

# Marshall Memo 316

A Weekly Round-up of Important Ideas and Research in K-12 Education  
December 27, 2009

## In This Issue:

1. [Teacher self-efficacy and adopting new techniques](#)
2. [How instructional coaches can work with resistant teachers](#)
3. [Seven keys to effective professional development](#)
4. [Applying the lessons of \*The Elements of Style\* to teaching](#)
5. [What works in all-boy classes?](#)
6. [Ideas, evidence, and argumentation in science classes](#)
7. Short items: (a) [Virtual college fairs](#); (b) [Alternatives to dropping out](#); (c) [Street games](#); (d) [Newspaper front pages online](#)

## Quotes of the Week

“Teacher self-efficacy is a teacher’s perceived capability to impart knowledge and to influence student behavior, even that of unmotivated or challenging students. A growing body of empirical evidence supports Bandura’s (1977) theory that teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs are related to the effort they invest in teaching, the goals they set, their persistence when things do not go smoothly, and their resilience in the face of setbacks.”

Megan Tschannen-Morgan and Peggy McMaster (see item #1)

“Get started, then get better.”

Robert Eaker and Janel Keating in “Deeply Embedded, Fully Committed” in *Journal of Staff Development*, December 2009 (Vol. 30, #5, p. 57), no e-link

“Like writing, effective teaching occurs in a precarious state of equilibrium. A balance exists between sufficient structure and information to sustain the learner and enough mystery and freedom to engage the student in the learning process.”

Daniel Bergman and Cathlina Bergman (see item #4)

“In becoming ‘a guide on the side’... [teachers] must be careful not to become the ‘slouch on the couch.’”

Daniel Bergman and Cathlina Bergman (*ibid.*)

“[S]tudents who have been able to explore why the wrong idea is wrong have a more secure and deeper understanding of why the right idea is right.”

Jonathan Francis Osborne (see item #6)

---

## 1. Teacher Self-Efficacy and Adopting New Techniques

In this intriguing *Elementary School Journal* article, researchers Megan Tschannen-Moran and Peggy McMaster explore the concept of teacher self-efficacy and report on a study of which of four professional development approaches had the most positive impact.

First, a definition and some research findings. “Self-efficacy, the belief in one’s abilities to accomplish desired outcomes, powerfully affects people’s behavior, motivation, and, ultimately, their success or failure,” say Tschannen-Moran and McMaster. “Without self-efficacy, people do not expend effort in endeavors because they perceive their efforts will be futile. Teacher self-efficacy is a teacher’s perceived capability to impart knowledge and to influence student behavior, even that of unmotivated or challenging students. A growing body of empirical evidence supports Bandura’s (1977) theory that teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs are related to the effort they invest in teaching, the goals they set, their persistence when things do not go smoothly, and their resilience in the face of setbacks.”

The key concept is a sense of competence and control over future events. Positive self-efficacy improves performance, which in turn increases self-efficacy and creates an upward spiral of success. Negative self-efficacy and discouraging experiences undermine effort and success, creating a downward spiral.

But where does self-efficacy originate? Researchers believe that a teacher’s sense of self-efficacy has five sources:

- *Verbal support* – Positive input from colleagues, administrators, and professional development providers can strengthen a teacher’s belief that he or she can perform successfully. Encouragement is especially helpful in challenging situations.
- *Watching others succeed* – Self-efficacy can be bolstered by watching another person of comparable ability successfully performing a task that one is contemplating. “Competent models transmit knowledge and teach observers effective skills and strategies for managing task demands through their behavior and by revealing their thinking about the task at hand,” explain the authors.
- *Mastery experiences* – Performing a task successfully is one of the best ways to develop self-efficacy. Succeeding immediately with few difficulties gives the biggest boost to self-efficacy. Success with setbacks and lots of outside help is less helpful. Failure after lots of effort, not attributable to external events, is worst of all.
- *Body feedback* – Elevated heart and breathing rates, sweating, and trembling hands in the face of a new challenge can undermine a person’s self-efficacy. A more moderate level of

anxiety can actually improve performance by keying the person up for a challenge. Mastery of new skills can produce feelings of accomplishment, pride, and exhilaration.

- *Analyzing the task* – Thinking about a new challenge, a teacher may calculate the difficulty of the task (the students involved, new skills required) compared to his or her perceived capabilities.

