Marshall Memo 221

A Weekly Round-up of Important Ideas and Research in K-12 Education
February 11, 2008

In This Issue:

Quotes of the Week

"The general lesson might be that if you are having difficulty in understanding something, you should try explaining it to your mom."

Bethany Rittle-Johnson, Megan Saylor, and Kathryn Swygert (see item #7)

"Brain-based education is not a panacea or magic bullet to solve all of education's problems. Anyone who claims that is misleading people. It is not yet a program, a model, or a package for schools to follow."

Eric Jensen (see item #1)

"Our new understanding is that every school day changes the student's brain in some way. Once we make those connections, we can make choices in how we prioritize policies and strategies."

Eric Jensen (see item #1)

"Even some of the purest, most accurately reported neuroscience research has been misinterpreted. People trying to capitalize on research with their elixirs, books, cure-all learning theories, and curriculum packages have perpetrated much of the damage."

Judy Willis (see item #4)

"Brain research rarely suggests novel approaches, since teachers have always been pretty creative."

Eric Jensen (see item #5)

1. An Advocate of Brain-Based Education Makes His Case

In this lengthy *Kappan* article, California educator Eric Jensen, author of 21 books on the brain and learning, writes about the promise – and limitations – of "brain-based education" and responds to some of its critics. He argues that "the synergy of biology, cognitive science, and education can support better education with direct application to schools."

But how? "Schools present countless opportunities to affect students' brains," he writes. "Our new understanding is that every school day changes the student's brain in some way. Once we make those connections, we can make choices in how we prioritize policies and strategies." Jensen goes on to list ten ways this can happen.

• The brain is much more "plastic" than is commonly believed – it can rewire and remap itself based on experiences. Jensen believes that schools can "influence this process through skill-building, reading, meditation, the arts, career and technical education, and thinking skills that build student success."

• The human brain grows new neurons, and some of those neurons are connected with memory, mood, and learning. Schools can affect the conditions that grow neurons, including…

• Exercise has been shown to positively affect brain mass, cognition, mood regulation, depression, and new cell production, so cutting back on recess time and physical education classes can undermine student learning.

• Nutrition also affects the brain, so eating well and remaining hydrated is about more than obesity. "Schools that pay attention to nutrition and cognition," says Jensen, "…will probably support better student achievement."

• Chronic stress has a negative effect on the brain and can have negative effects on health, attendance, memory, and social skills.

• "Social conditions influence our brain in ways we didn't know before," says Jensen. "School behaviors are highly social experiences, which become encoded through our sense of reward, acceptance, pain, pleasure, coherence, affinity, and stress… This discovery suggests that schools should not rely on random social groups and should work to strengthen prosocial conditions."

• Chronic or acute environmental stimuli can change how genes are expressed, so it's not just genes and environment that affect behavior. "Evidence suggests that gene expression can be regulated by what we do at schools and that this can enhance or harm long-term change prospects," writes Jensen.

• Researchers are exploring whether the arts affect the brain and whether there are particularly sensitive periods in children's lives for this effect.

• Great strides are being made in rehabilitating brain-based disorders such as fetal alcohol syndrome, autism, retardation, strokes, and spinal cord injuries, which Jensen says holds out hope that students with special needs "may be able to improve far more than we once thought."

• The brain is influenced by its physical surroundings, including the design and construction of school buildings.

Jensen readily concedes that most of the findings from the burgeoning but still-young field of neuroscience don't apply to schools. Silly claims hurt the cause, he says – for example, a school district saying it is "brain-based" because all students are required to have a bottle of water on their desks (based on the theory that cognition is enhanced by hydration). "Brain-based education is not a panacea or magic bullet to solve all of education's problems," says Jensen. "Anyone who claims that is misleading people. It is not yet a program, a model, or a package for schools to follow." Jensen suggests that advocates take a cautious and tentative approach, never saying, "Brain research proves…" but rather, "These studies suggest that XYZ may be true about the brain. Given that insight, it probably makes sense for us, under these conditions, to use the following strategies in schools." Teachers' hunches or other data may have suggested the same policy, but brain research can add credibility and power to the argument. Brain-based education is here to stay, he concludes, and to ignore it is foolish and irresponsible.

