

Marshall Memo 63

A Weekly Round-up of Important Ideas and Research in K-12 Education
November 22, 2004

In This Issue:

1. Raising reading achievement in high-poverty schools
2. Five suggestions for more effective schools
3. How to support struggling students in advanced math classes
4. Counteracting race-based low expectations
5. Value-added assessment gains momentum
6. Fine tuning value-added assessment
7. How can we make tests instructionally supportive?
8. Teaching to the curriculum versus teaching to the test
9. Misconceptions about college
10. Differentiation in a standards-based environment
11. The impact of television violence on children
12. Short items: (a) Can brain scans on babies predict school problems? (b) Flat Stanley website; (c) Website on school leadership

Quotes of the Week

"When parents feel supported by the staff at their children's schools, they are willing to work with the schools in a joint effort to educate their children."

Barbara Taylor and David Pearson (see item 1)

"As a first step in closing the achievement gap, schools must ensure that every child is reading on grade level in the 1st grade."

Janice Hale, *Educational Leadership* (November 2004, p. 36)

"The principal unit of production for K-12 education is the individual school. This is where most interaction between students and teachers takes place. This is where the most informed decisions are made regarding assignment and instruction of students and allocation of staff. This is where a culture of achievement is either constructed or absent. This is where organizational cohesion and purpose are infused or neglected."

James Guthrie (see item 2)

"Unlike a bank teller or branch manager, teachers and principals need decision room."

James Guthrie (*ibid.*)

"The sad thing about most television [programs] is what you are teaching these young, impressionable kids is that it's OK to be disrespectful, to tease, to taunt, and hurt other people – and it just gets worse from there."

Corinne Gregory (see item 11)

"There are a lot of half-baked ideas about brain-based education floating around."

John Bruer (see item 12a)

1. Raising Reading Achievement in High-Poverty Schools

Drawing on research done at the Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement (CIERA), Barbara Taylor and David Pearson describe the factors that seem to be at work in schools that beat the demographic odds. Noting that it took these schools years to develop effective programs, Taylor and Pearson list a number of factors that distinguished them from other schools with similar demographics but much lower achievement:

- ***Schoolwide practices:***

- *Parent involvement* – Effective schools had strong links to parents, including an active school council that reached out to parents through focus groups, phone surveys, or written surveys to learn parents’ needs and concerns. “When parents feel supported by the staff at their children’s schools,” say Taylor and Pearson, “they are willing to work with the schools in a joint effort to educate their children.”
- *Frequent assessment* – Students were regularly assessed on curriculum-based measures and teachers discussed the results and made changes in instructional practices and grouping.
- *Staff communication* – Teachers saw all children as everyone’s responsibility, followed a consistent program, and regularly collaborated within and across grades, including team teaching and peer coaching; Title I, reading resource, special education, ELL and regular-education teachers collaborated constantly.
- *Early intervention* – Struggling students got small-group instruction and benefited from proven reading interventions.
- *Welcoming transferring students* – Effective schools had well-developed procedures for working with students who arrived during the school year.
- *Strong principals* – Effective schools had capable and stable leadership.
- *Good teaching* – Each effective school had a core of experienced, knowledgeable, and hardworking teachers in the early grades.

- ***Classroom practices:***

- *Parent outreach* – Teachers communicated frequently with parents.
- *Small-group instruction* – Students had less whole-class instruction.
- *Student engagement* – Teachers coached students as they were trying to respond to questions (versus just giving them information).
- *Independent reading* – Students spent more time reading alone.

- *Strategy coaching* – Grade 1 and 2 teachers frequently prompted students on how to use strategies to decode unfamiliar words.
- *Higher-order thinking* – Teachers more frequently asked students to write about what they were reading and asked inferential and aesthetic questions to engage students in actively thinking about what they were reading and how the information related to their own experiences.
- *Skills-content balance* – Teachers explicitly taught phonics and other skills and used good children’s literature: “Effective teachers teach necessary skills and strategies” conclude the authors, “but also engage their students in challenging authentic literacy experiences.”