Teachers' self-efficacy matters most, say Tschannen-Moran and McMaster, when new programs and materials are introduced, usually through some form of professional development. "Researchers examining teacher attitudes toward the implementation of new instructional practices have frequently found teachers' self-efficacy to be among the most powerful influences on receptivity to change," they write. Teachers with high self-efficacy are more receptive and more likely to be successful, while those with low self-efficacy are fearful and resistant. In some cases, when teachers are persuaded to try new methods and see positive results with their students, their self-efficacy improves. This suggests that to be successful, professional development must simultaneously address teachers' beliefs and improve their practices.

Tschannen-Moran and McMaster explored these ideas by studying four different approaches to training 93 primary-grade teachers in a new literacy method, the Tucker Signing Strategies for Reading. Teachers were divided randomly into four groups, and each received a different PD approach:

- *Treatment 1: Information* – A standard one-time workshop explaining the new method and materials and answering questions (3 hours).
- *Treatment 2: Information plus modeling* – In addition to verbal explanation, the presenter modeled the Tucker methods with second- and third-grade students from the district (3 hours).
- *Treatment 3: Information plus modeling plus practice* – In addition to the methods used in Treatment 2, the presenter gave teachers opportunities to work in groups practicing the Tucker methods (4 hours, 30 minutes).
- *Treatment 4: Information plus modeling plus practice plus coaching* – In addition to the Treatment 3 methods, this group of teachers received personal coaching and feedback in the use of the Tucker methods, both one-on-one and in their classrooms, and had an authentic mastery experience in their own instructional setting (5 hours, 45 minutes).

The researchers measured teachers' general level of self-efficacy and then specifically with respect to classroom management, student engagement, reading instruction, and implementing the Tucker strategies.

What were the results? Teachers receiving Treatment 4 had by far the biggest gains in self-efficacy and did the best job implementing the Tucker methods with students. Teachers in Treatments 1, 2, and 3 did not successfully implement the new methods, and teachers in Treatments 2 and 3 had a *decline* in self-efficacy with respect to teaching reading. This seems to have come from being exposed to a new method and losing some confidence in their ability as reading teachers. Interestingly, teachers in Treatment 1 had a significant rise in general self-

efficacy, but were ineffective implementing the Tucker strategies. This suggests that conventional “sit and git” workshops may boost a superficial type of self-efficacy but have no impact on what teachers actually do in their classrooms.

The authors conclude by saying that their study “demonstrates that verbal persuasion, vicarious experiences, and even a limited mastery experience did not prove to be particularly powerful in creating the conditions to support implementation of a new instructional strategy when they took place in a large-group setting. Furthermore, the results lend support to the importance of an authentic task-specific mastery experience and of individualized verbal persuasion in raising self-efficacy beliefs and supporting implementation of a new teaching strategy. Only in the real setting can a teacher experience a true test of his or her capabilities.”

“Sources of Self-Efficacy: Four Professional Development Formats and Their Relationship to Self-Efficacy and Implementation of a New Teaching Strategy” by Megan Tschannen-Moran and Peggy McMaster in *Elementary School Journal*, December 2009 (Vol. 110, #2, p. 228-245), no e-link available

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

## **2. How Instructional Coaches Can Work with Resistant Teachers**

In this *Journal of Staff Development* article, Widener University (PA) professor Annemarie Jay suggests ways that literacy coaches can deal with teachers who are less than enthusiastic about getting support. It helps if the literacy coach is recognized by peers as an expert teacher and the school is focused on a shared vision of literacy improvement – but even when all this is in place, there still are teachers who don’t want to take advantage of coaching and don’t want a coach in their classroom.

In some cases the push-back is obvious – spoken, written, or body-language resistance. In other cases, teachers’ resistance is indirect – making excuses for not following through on suggestions, not inviting the coach to visit their classrooms, and not providing data on their students’ progress.

Jay believes that teacher resistance has two sources: discomfort and intransigence. Discomfort is most common when the school hasn’t been clear about the coach’s role. Teachers may assume that a visit from the coach means there’s something wrong with the way they are teaching. Teachers may be fearful of change and defensive about time-honored practices they have been using. Teachers may also be self-conscious about aspects of their teaching, particularly classroom management, and fear that the coach will judge and evaluate them.

