

# Marshall Memo 744

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

July 9, 2018

## In This Issue:

1. [A major teacher-improvement initiative produces disappointing results](#)
2. [Irene Fountas and Gay Su Pinnell on effective literacy instruction](#)
3. [Three approaches to talking with teachers after classroom visits](#)
4. [A New York City physics teacher reflects on his craft](#)
5. [How can a good math PD program have so little impact?](#)
6. [Books to get first graders thinking](#)

## Quotes of the Week

“When I was in high school, I remember loving physics, but it felt too often like my high-school teacher was the one having all the fun, and we were focused too much on getting right answers, not discovering anything for ourselves. I became a teacher to show him and other science teachers how to do more than just talk to students from behind a desk.”

Seth Guñals-Kupperman (see item #4)

“Teachers hate being lectured to about how they shouldn’t lecture.”

Seth Guñals-Kupperman (*ibid.*)

“The critical value of an articulated vision for literacy is that students are guaranteed access to a coherent educational experience regardless of the teacher, the grade level, or the latest educational mandate.”

Irene Fountas and Gay Su Pinnell (see item #2)

“Office-based activities like analyzing data and planning professional development are important, but they’re no substitute for actually seeing teachers at work, and talking to them about their work.”

Justin Baeder (see item #3)

“Listening is at the heart of strong relationships.”

Justin Baeder (*ibid.*)

“One of the things philanthropy can and should do is experiment and let us learn about what works. It was an expensive experiment, but it was a reasonable hypothesis... For good or bad, we’ve learned a lot. Not only about teacher evaluation, but about this approach to trying to change how school systems work.”

Frederick Hess on a Gates-funded teacher quality initiative (quoted in item #1)

---

## **1. A Major Teacher Improvement Initiative Produces Disappointing Results**

In this *Education Week* article, Madeline Will reports on a study by the RAND Corporation (with the American Institutes for Research) of a multi-year Gates Foundation-funded effort to improve teacher effectiveness. The \$575 million initiative, which focused on Memphis/Shelby County, Pittsburgh, and Hillsborough County over six years, “tried to pull a bunch of levers to have a big impact on student performance,” said RAND author Brian Stecher: a new teacher-evaluation system, measuring student achievement growth, PD based on teachers’ evaluations, merit bonuses, and revamped recruitment, hiring, and placement. “The sites did in fact modify all of these levers,” says Stecher, “some more than others, but in the end, there were no big payoffs in terms of improved graduation [rates] or achievement of students in general, and low-income and minority students in particular.” The study reported one positive outcome: most teachers said they had become more reflective and made changes in classroom practices.

Why the lackluster results? It appears that the high stakes attached to teachers’ evaluations (based on student results) – decisions on tenure, merit pay, and dismissal – had unintended consequences. There was pushback from teachers, and principals told researchers they’d rather help teachers improve instead of dismissing them – which may be why very few teachers in the districts got low ratings (Campbell’s Law in action). “There was a real tension between using these measures for accountability purposes... and using them for improvement tools,” says Stecher. “I don’t think any of the sites negotiated that tension perfectly, and I think it’s a difficult one for others to do as well.”

In addition, the new evaluation systems created burdensome time demands for school leaders. The reasoning was that with high stakes attached to classroom observations, school administrators needed to make hour-long classroom observations four times a year and fill out detailed evaluation rubrics. Some schools dialed back from these time-consuming requirements, trying to get principals into classrooms for shorter visits with a coaching focus, but this was not the original design of the initiative.

The Gates Foundation has shifted its philanthropic focus from teacher evaluation toward improved curriculum materials matching state standards, as well as helping networks of middle and high schools scale up best practices. Frederick Hess of the American Enterprise Institute had this to say about the initiative: “One of the things philanthropy can and should do is experiment and let us learn about what works. It was an expensive experiment, but it was a

reasonable hypothesis... For good or bad, we've learned a lot. Not only about teacher evaluation, but about this approach to trying to change how school systems work.”

“‘An Expensive Experiment’: Gates Teacher-Effectiveness Program Shows No Gains for Students” by Madeline Will in *Education Week*, June 21, 2018, <https://bit.ly/2KJix3N>

*[Back to page one](#)*

## **2. Irene Fountas and Gay Su Pinnell on Effective Literacy Instruction**

“Many good ideas flounder and fail because of haphazard implementation, conflicts, unintended consequences, an inability to sustain effort, and a simple lack of communication,” say Irene Fountas (Lesley University) and Gay Su Pinnell (The Ohio State University) in this article in *The Reading Teacher*. “It can be easy to get discouraged.” The key to an effective literacy program for all students, they say, is four key elements:

• *Element #1: Shared vision and values* – To stay focused through changes in literacy mandates, leaders, and programs, here’s what research and common sense tell us has worked – and will work going forward:

- High expectations for all students, valuing linguistic, ethnic, and cultural diversity;
- Teams taking collective responsibility for the success of each student;
- Using evidence gained from systematic observation and ongoing assessment;
- Effective practices appropriate to whole-class, small-group, and individual contexts;
- Students engaged in authentic inquiry about topics that fuel their intellectual curiosity;
- Students as powerful agents in their own learning, frequently making choices;
- Students thinking, talking, reading, and writing about their world;
- Lots of texts providing rich, diverse examples of genre, theme, topic, setting, and other literary qualities;
- Students reading and processing more than 2,000 texts by middle school;
- Students gaining an understanding of their physical, social, and emotional world and their roles as informed global citizens.

These values should guide every literacy decision the school makes and translate to a clear consensus on what a visitor should see and hear in every literacy classroom.