"A Fresh Look at Brain-Based Education" by Eric Jensen in *Phi Delta Kappan*, February 2008 (Vol. 89, #6, p. 408-417), http://www.pdkintl.org/kappan/k_v89/k0802jen.htm

Back to page one

2. Robert Sternberg Offers a Critique

Responding to Eric Jensen's *Kappan* article, psychologist Robert Sternberg (formerly at Yale, now at Tufts) says the problem with brain-based research is that its findings are all over the map – and don't give educators unequivocal guidance on what to do in classrooms. Some examples:

• *Intelligence* – Is there a single, "general" intellectual ability that dominates all others (as John Duncan and others have argued), or are there multiple intelligences, each relatively independent of the others (as Howard Gardner says)? "[W]hat can we conclude from brain research?" asks Sternberg. "We can conclude either that children can be ordered on a unidimensional scale that pretty much captures their different abilities to succeed in school, or we can conclude the opposite. Thus brain research does indeed have implications for education. What they are, however, depends in large part upon one's preferred ideology."

• *Racial differences in I.Q.* – There's an ongoing debate among brain scientists about this question – whether differences are genetic or environmental and what the public-policy

implications of those differences are. Sternberg says this debate is a red herring that prevents us from taking effective action to close the achievement gap.

• *Right-brain versus left-brain* – For a while there was lots of literature on the two hemispheres of the brain having quite different functions, and schools were exhorted to "teach to" one side or the other. This notion has been debunked, and now there isn't a clear message for teachers.

• *Physical education versus test prep* – Sternberg doesn't think brain research gives definitive answers on the trade-off between student exercise (or art and music, or programs for "gifted" children) and higher test scores.

He concludes that we don't know enough about the brain to use current research in schools, saying, "Perhaps we would do better, at least now, to focus the lion's share of our attention on the many pressing issues that demand immediate solutions."

"The Answer Depends on the Question: A Reply to Jensen" by Robert Sternberg in *Phi Delta Kappan*, February 2008 (Vol. 89, #6, p. 418-420), no free e-link available

Back to page one

3. Dan Willingham Joins the Debate

In a second response to Eric Jensen's *Kappan* article, University of Virginia/ Charlottesville psychology professor Dan Willingham expresses serious doubts that neuroscience can make meaningful contributions to schools. He suggests two criteria for judging brain research: (a) Does it tell us something we didn't already know? and (b) Does it improve teaching and learning? Willingham believes that brain science falls down on both counts. For example, teachers know that students don't learn if they are hungry. "What then does an understanding of the neurobiology of hunger and its effect on cognition add to a teacher's practice?" he asks. But isn't it useful to know exactly how hunger affects the brain? Nonsense, says Willingham, any more than knowing how the computer works affects what you type on the keyboard.

Jensen says that the brain is involved in everything that goes on in schools. This is true, says Willingham – but *duh*! What matters is whether brain-based research can be applied in the real world of schools. For example, a well-established finding from cognitive psychology is that "over-learning" is helpful – that is, if you continue studying something after you've mastered it, you remember it better and can more effectively apply it to new situations. The clear implication of this finding is that teachers should keep rehearsing important facts (like multiplication tables) even after students are proficient.

Not so fast! says Willingham. In the real world of classrooms, there are other variables, including boredom, motivation – and rebellion! "So here's the rub," he writes. "For the sake of simplicity, cognitive psychologists intentionally isolate one component of the mind (e.g., memory and attention) when they study it. But in the classroom, all the components operate simultaneously. So a principle from the cognitive lab might backfire when it's put into the more complex classroom environment."

Another problem, says Willingham, is that parts of the human brain don't map onto the cognitive systems, one for one. Take memory, which relies on the hippocampus, entorhinal cortex, thalamus, and frontal cortex. If a brain researcher finds out something about the hippocampus and tries to apply it to classroom learning, that's only one part of the overall memory system. And we haven't even begun to look at a real child in a complex classroom environment.

This is why Willingham believes brain research will very rarely make important contributions to classroom teaching and learning. Brain scans are just too far removed from complex classroom interactions.

What about Jensen's argument that students should get enough exercise in school, since brain studies associate exercise with learning? Willingham asks, what if it turns out that in real-life classroom studies, there are other variables and exercise turns out to detract from learning (perhaps because students return from recess all hyped up)? Which would we believe – the brain studies or the real-world studies? The latter, obviously. "So what has neuroscience done for us?" he asks. "In this case, not much, because it's the classroom data that really matter."