Intransigent teachers are more difficult to deal with. They may have philosophical disagreements with the coach, harbor low expectations of students, or have such low self-efficacy that they resist any encroachment on their classroom castle. These teachers are particularly suspicious and resistant if they fear that the coach may pass along negative information to the principal.

Jay believes that coaches can overcome these challenges if they follow certain

guidelines and formulate an action plan for building trusting relationships with resistant teachers:

- *Be very clear on the coach's non-evaluative role.* The principal and coach need to say this to the staff more than once and stick to the stated division of labor.

- *Teach first and observe the teacher later.* If the coach's first visit to a classroom is to teach a demonstration lesson, the teacher is the observer and the post-lesson conversation is less threatening.

- *Visit classrooms briefly and informally.* Frequent, low-stakes visits followed by positive comments help build trust and normalize the coaching relationship.

- *Address resistance through open, honest conversations.* Coaches should approach resistant teachers with humility, discuss classroom challenges without preconceptions, and show that they can learn from the teacher and the situation.

- *Engage in professional development and networking.* Coaches should read the abundant literature on instructional coaching and reach out to fellow coaches for ideas on dealing with resistant teachers.

- *Talk to teachers often.* Resistant teachers need lots of one-on-one conversation before and after classroom visits and PD sessions.

“Tackling Resistance” by Annemarie Jay in *Journal of Staff Development*, December 2009 (Vol. 30, #5, p. 57), no e-link; Jay can be reached at [abjay@mail.widener.edu](mailto:abjay@mail.widener.edu).

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

### **3. Seven Keys to Effective Professional Development**

In this *Kappan* article, Chicago-based consultants Robin Fogarty and Brian Pete present seven characteristics of effective PD:

- *It is sustained.* Adult learning occurs best when a professional development initiative is sustained over time, with regularly scheduled team meetings to process material and multiple options for all staff to be engaged. There should be a variety of time-slots (summer, after school, Saturday) and formats (collaborative, independent, face-to-face, remote). “When staff sense that this is a major initiative that is not going away,” say Fogarty and Pete, “teachers are more likely to get on board early and to expend genuine effort.”

- *It is job-embedded.* When teachers know they can get support any time they need it, an initiative is much more likely to succeed. “Peer coaching, expert coaching, teacher facilitators, and lead teachers are needed on site in every building,” say Fogarty and Pete. “...The evidence is clear: Coaching makes a difference.”

- *It enlists teacher teams.* “When teachers put their heads together over student-centered concerns,” say Fogarty and Pete, “that team effort can be the most powerful school improvement tool in the school.” But teams need time, support, goals, facilitation, and protocols to function well.

- *Learning is hands-on and interactive.* Teachers learn best when training includes clear expectations, solid content, and pedagogy that involves working with partners, trios, and table teams to think through and apply concepts.

- *Different modalities are used.* Research suggests that PD should use all appropriate channels, including face-to-face, Internet, web-based, book study groups, action research, data analysis, collaborative planning, reflective questioning, seeing model lessons, and engaging in peer dialogues, journaling, and conferencing.

- *It is practical.* Persuading teachers that training will be useful in their classrooms is one of the best ways to get them engaged. But transfer and application also need to be addressed.

- *It is results-oriented.* When a new initiative makes a positive difference in teachers' classrooms, it has immediate credibility and is much more likely to be sustained.

“Professional Learning 101: A Syllabus of Seven Protocols” by Robin Fogarty and Brian Pete in *Phi Delta Kappan*, December 2009/January 2010 (Vol. 91, #4, p. 32-34), \

<http://www.pdkintl.org/kappan/index.htm>

[Back to page one](#)

#### **4. Applying the Lessons of *The Elements of Style* to Teaching**

In this thoughtful *Kappan* article, Wichita State professor Daniel Bergman and Kansas high-school English teacher Cathlina Bergman celebrate the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the publication of William Strunk's and E.B. White's classic book, *The Elements of Style*, by pulling out some parallel lessons for classroom teaching:

- *Work from a suitable design.* As with writing, good teaching requires planning curriculum units and lessons in a way that foresees and determines the shape of what is to come. At the same time, teachers need to be flexible when unexpected events occur, keeping their eyes on the prize while unraveling student misunderstanding and taking advantage of teachable moments.

