

Marshall Memo 439

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

June 4, 2012

In This Issue:

1. [Learning to be “smart” in kindergarten](#)
2. [Keys to increasing students’ motivation](#)
3. [Incorporating social and emotional learning in literature classes](#)
4. [Can cell phones and social media be useful classroom tools?](#)
5. [What makes so many kids fat?](#)

Quotes of the Week

“You’re in big school now and in big school we cry quietly.”

A teaching assistant to a kindergarten boy crying after being reprimanded (see item #1)

“All those involved in the institution of schooling help to shape who we think we are, who others think we are, and who we think we can become.”

Beth Hatt (see item #1)

“If students aren’t motivated, it is difficult, if not impossible, to improve their academic achievement, no matter how good the teacher, curriculum, or school is. Moreover, unmotivated students can disengage other students from academics, which can affect the environment of an entire classroom or school.”

Alexandra Usher and Nancy Kober (see item #2)

“Discipline problems, poor interpersonal relationships, and poor academic achievement are interrelated.”

Zipora Schechtman and Mary Abu Yaman (see item #3)

“Despite the educational potential of computers, the reality is that their use for education or meaningful content creation is minuscule compared to their use for pure entertainment. Instead of closing the achievement gap, they’re widening the time-wasting gap.”

Vicky Rideout, author of a Kaiser Foundation study on children’s use of technology, quoted in “Wasting Time Is New Divide in Digital Era” by Matt Richtel, *New York Times*, May 29, 2012, <http://nyti.ms/KRII7E>

“With modern technology, if all there is is lectures, we don’t need faculty to do it. Get ’em to do it once, put it on the Web, and fire the faculty.”

Joe Redish, University of Maryland physics professor, quoted in “Physicists Seek to Lose the Lecture As Teaching Tool” by Emily Hanford on NPR, Jan. 1, 2012
<http://n.pr/w1sHT5>

1. Learning to Be “Smart” in Kindergarten

“All those involved in the institution of schooling help to shape who we think we are, who others think we are, and who we think we can become,” says Illinois State University professor Beth Hatt in this troubling *American Educational Research Journal* article. Hatt describes what she learned in a one-year ethnographic study of a kindergarten classroom in a semi-rural school district in the southeastern U.S. with a mix of 25 middle- and working-class white, African-American, and Latino children. She spent a total of 865 hours observing the classroom, interviewing teachers, children, and parents, following the students to lunch, recess, and specials, and examining classroom artifacts such as school assessments and report cards.

Right away, Hatt noticed that the teacher, Mrs. Rayburn (all names are pseudonyms), a white middle-class woman, had her own sense of which children were “smart.” For example, the child with the highest entering pre-K assessment score was a white boy from a very poor family who had a mild speech impediment. Rayburn openly expressed her low opinion of this boy’s intelligence, and by winter break referred him for tutoring. “Here the teacher’s implicit theory of smartness trumped her explicit knowledge of intelligence evidenced by pre-K assessment scores,” says Hatt. By Christmas in his kindergarten year, the boy had begun to actively dislike school.

Hatt describes two classroom artifacts that were central to student and teacher interpretations of smartness: the Stoplight and the Shoe Tyer’s and Phone Number Club:

- *The Stoplight* – On a large poster of a traffic light, each child had a car with his or her name on it. At the beginning of the day, all cars were on green, and children’s cars stayed there if they behaved well. If children disobeyed a rule, Rayburn or her assistant, Mrs. Daniels, told them to move their car to yellow, which meant *You better slow down*, or red, which meant *Stop what you’re doing and think about what you’re doing*. “The student then typically walked to the stoplight with his or her head down, moved the car either to yellow or red (depending on where the car was originally), and most often began to cry,” says Hatt. “When I interviewed students, I discovered *every* child defined being smart as ‘not having to move your car.’ For the children, being smart had come to be closely connected to the stoplight.”