So it's useful when neuroscientists say, "Hey, maybe you should try this at school," and for educational researchers to say, "Never thought of that!" But in practice (as in the case of kids needing exercise) these ideas are rarely new.

Willingham closes with three areas in which neuroscience *has* made valuable contributions:

• *Brain complexity* – Brain scans have made it clear that cognitive areas that were once regarded as a single function (for example, memory) often take place in two anatomically distinct parts of the brain.

• *Dyslexia* – For years, researchers debated whether or not this disorder had a phonological basis. Brain imaging made clear that dyslexics have decreased activation in brain regions known to support phonological coding, thus settling the argument. And although dyslexics in different countries exhibit somewhat different behavioral symptoms, brain studies have shown that the anatomical locus is quite consistent (at least in countries using alphabetic languages).

• *Learning disabilities* – Electroencephalograms show that children with reading difficulties show patterns of brain activity different from average readers. If these differences could be detected before reading instruction begins, teachers might be able to use early interventions that would make a very positive difference.

"When and How Neuroscience Applies to Education" by Dan Willingham in *Phi Delta Kappan*, February 2008 (Vol. 89, #6, p. 421-423), no free e-link available

Back to page one

4. Judy Willis Adds More Cautions on Using Brain Research

In a third response to Eric Jensen's *Kappan* article, neurologist/author Judy Willis (who is currently teaching in a California middle school) says, "The first thing we need to do is

debunk the neuromyths. Even some of the purest, most accurately reported neuroscience research has been misinterpreted. People trying to capitalize on research with their elixirs, books, cure-all learning theories, and curriculum packages have perpetrated much of the damage. Other folks have unintentionally made errors of interpretation when they have been unfairly asked for scientific evidence to support the strategies they have been using successfully for years."

One neuromyth, she says, is the left brain/right brain oversimplification of learning styles, which many educators still cling to. For more than a decade, writes Willis, "neuroimaging studies have… demonstrated that human cognition is far too complex to be controlled by a single hemisphere. We now know that although parts of the brain are particularly active during certain memory or learning activities, these regions do not work in isolation. There are networks throughout both hemispheres of the brain that constantly communicate, and even these neural networks change in response to genetics and environment throughout our lives."

Another neuromyth is the idea that children have periods of critical brain growth when they are primed to learn more rapidly. Research by John Bruer debunked this notion, says Willis, showing that despite peaks and valleys of brain growth, there are no fallow periods and students can learn at any age.

Willis poses three questions to evaluate neuroscience research: (a) Does the study adhere to the medical model by limiting the variables and confining interpretation to objective data? (b) Do the study's data about brain response correlate with a cognitive test given to children? and (c) Is there an objective evaluation of the effect of the intervention on a statistically significant number of children in classrooms? "To my knowledge," she writes, "there has not yet been a strategy or intervention that has made it through all three of these filters."

Despite the absence of definitive brain research, Willis believes we know enough to believe that certain practices will result in better learning. She lists things effective teachers do, most thought up long before neuroimaging, that are increasingly supported by brain research:

- Teaching that connects with students' past experiences and personal interests;
- Classrooms where students are engaged;
- Classrooms where students are invested in goals they helped create;
- Learning that uses intrinsic motivation;
- Learning that involves creative problem-solving;
- Activities that challenge students;
- Classrooms that are low in threat;
- Classrooms in which students actively process information in the construction of knowledge;
- Teaching through more than one modality (visual, auditory, kinesthetic);
- Stimulating classrooms, including novelty and surprise;
- Activities that give students choices;
- Activities that use interest-driven investigation;

- Learning that involves collaboration with peers.

Willis says there is also brain research that suggests that Piaget was right about stages of development at which children have the circuitry to handle certain kinds of learning.

As brain research becomes more sophisticated and more studies are conducted in real-world classroom settings, she believes we will become more and more sophisticated about what works and what doesn't – and when each intervention is most effective. She also believes that we will get better at diagnosing learning disabilities and devising early interventions to help students who would otherwise fall far behind.

Willis concludes by suggesting that for at-risk students who are failing in schools, we should try certain remedies even though they have not been fully proven by the research. "However," she cautions, "educators need to use these methods prudently. We need to discuss our successes and acknowledge what doesn't work… [E]ducators need to beware of opportunists who claim that their strategies are proven by brain research."

