to be read carefully*. "We already do all of this," is a frequent reaction to the new standards. In fact, say McTighe and Wiggins, they contain significant departures from existing curriculum with the ultimate aim of preparing all students for college and career success. "Merely trying to retrofit the Standards to typical teaching and testing practices will undermine the effort," they say. School leaders shouldn't just hand grade-level expectations to each teacher; they need to convene staff and carefully read the "front matter" with an essential question in mind: *What are the new distinctions in these Standards and what do they mean for our practice?*

For example, the ELA standards call for a better balance between informational and literary texts and stress the use of text-based evidence to support argumentation in writing and speaking. The math standards focus on a smaller set of conceptually larger ideas that spiral

across the grades, versus "covering" numerous skills absent the big picture. "Failure to understand the Standards and adjust practices accordingly will likely result in the 'same old, same old' teaching with only superficial connections to the grade-level Standards," say McTighe and Wiggins.

• *Big Idea #2: Standards are not curriculum*. In other words, the Common Core State Standards are the *what*, not the *how to*; they specify outcomes in ELA and math without dictating teaching methods. It's up to educators to design engaging, effective teaching methods and materials to get their students to the standards.

• *Big Idea #3: Standards need to be "unpacked" to create a macro curriculum blueprint*. McTighe and Wiggins suggest that states or districts break the standards into four broad categories (Massachusetts and Pennsylvania have already begun this process):

(a) Long-term transfer goals – What we want students to be able to do when they confront new and sometimes complex problems inside and outside of school;

(b) Overarching understandings – Important themes that students will encounter across the grades under a variety of topics – for example, in ELA: Writers don't always say things directly or literally; sometimes they convey their ideas indirectly in metaphor, satire, or irony. In math, mathematicians create models to interpret and predict the behavior of real-world phenomena, and these models have limits and sometimes distort or misrepresent reality.

(c) Overarching essential questions – for example, in ELA: What is this text really about? What's the theme, the main idea, the moral? How do you "read between the lines"?

(d) A set of recurring cornerstone tasks – These should be embedded in the curriculum and get students to apply their knowledge and skills in authentic and relevant contexts, using creativity, technology, and teamwork. "Like the game in athletics or the play in theater, teachers teach toward these tasks without apology," say McTighe and Wiggins.

• *Big Idea #4: A coherent curriculum is mapped backwards from desired performances*. "The key to avoiding an overly discrete and fragmented curriculum is to design backward from complex performances that require content," say McTighe and Wiggins. "Thus, the first question for curriculum writers is not: What will we teach and when should we teach it? Rather, the initial question for curriculum development must be goal focused: Having learned key content, what will students be able to do with it?... One could simply parcel out lists of discrete grade-level standards and topics along a calendar while completely ignoring the long-term goal of transfer… Such traditional scope-and-sequencing of curriculum reinforces a 'coverage' mentality and reveals a misconception: i.e., that teaching bits of content in a logical and specified order will somehow add up to the desired achievements called for in the Standards… To design a school curriculum backwards from the goal of autonomous transfer requires a deliberate and transparent plan for helping the student rely less and less on teacher hand-holding and scaffolds… Accordingly, we should see an increase, by design, in problem- and project-based learning, small-group inquiries, Socratic Seminars, and independent studies as learners progress through the curriculum across the grades." McTighe and Wiggins also emphasize that the Common Core Standards don't have to be taught in the sequence in which they are written.

• *Big Idea #5: The standards come to life through assessments*. At their core, the new standards are a set of criteria for building and testing local assessments, say the authors. Appendix B and C in the ELA standards spell out the degree of text difficulty students must be able to handle, what criteria their writing must meet, and the kinds of performance tasks that will serve as evidence of mastery. Similarly, the mathematics standards set a clear goal – being able to solve real-world problems. The standards shouldn't be tested one by one; rather, rich, complex performance tasks can assess a number of standards. These are the kinds of assessments currently being designed by the PARCC and Smarter Balanced consortia.