Rayburn and Daniels reinforced this by telling misbehaving children that if they made “good choices” and started being smart, they could move their cars back to green. They also chose students for special jobs based on whose cars were on green. Children were keenly aware of everyone’s status on the stoplight. Parents reported that the first thing children talked about when they got home was who moved his or her car that day. When Hatt asked, every student was able to immediately identify Natalie, a middle-class white girl, as the child who never had to move her car, and Jackson, an African-American boy, as the one who had to move

his car almost every day. On the very first day of the school year, Jackson moved his car to yellow for making “mouth noises.” When he cried loudly, he was told to “shut it off” and “cry quietly.” “You’re in big school now and in big school we cry quietly,” said Daniels.

Natalie, says Hatt, “was a ‘fish in water’; she stood out as smart by not standing out behaviorally, functioning effortlessly within the rules of the classroom.” Her parents had taught her about being conservative in speech (speak when called on), in movement (hands to yourself, legs crossed when sitting), and in communication (“Yes, ma’am”). It was easy for her to earn the label as the smartest child in the classroom. Jackson, on the other hand, was spontaneous, “on the move”, and had a hard time adjusting to classroom rules, even though he tried hard. “In essence the stoplight served as a giant, constant visual symbol and reminder of who was good and, consequently, smart,” says Hatt, “there for all to see.”

It’s not surprising that Natalie was constantly negotiating demands from children to sit with her at lunch, play with her at recess, or hold hands. Jackson, by contrast, was not included in games, not sought after at lunch, had no special friends in the class, and often played by himself at recess. Rayburn told Hatt on the first day of school that she knew Natalie would be her favorite student. During the year, she frequently complained that Jackson “gets on my nerves.”

The stoplight was supposed to be an impartial arbiter of student behavior, but Hatt noticed consequences were not doled out in a completely objective manner. “For instance,” she says, “white males from middle-class families repeatedly avoided Mrs. Rayburn’s surveillance. African-American students, especially black males, who refused a submissive position in the classroom were repeatedly the first to get in trouble and received the harshest reprimands. Hence, being good became about one’s relationship with authority and teacher attitude rather than whether one broke rules more than others.”

• *The Shoe Tyer’s and Phone Number Club* – The second artifact that caught Hatt’s attention was a poster with a picture of a shoe and a telephone and a list of the students who could tie their shoes and recite their telephone numbers. “Students did not learn home phone numbers or how to tie their shoes at school,” she says. “Mrs. Rayburn and Mrs. Daniels gave parents responsibility for these tasks, refusing to tie students’ shoes. If a student could not tie his or her shoes, he or she either had to find someone in the Shoe Tyer’s Club to do it or walk around with shoes untied. Children able to tie their shoes were framed as intelligent. On the first day of school, Daniels noticed a girl tying her own shoes and said, “You’re so smart! Did you tie your shoe by yourself? We have a Shoe Tyer’s Club. You’re gonna be part of it. Two thumbs up!” Jackson, on the other hand, never joined the Shoe Tyer’s Club; his mother, a single parent, worked full time while raising him and two siblings. “Membership in the Shoe Tyer’s Club was construed as a ‘big deal’”, says Hatt, “yet differences in students’ home situations and the unfairness of teachers’ expectations were left unrealized, unchallenged, and unapologized for. The concept of ‘smartness’ makes one’s ability to tie shoes seem based on one’s innate smartness rather than familial circumstances and teacher implementation.”

“Smartness related to a student’s prior knowledge of taught material,” continues Hatt. “For example, students already able to count to high numbers or who knew the seasons were

often called ‘geniuses’ or were told they were ‘so smart.’ In addition, when students demonstrated they knew material before it was taught, they were typically given privileges such as getting nap towels first or being first in line. Through the discourse of smartness students were taught being referred to as ‘smart’ was a form of praise.” They made “good choices”, were “responsible”, and knew how to “do school”, which meant they were smart. Privileges like leading the calendar activity every morning and taking part in show and tell didn’t go to students whose cars weren’t on green or students who weren’t in the Shoe Tyer’s or Phone Number Club.