- *Don't hog the spotlight.* Good teaching keeps students focused on what they need to learn, not on the teacher as performer. “Teaching is not telling,” say the Bergmans. “Students truly learn when they find meaning in the concepts and attach this understanding to their prior knowledge.” However, the authors caution that in becoming the “guide on the side,” teachers must be careful not to become the “slouch on the couch.” Teaching is demanding, skillful work and passive teaching isn't good teaching.

- *Use language to instruct, not to impress.* Some teachers use unnecessarily pretentious words. “In the classroom environment, stuffiness suffocates learning,” say the Bergmans. “Instructors who use grandiose language confuse their classes and convey an uncaring attitude. They are more interested in their own wealth of knowledge than in their students' understanding.”

- *Don't explain too much.* “[T]eachers who use too many words create bored, inattentive students,” say the Bergmans. “Children will grow deaf to excessive ‘teacher talk’ and will discover that they can quietly pass the time daydreaming.” One of the most difficult

challenges of teaching is structuring learning experiences in which students do most of the talking and thinking and construct meaning themselves. Effective teachers do this by posing questions and challenges and giving illustrations and exemplars, and then giving students space to figure things out. Less is more.

- *At the same time, be clear.* This may seem like the opposite of the injunction to leave the thinking to students, but the Bergmans (and Strunk and White) insist that learning expectations and ultimate goals must be transparent and lucid.

- *Find the right balance.* “Like writing, effective teaching occurs in a precarious state of equilibrium,” conclude the Bergmans. “A balance exists between sufficient structure and information to sustain the learner and enough mystery and freedom to engage the student in the learning process. How much weight one puts on either side of the balance depends on the situation. Occasionally the teacher may first need to provide ample direct instruction up front in order to provide a solid foundation for learning. In most cases, however, students find learning much more meaningful and memorable when they have opportunities to actively explore, investigate, apply, and reflect on their experiences.”

- *Revise and improve.* Reflecting on lessons and units after the fact, teachers should take a deep breath and tweak or rewrite as needed.

“Elements of Stylish Teaching: Lessons from Strunk and White” by Daniel Bergman and Cathlina Bergman in *Phi Delta Kappan*, December 2009/January 2010 (Vol. 91, #4, p. 28-34), <http://www.pdkintl.org/kappan/index.htm>

[Back to page one](#)

## 5. What Works in All-Boy Classes?

In this *Kappan* article, school psychologist Michael Reichert and former headmaster Richard Hawley wade into the debate on boy/girl learning styles and the low achievement of many boys by asserting that some boys are taught well “every day of the school year.” They asked hundreds of grade 7-12 teachers from Canada, New Zealand, Great Britain, South Africa, Australia, and the U.S. to describe a lesson that was particularly effective in their all-boy classes. From nearly a thousand responses, Reichert and Hawley were struck by the following common elements:

- Using games
- Motor activity
- Role play/performance
- Open inquiry
- Teamwork/competition
- Personal realization
- Responsibility for outcomes
- Intrinsically interesting subject matter
- Novelty/drama/surprise

“Regardless of other factors, such as different disciplines, length of tenure, school regions, and cultures,” say the authors, “the similarities among reported practices were profound. Nearly every reported lesson included multiple elements...”

For example, an English teacher in the U.S. describes how he had his boys form a circle and hold hands while he read a passage from *Moby Dick* in which the crew faces danger. “They listen,” reports the teacher. “Slowly, glancing like a dozen Ishmaels from one pair of eyes to the next, they begin to sense the purpose of the exercise. As my reading of the chapter progresses, they themselves become the crew, and they start to feel and then understand the deep brotherhood and mutual dependence that defines one of the central themes of the book. At last, as the chapter ends, I send a squeeze of the hand around the circle, and they release their grips. The physical moment is over, but the lingering stillness signals that the impression has been made.”

A Latin teacher in New Zealand describes a competition he sometimes uses with his 13-14-year-old boys. He puts verb/noun forms for conjugating/declining on the board and challenges boys to answer them. “Each form they get wrong is a point for me, each correct form a point to them,” he says. “I ensure that the game is always close by taking off points for untucked shirts/socks down, etc... It rewards them for getting answers right, which hopefully encourages learning. I build it up, stating that I’ve never lost, and that they could be the first class to beat me, but ‘only if you know your Latin!’”