"From Common Core Standards to Curriculum: Five Big Ideas" by Jay McTighe and Grant Wiggins (September 2012)

Back to page one

6. Nine Ways to Maximize Differentiation in Classrooms

In this article in *Principal*, Bill Brown (Capella University), Patrick Tucker (Cincinnati assistant principal), and Thomas Williams (Sacramento principal) list ways that differentiation can be maximized:

• *Universal design of lessons* – Ensuring that all students are engaged by a variety of instructional strategies, with a mix of direct instruction, reading relevant material, audiovisual aids, demonstration, discussion, hands-on experience, checking for understanding, and peer reteaching.

• *Cooperative learning* – Getting students working in groups of 2-5 on structured activities that require students to experience different roles, become positively interdependent, get formative feedback from the teacher, and be accountable for results.

• *Questioning* – Asking questions at different Bloom's levels and involving all students in answering.

• *Individual attention* – Working with students one-on-one as well as working with the whole class and small groups.

• *Classroom libraries* – Having a variety of reading and interest levels in the room's book and magazine collection.

• *Classroom environment* – Arranging desks and other furniture to allow students to work in groups and give the teacher easy access to students (versus the rigid desks-in-rows format).

• *Technology* – Making good use of computers, smartphones, tablets, and software to give all students a chance to succeed.

• *Special-education plans* – Being aware of students' unique needs and planning curriculum and instruction to maximize student success.

• *Additional staff* – Making full use of co-teachers, aides, parent volunteers, and others to increase individual attention, and giving teacher teams the time to plan together.

"9 Practices of Second-Order Schools" by Bill Brown, Patrick Tucker, and Thomas Williams in *Principal*, September/October 2012 (Vol. 92, #1, p. 32-35), www.naesp.org

Back to page one

7. Academic Gains from a Program Teaching Social-Emotional Skills

In this *Education Week* article, Jaclyn Zubrzycki reports on a three-year study of Responsive Classroom, a social-emotional skills program. Upper-elementary students whose teachers used the program with fidelity did significantly better on standardized math and reading tests than students who did not have the program. Responsive Classroom works to improve how students manage their emotions and interactions with others, largely through teachers' language and modeling of expectations.

Sara Rimm-Kaufman, the lead author of the study, believes that one of the key factors leading to improved academic performance is that students are encouraged to pick among different activities to accomplish the same learning goals. Schools that implemented the program with fidelity had strong leadership from the principal and faculty buy-in, compared to reluctant implementation in schools without strong leadership, where teachers said the program was one of many being "thrown at them."

"A lot of people believe that we just don't have time for social skills," says Steven Elliott of Arizona State University/Tempe, "and yet the data continue to show it's a great investment."

"Researchers Link 'Responsive' Classes to Learning Gains" by Jaclyn Zubrzycki in *Education Week*, Sept. 19, 2012 (Vol. 32, #4, p. 8), www.edweek.org; the study is "Efficacy of Responsive Classroom Approach: Results from a Three Year, Longitudinal Randomized Control Trial" by Sara Rimm-Kaufman et al., http://bit.ly/SoxbWT

Back to page one

Do you have feedback? Is anything missing?

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

About the Marshall Memo

Mission and focus:

This weekly memo is designed to keep principals, teachers, superintendents, and others very well-informed on current research and effective practices in K-12 education. Kim Marshall, drawing on 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 44 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 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
- 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

Publications covered

Those read this week are underlined.

American Educational Research Journal
American Educator
American Journal of Education
American School Board Journal
ASCD, CEC SmartBriefs, Daily EdNews
Better Evidence-Based Education
EDge
Education Digest
Education Gadfly
Education Next
Education Week
Educational Leadership
Educational Researcher
Elementary School Journal
Essential Teacher (TESOL)
Harvard Business Review
Harvard Education Letter
Harvard Educational Review
JESPAR
Journal of Staff Development
Kappa Delta Pi Record
Language Learner (NABE)
Middle Ground
Middle School Journal
New York Times
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
Teachers College Record
Teaching Children Mathematics
The Atlantic Monthly
The Chronicle of Higher Education
The Language Educator
The New Yorker
The Reading Teacher
The School Administrator
Theory Into Practice