One day a student brought in a toy snow leopard for show and tell. A boy correctly named the animal and another boy said, “Aren’t you smart! You’re a genius!” “His words and intonation directly mimicked Mrs. Daniels’s when she would tell students they were smart,” says Hatt. “Encouraging students to appropriate authoritative discourse in the classroom overshadowed students’ own voices, and students thereby became ventriloquists of teachers’ voices of authority. Because students adopted teacher discourse, student agency became limited; Mrs. Rayburn in effect became the author of their words, interpretations, and meanings, and students became stratified along the lines of who could best approximate the teacher’s authority.”

Hatt is most troubled by the fact that students were labeled “smart” and lavishly rewarded in the classroom if they knew curriculum content and behavioral expectations before they were taught. “Hence, smartness becomes largely about possessing the cultural capital most valued by the teacher,” she says. “... Defining smartness is a tool for maintaining power and limiting who has access to power... [Smartness] teaches us about our academic identities by answering the question, ‘Do I have something worth saying?’ ‘Do I have authority in this context?’ and ‘How should I behave?’” Children arrive in school and use feedback – grades, teachers’ comments, classroom status – to decide if they are smart and if school is a place where they belong and a place worth investing in. Students like Jackson may not see themselves as “dumb” but they see that they will never be identified as smart in school. It’s not surprising that Jackson said he hated school before the end of his kindergarten year.

“What is taught in schools includes who ‘is’ and ‘is not’ smart and what smartness means,” Hatt concludes. “Determinations are based on teachers’ expectations mediated by knowledge of students’ socioeconomic backgrounds and racial identities... If we fail to pay attention to how smartness operates in schools and within larger society, we miss a critical opportunity to reimagine and reinterpret smartness, particularly for low-income students and students of color. We also miss the opportunity to explore how we perpetuate it ourselves. We must see smartness as a tool of control and social positioning. Only then can we begin to disrupt smartness in everyday schooling practices, empowering students to frame and author their lives.”

“Smartness As a Cultural Practice in Schools” by Beth Hatt in *American Educational Research Journal*, June 2012 (Vol. 49, #3, p. 438-460); Hatt can be reached at hatt.beth@gmail.com; <http://aer.sagepub.com/content/early/2011/08/06/0002831211415661.full.pdf+html>

[Back to page one](#)

2. Keys to Increasing Students' Motivation

"If students aren't motivated, it is difficult, if not impossible, to improve their academic achievement, no matter how good the teacher, curriculum, or school is," say Alexandra Usher and Nancy Kober in this Center on Education Policy paper. "Moreover, unmotivated students can disengage other students from academics, which can affect the environment of an entire classroom or school." When students are motivated, on the other hand, they perform better academically, attain greater conceptual understanding, feel better about school, have higher self-esteem, are better adjusted socially, and have higher rates of school completion.

Usher and Kober summarize research and school-based insights on six key questions on student motivation:

- *What is motivation and why does it matter?* Scholars distinguish between intrinsic motivation – the desire to do something because one gets pleasure from or sees value in it – and extrinsic motivation – doing something for an external reward. Students' beliefs can affect motivation; if students have a low opinion of their ability and believe intelligence is a fixed quantity, they tend to have low motivation. There are four dimensions of motivation:

- Competence – The student believes he or she has the ability to complete the task.
- Control and autonomy – The student can see a direct link between his or her actions and an outcome and has some choice about whether or how to undertake the task.
- Interest and value – The student has some interest in the task or sees value in completing it.
- Interpersonal rewards – Completing the task produces a sense of belonging to a classroom or other desired social group or approval from a person of social importance.

"At least one of these dimensions must be satisfied for a student to be motivated," say Usher and Kober. "The more dimensions that are met, and the more strongly they are met, the greater the motivation will be."

- *Can money or other rewards improve motivation?* Some schools use cash rewards, pizza coupons, cell phone minutes, and other extrinsics to motivate students to do their homework, earn good grades, get on the honor roll, read books, attend after-school study sessions, or behave well. The rationale is that students need short-term rewards to bridge the gap between challenging and seemingly meaningless school tasks and the long-term rewards that achievement will bring. Some educators also argue that incentives level the playing field for students whose parents can't afford the kinds of rewards that more-affluent parents routinely give their children.

Opponents argue that rewarding students for desirable behaviors undermines curiosity, love of learning, and intrinsic motivation, all of which are important to long-term success. It's also argued that rewards unfairly favor students who have natural gifts, producing an inequitable distribution of the goodies.