"Building a Bridge from Neuroscience to the Classroom" by Judy Willis in *Phi Delta Kappan*, February 2008 (Vol. 89, #6, p. 424-427), no free e-link available. Willis can be reached at jwillisneuro@aol.com.

Back to page one

5. Eric Jensen Responds to His Critics

In this rejoinder to Robert Sternberg, Dan Willingham, and Judy Willis, Eric Jensen emphasizes the common ground, acknowledges that there have been countless "errors of enthusiasm" among brain researchers, affirms that we need to debunk the "neuromyths," and makes these points:

• He disagrees with Willingham that brain research is useless if it tells us things we already know. Jensen says there are many things that educators "already know" – for example, *The apple doesn't fall far from the tree* – that are dead wrong. "What some educators claim they 'already know' scares me," he says. "Student I.Q., parental intelligence, and traditional gene profiles are seen today to mean far less than they used to."

• Jensen also disagrees with Willingham's statement that educators don't need to know the details of how hunger adversely affects learning. On the contrary, Jensen says, knowing the mechanism is important. "Recent discoveries about glucose requirements in the hippocampus," he writes, "suggest (1) that teachers educate kids and parents better about the roles of glucose, fructose, and sucrose in learning and memory, (2) that teachers make glucose-boosting snacks available, and (3) that teachers understand that, since brief physical activity stimulates the liver to release glucose, energizers at times make good sense… Saying that there's nothing practical that can be done about research on hunger and poor nutrition is both inaccurate and unempowering for teachers."

• Jensen agrees with Willis that there is broad overlap between brain research findings and what good teachers have figured out over the ages. "There is nothing, *absolutely nothing*, that I have advocated in the past 25 years for classroom teachers that has not already been supported by complementary educational, cognitive, or sociological research," he writes.

"Brain research rarely suggests novel approaches, since teachers have always been pretty creative."

• Finally, Jensen urges teachers to conduct action research in their classrooms as they try out different interventions and test the validity of brain-friendly approaches – and publish their findings.

"Exciting Times Call for Collaboration" by Eric Jensen in *Phi Delta Kappan*, February 2008 (Vol. 89, #6, p. 428-431), no free e-link available

Back to page one

6. How Explaining Something to Mom Helps Children Learn

In this *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology* article, researchers Bethany Rittle-Johnson, Megan Saylor, and Kathryn Swygert report on a study designed to see if having 4- and 5-year-olds explain something to their mothers made a difference in how well they learned it – and whether they could apply their learning to a new situation. The researchers had 54 youngsters work with pattern problems (deciding which color and kind of bug – e.g., red spider, red bee, blue bee – should come next in a progression) and gave them feedback on whether they were correct. The children were then divided into three groups: those in the first were asked to explain the classification to their mothers, who were instructed to listen and not prompt or correct; those in the second group were asked to explain the solution to themselves, (speaking into a tape recorder); and those in the third were asked to repeat the correct answer without explaining it.

What did the researchers find? You guessed it – children who explained the problem to their mothers performed better than the other two groups when they were asked to solve another pattern problem similar to the initial problems. And mom-explainers were markedly better able to transfer what they had learned to new and more challenging problems. (Children in the second group did better than those who weren't asked to explain to anyone.)

What does this prove? That explaining your thinking helps even very young children think through and solidify their learning – and explaining to another person enhances that effect – as long as the person is listening. "Explaining to their moms may prompt children to be more explicit and/or to generate more generalizable rules," explain the authors. "Presence of a listener may provide a natural context for helping children to stay motivated and integrate knowledge across multiple dimensions of a problem. The general lesson might be that if you are having difficulty in understanding something, you should try explaining it to your mom."

What wasn't determined was whether this applies to older children, and whether other listeners – a father, a teacher, another student – would have the same effect.

"Learning from Explaining: Does It Matter if Mom Is Listening?" by Bethany Rittle-Johnson, Megan Saylor, and Kathryn Swygert in *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 2007 (in press). The lead author can be contacted at bethany.rittle-johnson@vanderbilt.edu.
Spotted in "Report Roundup" in *Education Week*, Feb. 6, 2008 (Vol. 27, #22, p. 5)

Back to page one

7. Advice for Those Who Mentor New Principals

In this thoughtful *Kappan* article, Spokane (WA) principal Pete Hall suggests some key factors in successful principal mentoring programs:

• *A common frame of reference* – It's important, says Hall, for principals, mentors, and others in the district to have a shared vocabulary and concept system about what a mentor is and what he or she should do.