From teachers’ lesson descriptions, and from a questionnaire administered to hundreds of male students, the authors drew three general conclusions:

- *Boys are relational learners.* In fact, say Reichert and Hawley, the most effective teaching takes place when there is a strong relationship between teacher and student. “In the presence of attentive teachers and their refined lessons,” they write, “boys seemed to find it difficult to resist engaging in learning. They shared stories of being uplifted by their teacher’s humor, passion, and care and of seeking, finding, and submitting themselves to the inspiration of mentors.” Under the umbrella of an effective relationship and basic fairness, a variety of styles seemed to work: no-nonsense, highly structured, kind, and being “a friend.”

- *Effective lessons for boys are transitive.* By this, Reichert and Hawley mean that some element of instruction arouses and holds students’ interest and boosts learning. For example, in an English class on Romeo and Juliet, the teacher had boys learn the basics of stage swordplay. “The activity was highly engaging because it was physically rigorous,” say the authors. “It was dramatic, holding the faint promise of danger; and it was novel. But, as the teachers’ account reveals, it was also transitive to a deeper more enlivened reading of those scenes in which Tybalt slays Mercutio and Romeo slays Tybalt – and to the play as a whole. The active exertions infuse the experience of tackling a dense, rich text with an altogether different kind of energy, appreciation, and attention.” In the same vein, a science teacher in New Zealand taught the principles of momentum, aerodynamics, and friction by staging a race of toy cars powered by CO<sup>2</sup> cartridges.

- *Boys tend to elicit the pedagogy they need.* There is no one right way to teach, say the authors, but there is a self-correcting mechanism at work in all-male classrooms. When

teachers use ineffective methods, boys disengage and/or become disruptive, which leads the best teachers to find content and pedagogy that work better. “Effective adjustments,” say Reichert and Hawley, “will result in better engagement, sustained effort, and mastery on the boys’ part. Their positive responses in turn reinforce and lock into place the better pedagogy. In this manner, teachers committed to boys’ success will reinforce the boys’ adjustments in a continuous, self-correcting cycle.”

So why hasn’t this improvement mechanism resulted in good teaching for all students? Reichert and Hawley believe there are five reasons:

- Boys and girls may elicit different, even contradictory responses from teachers, producing teaching that satisfies neither gender.
- School and district policies may not allow teachers to use the kinds of dramatic pedagogy that will engage boys.
- Teachers may not be open enough to examining and reconsidering practices that aren’t working for boys.
- “Teachers may lack the empathy or openness to consider the causes of student responses,” write the authors, “and instead proceed according to a prescribed method or an eccentrically established personal approach, punishing or even banishing those who resist or disrupt.”
- Some students may have such challenging home circumstances and other concerns that they aren’t able to engage successfully in even the most effective teaching.

“Reaching Boys: An International Study of Effective Teaching Practices” by Michael Reichert and Richard Hawley in *Phi Delta Kappan*, December 2009/January 2010 (Vol. 91, #4, p. 35-40), <http://www.pdkintl.org/kappan/index.htm>

[Back to page one](#)

## **6. Ideas, Evidence, and Argumentation in Science Classes**

In this *Kappan* article, Stanford professor Jonathan Francis Osborne says that students’ interest in science is being killed by classes and tests that require them to memorize long lists of disconnected facts. He believes that the science curriculum is determined too much by scientists trying to produce a new generation of scientists, and that there isn’t enough of the kind of overarching narrative and argumentative back-and-forth that might capture the interest of other students. “Rarely are students able to explore how we know what we know,” he says, “how such knowledge came to be, and why it matters.”

The irony, Osborne continues, is that of all disciplines, science prides itself on escaping the shackles of conventional wisdom – “yet it is taught in a manner that is the antithesis of the spirit of open inquiry and invention that it has fostered.” In addition, few science classrooms are teaching the kind of knowledge synthesis and analytical thinking that students need to enhance America’s international competitiveness.

What is to be done? Osborne cites research on the merits of getting students to construct arguments and counter-arguments and consider several possible outcomes as a way of developing reasoning ability and conceptual understanding. “An important finding in this

research,” he says, “is that students who have been able to explore why the wrong idea is wrong have a more secure and deeper understanding of why the right idea is right.” For example, to help students understand what makes day and night, the teacher might invite them to refute these ideas: that the earth is the center of the universe; that if you jump up you will not come down in the same spot because of the earth’s rotation; and that a person standing on the equator, traveling at over 1,000 miles per hour, would be flung into space.