Studies of extrinsic-rewards program have produced mixed results, depending on which behaviors are rewarded and how the program is designed. Harvard economist Roland Fryer conducted one experiment in which students were paid if they improved their test scores (no impact), and another experiment in which primary-grade students were paid to read books and

take quizzes on them (dramatic increases in test scores). A key variable seemed to be whether students had control over what would produce learning gains. It was more effective to reward students for completing a specific task (read this book) than for a performance (such as reaching a benchmark on a test), and using books as rewards rather than money appeared to work better.

“At the same time,” say Usher and Kober, “poorly designed programs can actually decrease motivation if they are targeted at the wrong students, do not build in the four dimensions of motivation, or are implemented ineffectively.” Two other cautionary notes: Rewarding students for activities they genuinely enjoy can decrease motivation, and paying students to solve one kind of problem can detract from their ability to solve problems that require a different strategy.

- *Can goals motivate students?* Yes, if the goals are structured appropriately and show students a gateway to something else they value. Goals need to be achievable, education-dependent, and have some degree of ownership by the student. It’s also helpful if adults who are important to the student support the goal. “Mastery-based goals, which involve demonstrating increased understanding, skills, and content knowledge, are preferable to performance-based goals, which involve reaching a pre-defined level of performance or outperforming others,” say Usher and Kober. “Goals can actually undermine motivation, however, if they are too difficult, or if students feel that a goal has been imposed on them or that failing to meet it would have dire consequences.”

How about setting goals for test performance? This can be motivating if the tests are meaningful to students (e.g., for grades), less so if the tests are meaningful only to teachers and school administrators (for AYP). Test goals are more performance- than mastery-oriented, and can be counterproductive if they evoke anxiety, frustration, or fear of failure, and some drill-and-practice test-prep activities can also sap motivation. The best scenario is where tests are frequent, low-key, gradually increase in difficulty, and provide feedback to students on how they are doing and how they can improve their performance.

How about encouraging students to set college as a goal? This works if students are given a clear idea of what’s involved in being successful in college and get the support they need every step of the way. “The goal of postsecondary education is also more motivating if students can see for themselves the value of attending college and if their peers and respected adults support this goal,” say Usher and Kober.

- *What roles do parent involvement, family background, and culture play in student motivation?* Parents who read to their children, talk to them about school, celebrate moments of intellectual discovery, and have high expectations definitely contribute to intrinsic motivation. “By contrast, parents who are controlling, use rewards and punishments for academic performance, or display negativity or anger about academics can discourage children from developing intrinsic motivation,” say the authors. In addition, praising children for being “smart” can reinforce the fixed mindset about intelligence. Among the reasons for Asian-American students’ high level of academic motivation is parents’ belief in the growth mindset about intelligence, as well as parents’ high expectations. Changing ineffective parenting

practices is difficult, and interventions have to start when children are young and cannot be accomplished by schools alone.

- *What can schools do to motivate students?* Usher and Kober believe there are three ways schools can pick up where parents leave off (or step in where parents are not successful):
 - Targeted intervention programs – Zeroing in on a high-risk population to rekindle their motivation before they disengage for good – for example, providing mentors, tutoring, and after-school activities for boys showing signs of dropping out of school.
 - Programs focused on teachers – Providing professional development to influence teachers’ classroom style, behavior management, interactions with students, and beliefs.
 - Efforts to reorganize schools – Creating smaller schools and redesigning the way schools are scheduled, handle student groupings, and shape their climate can influence student motivation – as can looping and project-based learning.

The keys to all these interventions are high expectations, ambitious instruction, and personalizing features like student-centered instruction.

- *What nontraditional approaches can motivate unenthusiastic students?* These include inquiry-based learning, service learning, alternative education programs, extracurricular activities, and creative use of technology.