• *Clear roles and responsibilities* – "Poorly trained (or untrained) mentors can damage budding administrators," says Hall. So will an unclear vision, fuzzy timelines, and undefined roles.

• *Allocating enough time* – Mentors and novice principals need "quality time to talk, banter, share ideas, ask questions, and grow together as professionals," says Hall. Mentoring won't work without a significant commitment of time on both sides.

• *Thoughtful mentor/protégé matching* – New principals need someone who will "push them beyond what they think they're capable of doing." Issues involving competence, jealousy, trust, confidentiality, reluctance to assign responsibility, and mentor pushiness can derail a mentor/protégé relationship.

• *Clear goals* – Without end-point and interim goals, says Hall, a mentoring relationship can end up "meandering aimlessly, resulting in little growth and the failure to accomplish the primary objective."

Hall closes with some specific advice. "The most important thing we can pass on to a new principal is self-reflection," he writes. "It's the least-practiced thing we do." He suggests the following guidelines for mentors:

- Ask probing questions.
- Provide honest feedback.
- Listen.
- Analyze decisions.
- Propose alternative viewpoints.
- Encourage independence.
- Foster lifelong learning.
- Offer caring support.

It's difficult, but mentors need to *refrain* from giving directive feedback. "Effective, positive mentors understand a key concept," says Hall. "The mentor's mission is to support the protégé's learning, not to help run the protégé's school… Successful mentors, like coaches, ask, probe, challenge, and support – and maybe even guide or nudge – but rarely order or tell. Protégés' mistakes and blunders lead to powerful learning, buoying their chances of future success."

"Building Bridges: Strengthening the Principal Induction Process Through Intentional Mentoring" by Pete Hall in *Phi Delta Kappan*, February 2008 (Vol. 89, #6, p. 449-452), no free e-link available

Back to page one

8. The Limits – and Importance – of Educational Research

In this *Education Week* article, Frederick Hess and Jeffrey Henig, who come from opposite ends of the ideological spectrum, warn against overblown, dubious claims for educational research. "Despite our differences," they write, "we share the concern that undisciplined claims about the power of research can stand in for careful thinking, foster cynicism, and undermine the long-term contribution of the research community."

Hess and Henig suggest three reasons why even the most "scientific" educational research is almost never definitive:

• The metrics used by researchers are at least one step removed from the reality they are studying. For example, reading and math test scores are an approximation of students' learning, and eligibility for free and reduced-price meals is a "crude proxy" for a family's income.

• Programs that seem to be effective in one setting may not work elsewhere, and ideas that seem to be effective when they are first implemented can peter out over time. Policymakers want answers *now*, but they should listen when researchers say that it's "too soon to tell."

• The "gold standard" of research – randomized clinical trials, like those used in medicine – is difficult to implement in schools and is impossible with most policy debates, for example, merit pay. "Scholarship's greatest value," say Hess and Henig, "is not the ability to end policy disputes, but to encourage more thoughtful, disciplined, and tempered debate. In particular, rigorous research can establish parameters as to how big an effect a policy or program might have, even if it fails to conclusively answer whether it 'works'." Some examples:

- Research has "quieted the notion that either Teach for America recruits or national-board-certified teachers are likely to have heroic impacts on student achievement."
- Research can question glib assumptions, for example, that spending more necessarily improves performance, or that the more credentials a teacher has, the better student achievement will be.
- Research can spotlight "uncomfortable realities" – for example, the allocation of funds in urban districts, the extent of the dropout problem, and the impact of collective bargaining on district practices.