Taylor and Pearson have an interesting comment on the link between good teaching and schoolwide policies: “Sound classroom instruction, as one would expect, appears to be a necessary foundation, but schoolwide support appears to leverage the effects of good classroom instruction... [A] combination of sound school decisions and collaboration among staff, as well as effective teaching practices, contributed to the most effective schools beating the odds in terms of primary-grade students’ reading growth and achievement... Effective schools are collaborative learning communities led by an enthusiastic leadership team.”

“Research on Learning to Read – at School, at Home, and in the Community” by Barbara Taylor and David Pearson in *Elementary School Journal*, November 2004 (Vol. 105, #2, p. 167-181) <http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/ESJ/journal/>

2. Five Suggestions for More Effective Schools

In a thoughtful commentary article in *Education Week*, Vanderbilt education professor James Guthrie suggests policy shifts in the following areas:

- *Give principals decision-making authority.* “The principal unit of production for K-12 education,” argues Guthrie, “is the individual school. This is where most interaction between students and teachers takes place. This is where the most informed decisions are made regarding assignment and instruction of students and allocation of staff. This is where a culture of achievement is either constructed or absent. This is where organizational cohesion and purpose are infused or neglected.” Guthrie contends that for accountability to work (and be fair), principals need the authority to make key decisions – and to control the custodians, gardeners, and cafeteria workers in their buildings.

- *Don't micro-manage teachers and principals.* Guthrie says that a key factor in keeping good people in the classroom and the principal's office is not over-controlling them as they do their jobs: "Teaching, while still not a science, involves a great deal of craft knowledge. A teacher needs discretion to interact with the complexities of each student, and a principal needs discretion to interact with the complexities of each teacher and many parents. This professional discretion, if restricted or scripted, eviscerates accountability and undermines incentives to perform effectively. Unlike a bank teller or branch manager, teachers and principals need decision room."

- *Allow differential pay.* Guthrie says that it's a myth that there is a teacher shortage in all areas. In fact, only a few areas have critical shortages. Schools would do far better at attracting and keeping strong teachers in these areas if they could pay them more. Supply and demand.

- *Allocate funds according to need.* State funding should mirror the challenge of educating each district's students.

- *Link K-12 and post-secondary education.* Guthrie argues for an overarching state authority to knit together the two levels of education.

"An Education Reform Agenda for the Recently Elected" by James Guthrie in *Education Week*, Nov. 17, 2004 (Vol. 24, #12, p. 31, 33)
<http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2004/11/17/12guthrie.h24.html>

3. How to Support Struggling Students in Advanced Math Courses

In this article, a Seattle education professor compares the math experiences of Gabrielle and Tamika, students at two different high schools. Both young women started with similar math aptitude and identical attitudes toward the subject; both worked with teachers who had high expectations; and both encountered significant challenges in their advanced math classes. Gabrielle eventually dropped out of her course; Tamika persisted and passed. What made the difference?

- *High expectations built into the curriculum* – All students at Tamika's school were placed in the college preparatory track. Gabrielle, on the other hand, had a remedial track to fall back on when the going got tough.

- *Scheduling that facilitates a second chance* – Tamika's school used a block schedule in which most classes met for 90 minutes every day for half of the academic year. When she failed, she was able to retake the course without getting off grade level. Math classes at Gabrielle's school met for double periods every other day for the entire year. When Gabrielle failed, she had the choice of dropping the course or repeating the year.

- *Teacher collaboration* – Gabriella’s math teacher described herself as a “lone wolf” and got little support from her math colleagues. The math teachers at Tamika’s school prided themselves on working collectively to teach rigorous math; they observed each other’s classes and met weekly to plan lessons, design assessments, and consult about classroom challenges. They were aware of one another’s expectations of students, which smoothed the transitions for Tamika as she moved from one teacher to another.