“Student Motivation – An Overlooked Piece of School Reform” by Alexandra Usher and Nancy Kober, Center on Education Policy, The George Washington University, May 22, 2012, <http://www.cep-dc.org/displayDocument.cfm?DocumentID=405>

[Back to page one](#)

3. Incorporating Social and Emotional Learning in Literature Classes

“Discipline problems, poor interpersonal relationships, and poor academic achievement are interrelated,” say Zipora Shechtman and Mary Abu Yaman (professor and doctoral student at Haifa University) in this *American Educational Research Journal* article. Social and emotional learning (SEL), designed to improve students’ self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making, is usually taught as a separate curriculum. Shechtman and Yaman wondered if integrating SEL with academic content would boost academic *and* behavioral outcomes.

In this article, they describe their experiment teaching SEL content through literature with fifth and sixth graders in 12 schools. In the experimental classrooms, teachers included three elements:

- Informative – The facts and knowledge contained in the piece of literature;
- Conceptual – Higher abstract thinking integrating these facts and information into broad concepts and understanding;
- Valuing – Relating the facts and concepts to students’ social and emotional lives, trying to make meaning of the knowledge.

In control classes, students had only the informational and conceptual content.

One of the six lessons focused on Aesop’s tale, “The Fox and the Crow.” In this story, a fox sees a crow flying with a piece of cheese in its beak. The fox wants the cheese, and when

the crow lands on a tree branch, the fox sits underneath and starts a conversation, flattering the crow. The crow likes the fox's patter, and asked for a song, opens its beak, dropping the cheese. As the fox enjoys his meal, he tells the crow, "Never trust a flatterer."

On the informational level, students identified the characters, their traits, and the sequence of events. On the conceptual level, they learned about flattery, the need for approval, cheating, and how all this affects other people. On the affective level, teachers drew students out on how it feels to get approval or be deprived of it and how peers' perceptions affect them and their behavior. Students gave examples of cheating and being cheated, how it happened, and how they felt about it, as well as feelings of remorse and changes they might want to make in their own behavior. Teachers explored these issues through individual student writing and group activities and sharing.

What were the results? Students in SEL-incorporating classrooms did significantly better than control-class students in content knowledge, motivation to learn, perceived classroom climate, positive behavior (and a reduction in negative behavior), understanding and communication among classmates, and group cohesion. Why? Shechtman and Yaman believe it's because these students were engaged at the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral level. "As content becomes personalized," they say, "it may become more interesting and more effectively internalized. Such processes include revealing personal information and disclosure of emotions, which are known to improve the group climate and sense of cohesiveness... In a positive climate, students are more motivated to make an effort and are more engaged in the material presented... The more frequent the positive behavior, and especially the less frequent the negative behavior, the greater the chance not only to develop a positive climate but also to spend more time on teaching and learning."

"SEL As a Component of a Literature Class to Improve Relationships, Behavior, Motivation, and Content Knowledge" by Zipora Shechtman and Mary Abu Yaman in *American Educational Research Journal*, June 2012 (Vol. 49, #3, p. 546-567), <http://aer.sagepub.com/content/49/3/546.abstract?rss=1>; Shechtman can be reached at ziporas@construct.haifa.ac.il.

[Back to page one](#)

4. Can Cell Phones and Social Media Be Useful Classroom Tools?

In this thoughtful article in *Teacher Magazine* (online), Tennessee high-school teacher Paul Barnwell describes his early enthusiasm for using social media and allowing students to take out their forbidden cell phones and use them in school. "I was a cool teacher, seeing beyond the anachronistic policy and bringing 21st-century learning into the classroom," he says. He used Poll Anywhere and class blogs to get students summarizing what they read and submitting exit tickets, and students loved seeing their comments instantly posted on the classroom screen and blog site.

But there were problems with Poll Anywhere. Some students didn't have texting cell phones and others thought it was hilarious to post derogatory comments for all to see. Barnwell decided that old-fashioned note-cards and verbal responses were more effective – and less

time-consuming. He's come to see Twitter, Facebook, and Tumblr as "mindless banter and instant gratification" rather than helpful learning tools. "While summarizing is a real skill," he says, "do we really want students to further fragment their thoughts and attention in this age of incessant digital distraction and stimuli with 140-character blurbs? Do we want students to spend even more time in front of a screen, bypassing opportunities to converse and collaborate face to face?"