"'Scientific Research' and Policymaking: A Tool, Not a Crutch" by Frederick Hess and Jeffrey Henig in *Education Week*, Feb. 6, 2008 (Vol. 27, #22, p. 36, 26) http://www.edweek.org (you can get free access to two articles a week – click on Current Issue and scroll down to the page number)

Back to page one

9. Research Reviews of Dropout Prevention Programs

This *Education Week* article reports on a recent What Works Clearinghouse review of dropout prevention programs, which found that a much-touted program, First Things First, has yet to show that it prevents students from dropping out of school. Here are the Clearinghouse

ratings of other dropout-prevention programs based on its three criteria (Staying in School, Progressing in School, and Completing School):

- ALAS (Achievement for Latinos through Academic Success) – potentially positive effects on staying in school and progressing in school;
- Career Academies – potentially positive effects on staying in school and progressing in school;
- Check and Connect – positive effects on staying in school and potentially positive effects on progressing in school;
- Financial Incentives for Teen Parents to Stay in School – potentially positive effects on staying in school;
- High School Redirection – mixed data on staying in school and potentially positive effects on progressing in school;
- New Chance – potentially positive effects on completing school;
- Project "Graduation Really Achieves Dreams" (GRAD) – no evidence of effectiveness;
- Quantum Opportunity Program (QOP) – no evidence of effectiveness;
- Talent Development High Schools – potentially positive effects on progressing in school;
- Talent Search – potentially positive effects on completing school;
- Twelve Together – potentially positive effects on staying in school.

"U.S. Review Finds No Proof That Reform Model Works" by Debra Viadero in *Education Week*, Feb. 6, 2008 (Vol. 27, #22, p. 6) http://www.edweek.org (you can get free access to two articles a week – click on Current Issue and scroll down to the page number)

Back to page one

10. How Much Freedom Should New Teachers Have with Literacy?

In this troubling *Kappan* article, California State University/Stanislaus professor Mary Borba laments the way some of the teachers she works with are forced into a straitjacket of "fidelity" as they implement a particular literacy program in their classrooms. "They are required to be so tied to the text that they hardly look up to notice the possible confusion or boredom in children's eyes," writes Borba. "I fear they will not have the freedom or courage to enrich the lesson, skip the lesson, or repeat the lesson, if that is what their students need. I fear that my carefully planned university classes will be in vain because these future teachers will soon learn that teaching is not about thinking, reflecting, observing, and making expert decisions about the best teaching intervention for a particular child."

"Commercial reading programs may be helpful to novice teachers with all they are trying to manage in that first year or two," concludes Borba. "However, new teachers need to be able to deal with variation, not sameness. Children come to us from different cultures, families, and teachers and have had different learning opportunities. Only a well-trained teacher – not a program – can respond to individual needs."

"Literacy Lessons on Location" by Mary Borba in *Phi Delta Kappan*, February 2008 (Vol. 89, #6, p. 440-441), no free e-link available

Back to page one

11. Short Items:

a. MIT courses online – The Massachusetts Institute of Technology has a new website providing high-school teachers open-source access to a wealth of material – more than 2,600 lecture videos and descriptions of labs, experiments, syllabi, course notes, and other course materials. Some of the material is organized by high-school AP courses including biology, calculus, and physics. Check it out at http://ocw.mit.edu/OcwWeb/hs/home/home/index.htm.

"New Web Site From MIT Organizes Materials for K-12" in *Education Week*, Feb. 6, 2008 (Vol. 27, #22, p. 13)

Back to page one

b. A report on teacher evaluation – This thoughtful Education Sector study, "Rush to Judgment: Teacher Evaluation in Public Education" by Thomas Toch and Robert Rothman is available at http://www.educationsector.org/research/research_show.htm?doc_id=656300

Spotted in "Report Roundup" in *Education Week*, Feb. 6, 2008 (Vol. 27, #22, p. 5)

Back to page one

c. Doing What Works website – This new federal Department of Education website has reports on best practices and the research behind them: http://dww.ed.gov.

Spotted in "Research News to Use" in *Reading Today*, Feb./Mar. 2008 (Vol. 25, #4, p. 37)

Back to page one

Do you have feedback? Is anything missing?

If you have comments or suggestions, if you saw an article or web item in the last week that you think should have been summarized, or if you would like to suggest additional publications that should be covered by the Marshall Memo, please e-mail: kim.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 School Board Journal
ASCD, CEC SmartBriefs, Daily EdNews
Atlantic Monthly
Catalyst Chicago
CommonWealth Magazine
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
NASSP Bulletin
New York Times
New Yorker
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
TESOL Quarterly
The Reading Teacher
Theory Into Practice
Tools for Schools