- *Awareness of status issues* – Gabriella felt stigmatized when she was an off-level student in a college-prep class – not one of the “smart kids.” Tamika’s teachers, on the other hand, “worked consciously to change students’ sense of mathematical incompetence to one of competence.” Teachers contacted parents with good news about students’ progress and made a point of drawing attention to students’ mathematical prowess in class.

The article concludes by contrasting the two schools’ adult culture around the issue of teacher autonomy: “Some teachers relish the independence they feel once classroom doors are closed. But if we are to stop struggling students from dropping out of advanced math classes when the path becomes steep, teachers must coordinate their expectations, their knowledge of students, and – to some extent – their teaching practices. Just as it takes a whole village to raise a child, it takes a whole mathematics department to raise the achievement of students like Gabrielle and Tamika.”

“Why Do Students Drop Advanced Mathematics?” by Ilana Horn in *Educational Leadership*, November 2004 (Vol. 62, #3, p. 61-64), no e-link available

4. Counteracting Race-Based Low Expectations

In this hard-hitting article in *Educational Leadership*, Julie Landsman, an education professor at Carleton College, challenges white teachers and school leaders to change practices that perpetuate low expectations for African-American and Latino students – for example, a principal punishing black boys for disruptive behavior and ignoring the same behavior in white boys, a “gifted” class with very few children of color, and an Advanced Placement teacher asking deep and complex questions only to white students. (When challenged by a black student in the class, the AP teacher was stunned and said, “I just assumed you didn’t know the answers, and I didn’t want to embarrass you.”)

Landsman recommends that white educators: (a) explore the issues intellectually, coming to grips with common tendencies such as not asking some

children challenging questions; (b) engage in dialogue with colleagues, parents, and community members about racism; (c) immerse themselves in other cultures, getting out of their comfort zone to experience what students experience; (d) create a safe environment for all students, ensuring that if anyone engages in racist comments, hurtful assumptions, or name calling, the teacher will step in; and (e) working to increase the number of students of color in advanced and “gifted” programs.

“In some ways,” writes Landsman, “keeping our own personal actions welcoming and non-racist is the toughest part of this task because it has to do with how we think and react instinctively when we are working with students – how we turn our shoulder or change our tone of voice... The best teachers are those who have explored how their own background and experience of the world is different from that of others, and have reflected on how that difference affects their beliefs, their personal reactions and their teaching.”

In a sidebar, Landsman offers the following list to check on whether a school’s expectations are high for all students:

- Are examples of the achievements and ideas of diverse authors, thinkers, and historical figures woven into – not separated from – the curriculum?
- Are texts, lessons, and discussion topics chosen with thought about how to provide a safe environment for discussion of controversial issues?
- Do all students feel safe in the classrooms, hallways, and lunchroom?
- Does the school challenge anyone making generalizations about racial or ethnic groups?
- Are administrators and teachers willing to counter racist comments?
- Is evidence of diverse cultures displayed in hallways, in the library, in classroom examples, and in the racial and cultural backgrounds of adults working in the building?
- Does the school take students’ and parents’ discomfort, frustration, or anger seriously? Are issues worked out through mediation and discussion?
- Do teachers expect all students to complete and turn in work, know the answers to different levels of questions, work in class, follow class guidelines, and respond to structure?
- Do parents of color feel welcome at conferences, parent advisory group meetings, and school events?
- Do students of all ethnicities represented in the school participate in all academic courses and programs?

- Are students of color counseled to consider high-level academic programs and college?
- Do teachers value inclusive curriculum even when the school is primarily populated by white students?
- Do staff members feel they can openly discuss issues of race, class, and gender without feeling defensive or ashamed?

“Confronting the Racism of Low Expectations” by Julie Landsman in *Educational Leadership*, November 2004 (Vol. 62, #3, p. 28-32), no e-link available

5. Value-Added Assessment Gains Momentum

A front-page story in last week’s *Education Week* reports that value added assessment is steadily picking up support around the nation. The appeal is that value added measures a school’s effectiveness by the amount of academic progress its students make from one year to the next – on the “value” the school adds to incoming students. Value-added is said to have three advantages over conventional accountability systems: (a) it isolates the effects of teachers and schools on learning from other background factors such as race and poverty; (b) it measures the progress of the same youngsters over time, rather than comparing this year’s third graders (for example) to last year’s third graders; and (c) it strikes some educators as fairer than judging a school on the number of students who meet a fixed achievement level. An Ohio union official said, “We felt there were a lot of hard-working people out there who were not getting adequate credit for moving kids along the way they do.”