Barnwell is also disillusioned with Prezi, which seemed cool at first, but is really "just a better-looking, slightly more interactive version of PowerPoint," he says. "I don't want students to become dependent on technology that requires too many templates, cheapens thinking, or relies on flashy graphics and movement. These gimmicks do not develop genuine technology competence... Being tech savvy should include the ability to synthesize ideas and media forms, and create something original."

But Barnwell is no Luddite. In fact, he's teaching a course on digital media and storytelling that uses technology as part of a larger creative process – planning, prewriting, drafting, editing, and revising student-generated audio, still photos, and video. "There is tremendous power and potential in what we can teach students with sound, image and video-based projects," he says. Students are using Google docs, analyzing images and video in the context of literature and narrative, and learning how to shoot photos, interview people, and edit and sequence their raw footage and images. "They create photo essays, audio slideshows, and short documentaries from start to finish, then critique each other's work," says Barnwell.

His biggest insight is that being tech savvy is all wrapped up with people skills. "If students can't communicate face to face to conduct interviews or set up photo shoots, there is little point in placing a camera in their hands or a laptop at their desk," he says. "As educators, we must find a balance between screen time and 'face' time."

Barnwell doesn't regret his experiments with technology, and keeps trying new things. "I'm still trying to figure out my curriculum," he concludes, "and will continue to test out new programs and technology applications to enhance the course. But until I'm convinced that cell phone and social media applications truly support deep thinking, my students will keep their devices in their pockets and backpacks."

"Why Twitter and Facebook Are Not Good Instructional Tools" by Paul Barnwell in *Teacher*, May 30, 2012, http://www.edweek.org/tm/articles/2012/05/30/fp_barnwell.html

[Back to page one](#)

5. What Makes So Many Kids Fat?

In this provocative *Newsweek* cover story, UCLA/Robert Wood Johnson Foundation health investigator Gary Taubes wonders why so many poor children during the Depression were overweight. It certainly wasn't because they were eating too much, because there wasn't enough food to go around. In fact, he says, it was because the food that was most affordable in hard times was scientifically designed to make them fat.

Taubes believes the conventional wisdom on reducing obesity – eat less and exercise more – is wrong. We need to focus on reducing intake of the same substances that made

Depression-era children fat – sugars, refined flour, and starches – because they affect the hormone insulin, which regulates fat accumulation.

Sugars include the now-omnipresent high-fructose corn syrup, which is metabolized by liver cells. “From there, the chain of metabolic events had been worked out by biochemists over 50 years,” says Taubes. “Some of the fat accumulates in the liver cells, which become resistant to the action of insulin, and so more insulin is secreted to compensate. The end results are elevated levels of insulin, which is the hallmark of type 2 diabetes, and the steady accumulation of fat on our fat tissue – a few tens of calories per day, leading to pounds per year, and obesity over the course of a few decades.”

What about exercise? Isn’t that essential to weight reduction? “So why is the world full of obese individuals who do exercise regularly?” asks Taubes. Because running three miles only burns the calories contained in a single candy bar – and leaves a person hungry enough to consume more than a candy bar’s worth of fat-producing junk.

“At the moment,” says Taubes, “the government efforts to curb obesity and diabetes avoid the all-too-apparent fact... that exhorting people to eat less and exercise more doesn’t work, and that this shouldn’t be an indictment of their character but of the value of the advice... If the latest research is any indication, sugar may have been the primary problem all along.

“So what should we eat?” he asks. “The latest clinical trials suggest that all of us would benefit from fewer (if any) sugars and fewer refined grains (bread, pasta) and starchy vegetables (potatoes). This was the conventional wisdom through the mid-1960s, and then we turned the grains and starches into heart-healthy foods and the USDA enshrined them in the base of its famous Food Guide Pyramid as the staples of our diet. That this shift coincides with the obesity epidemic is probably not a coincidence.”

“The New Obesity Campaigns Have It All Wrong” by Gary Taubes in *Newsweek*, May 14, 2012, <http://byliner.com/gary-taubes/stories/the-new-obesity-campaigns-have-it-all-wrong>

[Back to page one](#)

© Copyright 2012 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

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 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 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