The argument-centered approach seems illogical to many science teachers, who see their job as persuading students of the validity of scientific explanations. But many students aren’t engaged by the conventional approach, says Osborne. We need to shift the emphasis to explanatory theories, “the creative ideas that scientists have dreamt up, for example, that all stable matter consists of only 92 atoms or that the universe started with a big bang. Judging which theory is best, assessing the significance of experimental evidence, or simply determining which data and how much to collect are critically dependent on argument.”

Osborne created the following 7<sup>th</sup>-grade activity with a colleague. Students are presented with two alternative graphs showing how the temperature rises as ice is heated, turning first into water and then into steam. One graph shows a steady linear increase, the second shows plateaus at the transition points from ice to water and water to steam. Students are also given basic information about matter and particles and asked to debate which graph is accurate, making arguments and counter-arguments. “Embedded in such an activity,” says Osborne, “is an opportunity to show students that ambiguity is a normal rather than an exceptional feature of science.”

Osborne cautions that argument-oriented science activities must be well-structured, with clearly defined goals and outcomes. Teachers need to provide genuine support for independent thinking and allow students to explore concepts in depth. Teachers also need to understand that the skills of reasoning and argumentation are domain-specific – that is, students who have learned to argue successfully in science classes don’t carry that skill over to history and literature classes.

Osborne and his colleagues have worked on DVD-based materials to support science teachers in making the transition to teaching about ideas, evidence, and arguments (the IDEAS pack, Osborne, Erduran, and Simon, 2004). Their materials provide these key elements:

- Why argumentation matters in science;
- How to structure small-group discussion so it is productive;
- Instructional strategies to teach argumentation;
- Resources for teachers;
- How to distinguish strong from weak arguments;
- Ways to model arguments for students.

“An Argument for Arguments in Science Classes” by Jonathan Francis Osborne in *Phi Delta Kappan*, December 2009/January 2010 (Vol. 91, #4, p. 62-65), <http://www.pdkintl.org/kappan/index.htm>

[Back to page one](#)

## 7. Short Items:

(a) *Virtual college fairs* – CollegeWeekLive offers two virtual college tours a year with “booths”, videos, etc. The next one isn’t until March, but there’s a one-day event this January on paying for college. See <http://www.collegeweeklive.com> for details.

Spotted in “Bulletin Board” in *Principal Leadership*, December 2009 (Vol. 10, #4, p. 6)

[Back to page one](#)

(b) *Alternatives to dropping out* – This website answers the kinds of questions that potential dropouts are posing, with state-by-state resources, online high schools, alternative diplomas, daycare assistance for teen mothers, etc.: <http://www.dropoutanswers.com>.

Spotted in “Bulletin Board” in *Principal Leadership*, December 2009 (Vol. 10, #4, p. 7)

[Back to page one](#)

(c) *Street games* – This website has information on traditional games – hopscotch, halfball, etc. – with a short history of each. There’s also a wiki for readers to contribute new games. <http://www.streetplay.com>.

Spotted in “Bulletin Board” in *Principal Leadership*, December 2009 (Vol. 10, #4, p. 7)

[Back to page one](#)

(d) *Newspaper front pages* – This website posts the front pages of newspapers from around the world each day: <http://www.newseum.org/todaysfrontpages>.

Spotted in “References and Resources” in *Essential Teacher*, Oct. 2009 (Vol. 6, #3-4, p. 54)

[Back to page one](#)

© Copyright 2009 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.marshall8@verizon.net](mailto: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 37 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 about 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
- 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 Journal of Education  
American School Board Journal  
ASCD, CEC SmartBriefs, Daily EdNews  
Catalyst Chicago  
Changing Schools (McREL)  
Ed. Magazine  
EDge  
Education Digest  
Education Gadfly  
Education Next  
Education Week  
Educational Leadership  
Educational Researcher  
Edutopia  
Elementary School Journal  
Essential Teacher (TESOL)  
Harvard Business Review  
Harvard Education Letter  
Harvard Educational Review  
JESPAR  
Journal of Staff Development  
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  
Teacher Magazine (online)  
Teachers College Record  
The Atlantic Monthly  
The Language Educator  
The New Yorker  
The Reading Teacher  
Theory Into Practice  
Tools for Schools/The Learning Principal