A Pennsylvania middle school that volunteered to pilot value-added assessment was asked to identify which students it was serving best. The principal confidently named his most academically advanced group. To his surprise, the value-added data showed that these students were not making significant gains from their high starting point. “I was wrong, obviously wrong,” said the principal.

Analyzing the value-added data on all students, teachers in this school made a number of changes. They decided that they were spending too much time reviewing material at the start of each school year and speeded up the pace of instruction. They divided students into four levels of algebra and gave additional periods of math to students who were falling behind. Teachers in the same grade and subject met each week to decide what they would teach in the coming week. Finally, teachers wrote nine-week assessments to track students’ progress. Within a year, the school’s math achievement had made significant gains.

Value-added assessments have confirmed an important belief: good teaching has an impact on students that is “profound and cumulative.” But value-added must answer three questions to fully establish itself [see next story for additional issues]:

- How it relates to NCLB mandates to get students to “proficiency” by 2014; several testing companies are working on ways to combine the two approaches so that schools can get data on value added *and* on whether students are on track to reach their state’s proficiency target.
- How value added can go beyond the relatively straightforward task of identifying highly effective and ineffective teachers and analyze the effectiveness of the majority of teachers whose students’ achievement is average. Some unions are receptive to value added but urge that it be kept “low-stakes” – not used for teacher evaluation until more is known.
- How to identify what highly effective teachers are doing to get such good achievement.

“Value Added’ Models Gain in Popularity” by Lynn Olson in *Education Week*, Nov. 17, 2004 (Vol. 24, #12, p. 1, 14, 15),

<http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2004/11/17/12value.h24.html>

6. Fine-Tuning Value-Added Assessment

In this sidebar accompanying the article just above, reporter Lynn Olson follows up with five pieces that students of value added believe must be in place for it to achieve its full potential:

- *Curriculum alignment* – There needs to be a close match between tests and teachers’ daily curriculum content.
- *Vertical equating* – Curriculum and assessments need to flow smoothly from grade to grade.
- *Controlling for background factors* – If students’ race and poverty levels are not taken into account, value-added assessment cannot isolate the effects of teachers and schools on achievement. William Sanders of Tennessee, the granddaddy of value-added in the U.S., says this is not necessary, but other researchers argue that Sanders is only right if a school’s population is racially and economically mixed. In more homogeneous settings (where students go to high-poverty or single-race schools based on where they live), getting race and poverty data is critical.
- *Missing data* – Some analysts treat students who are not tested as random scores, but others contend that this population is not random but tends to

includes many high-risk children with low achievement.

- *Sensitivity to all achievement levels* – Some researchers are concerned that value-added focuses too much on achievement close to the “proficiency” bar; they contend that value-added analysis needs to “stretch” to all levels in the 4-3-2-1 achievement range so that it can identify the gains – and needs – of all students.

“Researchers Debate Merits of ‘Value Added’ Measures” by Lynn Olson in *Education Week*, Nov. 17, 2004 (Vol. 24, #12, p. 14, 15),
<http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2004/11/17/12value-s1.h24.html>

7. How Can We Make Tests Instructionally-Supportive?

In this *Educational Leadership* article, UCLA assessment guru James Popham continues his campaign against “instructionally-insensitive” tests. He slams norm-referenced tests, saying: “The makers of standardized achievement tests have no serious interest in selecting test items that will reflect effective instruction. They are interested in using items that not all test takers can answer, even if having many such items causes a test to be *instructionally insensitive* – that is incapable of detecting the presence and impact of effective instruction.”

Popham goes on to say that between 40 and 80 percent of test items in reading, language arts, science, and social studies are “SES-linked” – they give an unfair advantage to students of higher socio-economic status (he says the same is true of 15-20 percent of math test items). Popham asserts that many state assessments are guilty of the same sins [a claim disputed by one state testing official with whom I communicated yesterday about this article].

Popham says that most educators “don’t know squat about measurement” and have historically given “far too much deference” to assessment experts. School leaders, he says, need to master the basics themselves and insist on three key qualities in their curriculum and testing program:

- Tests should measure only a modest number of truly important learning expectations so that teachers can focus and not be overwhelmed.
- The learning expectations measured by tests should be described in clear language so that teachers can teach to the curriculum rather than trying to teach to specific test items [see the next article for more on this].
- Test scores should be reported in a way that shows clearly whether each learning expectation was mastered by students – making it possible for teachers to determine which aspects of their instruction are working and which need improvement.

“A Game Without Winners” by James Popham in *Educational Leadership*, November 2004 (Vol. 62, #3, p. 46-50), no e-link available to this article. The full text of *Building Tests that Support Instruction and Accountability: A Guide to Policymakers* by the Commission on Instructionally Supportive Assessment (2001) is available at <http://www.ioxassessment.com/catalog/pdfdownloads/BuildingTestsToSupport.pdf>

8. Teaching to the Curriculum versus Teaching to the Test

James Popham is sick of hearing educators talk about “teaching to the test.” Whenever someone uses this phrase, he thinks we should ask, “What do you mean?” This is because Popham believes that there are two very different meanings for “teaching to the test” – one bad, the other good:

- *Teaching toward a specific test’s items* – For example, if the goal is for students to master 200 spelling words and the teacher will give a test on a random sample of 20 words, it’s a bad idea to drill students only on just those 20 words. This is “item teaching” or “teaching the test.” If students are taught this way, their test scores will say almost nothing about their mastery of all 200 words.

- *Teaching toward the curricular aim represented by the test* – If, on the other hand, the teacher has students study all 200 words, their performance on a sampling of 20 words (not known in advance) will be a good indication of whether they met the learning goal. “If a teacher has not taught directly toward a set of items on a particular test,” writes Popham, “then students’ high performance on the test shows that they learned what they were supposed to learn, not merely that they sparkled on one set of previously practiced items.”

Popham notes that the teaching of writing is an area where many teachers intuitively do the right thing, aiming at the broader curriculum goals: “A teacher who sets out to have students become skilled writers of persuasive essays... wants those students to acquire a generalized mastery of that skill, not just the ability to write a single essay persuading the city council to build more public parks. We want our students to acquire skills so solidly that they can then apply those skills in a variety of in-school or post-school settings.”

“‘Teaching to the Test’ – An Expression to Eliminate” by James Popham in *Educational Leadership*, November 2004 (Vol. 62, #3, p82-83)
http://www.ascd.org/cms/objectlib/ascdframeset/index.cfm?publication=http://www.ascd.org/publications/ed_lead/index.html

9. Misconceptions About College

In this article, Stanford professor Michael Kirst warns of a serious disconnect

between high school and college, and asks us to be especially mindful of the racial and economic gaps in college attrition. These are recent figures for high-school graduation and college attendance and graduation:

	Graduated from high school	Completed at least some college	Obtained at least a bachelor's degree
Asian and Asian American	94%	80%	49%
White (non-Latino)	93%	62%	29%
African American	86%	48%	15%
Latino	61%	31%	10%

Source: Education Trust (2001)

A large part of the problem, says Kirst, is a series of misconceptions about what college is like and how to prepare for it, neatly captured in this Bridge Project report:

- *Misconception:* I can't afford college.
Reality: College is not as expensive as many students and parents believe.
- *Misconception:* I have to be a stellar athlete or scholar to get financial aid.
Reality: Most students get some form of financial aid.
- *Misconception:* Meeting high-school graduation standards prepares me for college.
Reality: Most high schools' requirements do not prepare students for college.
- *Misconception:* Getting into college is the hardest part.
Reality: For most students, completing college is the hardest part!
- *Misconception:* Community colleges don't have academic standards.
Reality: Community colleges have placement tests as gateways to college-level work.
- *Misconception:* I should take the easy courses in high school to rack up better grades.
Reality: Rigorous high-school classes are the best predictor of college success.
- *Misconception:* My senior year in high school doesn't matter.
Reality: Senior-year classes open up good college classes and boost preparation level.
- *Misconception:* Junior year is the furthest back that colleges will look for my grades.
Reality: A well-planned college-prep program goes all the way back to 9th grade.
- *Misconception:* I can't start thinking about financial aid until I get into a college.
Reality: Students must file a federal aid form before acceptance letter time.
- *Misconception:* I can take whatever classes I want once I get to college.
Reality: Many colleges require placement tests and these determine possible courses.

"The High School / College Disconnect" by Michael Kirst in *Educational Leadership*, November 2004 (Vol. 62, #3, p51-55), no e-link available

10. Differentiation in a Standards-Based Environment?

Carol Tomlinson says that differentiation “is just a teacher acknowledging that kids learn in different ways, and responding by doing something about that through curriculum and instruction... adapting content, process, and product in response to student readiness, interest, and/or learning profile.”

Many teachers feel so constrained by state standards it’s impossible to differentiate instruction. This is a myth, says Angela Peery of the Center for Performance Assessment. Take, for example, an Ohio 9th-grade English standard: “Apply reading comprehension strategies, including making predictions, comparing and contrasting, recalling and summarizing and making inferences and drawing conclusions.” This could be differentiated along three dimensions:

- To differentiate *content*, groups of students could be allowed to choose reading materials based on their interests and/or reading levels.
- To differentiate *process*, students could be given the choice of reading silently in class, using audiobooks as an aid, or reading materials independently at home while working on other assignments during class time.
- To differentiate *product*, students could be given the option of demonstrating their comprehension by completing written assignments, creating PowerPoint presentations, or having a private conference with the teacher.

“Questions from the Real World” by Angela Peery in *Focus on Achievement*, November 2004 (Vol. 6, #2, p. 4, 3), Center for Performance Assessment

11. The Impact of Television Violence on Children

Studies estimate that the average American child watches 3-4 hours of television a day and by the age of 18 has seen 200,000 acts of TV violence, including 40,000 murders. Many programs trivialize violence and few carry an anti-violence message. Popular shows like “Rug Rats,” “The Simpsons,” “Pokemon,” and “Power Rangers” are a big part of the problem. “The sad thing about most television [programs],” says Corinne Gregory, a Seattle social skills activist, “is what you are teaching these young, impressionable kids is that it’s OK to be disrespectful, to tease, to taunt, and hurt other people – and it just gets worse from there.”

Cartoon violence has the same effect on the brain as realistic violence, according to psychologist John Murphy of Kansas State University. “Characters get shot with double-barreled shotguns and they get back up,” says Murphy. “It sets it in a humorous context with a laugh track, and communicates to preschoolers that

violence is funny and it's OK to do... We can safely say that viewing violence does lead to more aggressive behavior." Research indicates that as much as 10 percent of violent behavior can be traced to the influence of television.

What can be done? "A ray of hope," says Murray, "is that parents do matter. What they do sticks with kids, particularly the younger they start." Schools can urge parents to set limits on television time, monitor what their children watch, and speak up to their children about what they think about violence. Says Frank Gallagher of *Cable in the Classroom*, "If parents and children are sitting and watching a television program together [with some violent content], and the parents say nothing, it's an implicit endorsement – where is a parent says something, it makes their values clear to the child."

"Researchers Target Impact of Television Violence" by Marianne Hurst in *Education Week*, Nov. 17, 2004 (Vol. 24, #12, p. 8)
<http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2004/11/17/12real.h24.html>

12. Short Items:

a. Can brain scans on babies predict school problems? - In a few years, say some researchers, parents will be able to present their children's schools with neurological data, perhaps even genetic information, and tell teachers to take it into account in the classroom. Brain scans of infants can pick up indicators of later dyslexia and other learning problems – information that could be put to work by schools. "If you can identify a baby at birth who's at risk for a disability, you can start intervention much earlier than you do now," says Dennis Molfese, a researcher at the University of Louisville.

But others point out that early brain scans sometimes identify children who turn out not to have disabilities. "There are a lot of half-baked ideas about brain-based education floating around," says John Bruer of the McDonnell Foundation in St. Louis. He thinks it will be 20 years before we know enough to put brain scans to work in schools, and says that in the mean time, educators should use cognitive psychology and proven classroom interventions to decide what to do for children at risk.

"Educational Forecasting" by Debra Viadero in *Education Week*, Nov. 17, 2004 (Vol. 24, #12, p. 28-30) <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2004/11/17/12mind.h24.html>

b. Flat Stanley website – Largely by word of mouth, children around the world have begun exchanging paper cut-outs of Flat Stanley, a character from a 1977 book

by the late Jeff Brown, with notes, essays, poems, and artifacts about their personal Stanley's adventures. A new website in Canada helps students and teachers become part of this network: <http://www.flatstanley.enoreo.on.ca>

"Paper Trail" by Robert Johnston in *Teacher Magazine*, Nov./Dec. 2004 (Vol. XVI, #3, p. 20-23) <http://www.edweek.org/tm/articles/2004/11/01/03paper.h16.html>

c. Website on school leadership – A new site, e-Lead, has just been established to provide information on quality school leadership development strategies. This free site presents principles of professional development for school leaders, catalogues over 30 school leadership development programs, and has a Leadership Library with links to information, articles, tools, and resources on topics from action research and professional learning communities to mentoring and supplying the principal pipeline. The site is <http://www.e-lead.org>

Spotted in *PEN Weekly NewsBlast*, Nov. 18, 2004

© Copyright 2004 Kim Marshall

Do you have feedback? Is anything missing?

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

About the Marshall Memo

Mission and focus:

This weekly memo aims to keep busy principals and other educators very well-informed on important research and ideas in K-12 education. Kim Marshall, drawing on 35 years of experience as a teacher, principal, central office administrator, coach of principals, and writer, acts as “designated reader.” Kim searches through 39 publications the week they come out, chooses the articles that are most relevant and useful to improving teaching and learning, and summarizes them in a brief e-mail. Some ideas will be familiar, reinforcing what readers already know; others will be new and genuinely thought-provoking.

Subscriptions:

The Marshall Memo is sent every Monday (with occasional breaks). Individual subscriptions are \$50 for the school year; rates decline steeply for multiple readers within the same organization. See the website for information on paying by check or credit card.

Website:

If you go to <http://www.marshallmemo.com> you can get information on:

- How to subscribe or renew
- Why the Marshall Memo?
- Focus topics
- Headlines for issues 1-51
- What readers say
- About Kim Marshall
- A free sample issue

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

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

Publications covered:

(those read this week are underlined)

American Education Research Journal
American Educator
American School Board Journal
ASCD SmartBrief
Atlantic Monthly
Bay State Banner
Boston Globe
CommonWealth Magazine
Curriculum Update (ASCD)
Ed. Magazine (Harvard School of Education)
Education Digest
Education Gadfly
Education Next
Education Update (ASCD)
Education Week
Educational Leadership
Educational Researcher
Elementary School Journal
Harper’s
Harvard Business Review
Harvard Education Letter
Harvard Education Review
Journal of Staff Development
Middle School Journal
NASSP Bulletin
New York Times
New Yorker
Newsweek
PEN Weekly NewsBlast
Phi Delta Kappan
Principal Magazine
Principal Leadership
Psychology Today
Reading Research Quarterly
Reading Today
Rethinking Schools
Review of Educational Research
Teachers College Record
Teacher Magazine

E-links will be provided whenever possible.