“Educators need to grapple with beliefs, values and a forward-thinking vision,” say Fountas and Pinnell, “until they fully understand and believe in them and agree that they can commit to act in unison when they walk out of the meeting room and into their classrooms.” The vision and values should be written up and revisited regularly, ensuring that everyone is on the same page, “moving beyond an approach where each teacher applies his or her own methods or philosophy...” This is not about cookie-cutter teachers and classrooms but a deep consensus about what good teaching looks like. “The critical value of an articulated vision for literacy,” they say, “is that students are guaranteed access to a coherent educational experience regardless of the teacher, the grade level, or the latest educational mandate.”

• *Element #2: Common goals and language and collective responsibility* – Once a shared vision is in place, say Fountas and Pinnell, “[t]he language naturally shifts from *my* students and *my* classroom to *our* students, *our* classrooms, *our* curriculum, *our* school, *our*

data, *our* goals, *our* professional learning opportunities, and *our* expectations for students and one another.” The school becomes more coherent for students – “they get the same messages about the role of literacy in their lives year after year from all members of the school community.” There’s also a collective effort to understand the increasingly diverse students in our classrooms and build cultural proficiency in all staff. For educators, common aims and collective work reduce stress. “You have a shared pool of expertise and support upon which you can draw and to which you contribute,” say Fountas and Pinnell. “The burden is lighter, the anxiety lower, and your own ability to improve student outcomes is enhanced.”

• *Element #3: A high level of teacher expertise* – To prepare students for the literacy demands of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, teachers need to bring their A game and help each other develop in four critical areas:

- A repertoire of techniques for observation and assessments – “The most effective teaching is scientific,” say Fountas and Pinnell: “You analyze and respond minute by minute to the precise reading or writing behaviors you observe.”
- A clear vision of proficiency in reading, writing, and talking – For reading, this includes thinking *within* the text (searching for and using information, monitoring and self-correcting, solving words, maintaining fluency, adjusting, and summarizing), thinking *beyond* the text (predicting, making connections, synthesizing, and inferring), and thinking *about* the text (analyzing and critiquing).
- A deep knowledge of texts, their characteristics, and their demands – Fountas and Pinnell recommend a using a wide variety of texts (not one core text), implemented in interactive read-alouds, shared reading, guided reading, book clubs, and independent reading. Leveled texts are used only in guided reading.
- Expertise in implementing a range of research-based instructional practices – “The result,” say Fountas and Pinnell, “is a coordinated series of instructional contexts that take into account a student’s current abilities but are designed to stretch the student in new ways every day.”

This level of teacher expertise and teamwork should produce “thoughtful, literate, and socially responsible young people moving into our society.”

• *Element #4: A culture of continuous professional learning* – “Effective teaching is complex and demanding,” say Fountas and Pinnell. “It requires far more expertise, information, resources, and problem solving than any one of us could have alone.” That’s why reflection, collaboration, conversation, communication, open classroom doors, regular team meetings, and mutual support are so essential, fueling energy, teacher agency, and individual acts of leadership. Support and communication are especially important for new teachers.

“It is not as hard as it sounds,” conclude Fountas and Pinnell. “Your school may already be engaging in many of these practices, so much is already in place... The key is implementation of good ideas – trying them on with care, studying them over time, and getting better and better.”

“Every Child, Every Classroom, Every Day: From Vision to Action in Literacy Learning” by Irene Fountas and Gay Su Pinnell in *The Reading Teacher*, July/August 2018 (Vol. 72, #1, p.

7-19), <https://ila.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/trtr.1718>; the authors can be reached at [ifountas@lesley.edu](mailto:ifountas@lesley.edu) and [gspinnell@yahoo.com](mailto:gspinnell@yahoo.com).

*[Back to page one](#)*

### **3. Three Approaches to Talking with Teachers After Classroom Visits**

“I believe changing practice starts with getting into classrooms and having conversations with teachers,” says author/consultant Justin Baeder in this *Principal Center* article. “Office-based activities like analyzing data and planning professional development are important, but they’re no substitute for actually seeing teachers at work, and talking to them about their work.” He believes school leaders should make short, frequent, unannounced classroom visits every day (aiming to see each teacher about twice a month), and observe with an open mind (no checklists).

However, short classroom visits may not provide enough information for high-quality feedback, which is why it’s important not to jump to evaluative conclusions. Teachers can become resistant to administrators’ comments and suggestions, creating a psychological barrier for both teachers and administrators to future observations. Because of this dynamic, says Baeder, many principals do the absolute minimum of required formal evaluation visits, and consequently are out of touch with the daily realities of classrooms.

The solution is simple: always have an informal face-to-face conversation with teachers after each classroom visit, and use the talks to get the bigger picture of what’s going on in each classroom, build relationships and trust, and improve teaching and learning.

Of course it’s not as simple as popping into classrooms and chatting with teachers. As with the trust a good physician builds with patients, teachers’ trust in their supervisors depends on three leader characteristics:

- Expertise – Knowing curriculum and instruction;
- Firsthand knowledge – Knowing about individual teachers and what’s going on in their classrooms;
- Listening – Post-visit conversations can’t be a one-way street. “Listening is at the heart of strong relationships,” says Baeder.

From his years as a teacher, principal, researcher, and consultant, Baeder has found that post-observation interactions fall into three categories, depending on what was observed in the classroom: boss-oriented directive feedback; coach-oriented reflective feedback; and leader-oriented reflexive feedback:

- *Directive feedback* – This usually involves telling a teacher who is using an ineffective practice what needs to change – for example, *You must not raise your voice or yell at students. Instead, use a consistent signal to get everyone’s attention, then give directions in a normal speaking voice.* “Even when we’re working with teachers who are making serious and obvious mistakes,” says Baeder, “– like failing to plan lessons or screaming at students – we need to have expertise, gain firsthand knowledge, and listen.” It’s helpful to give the rationale behind the directive, so the teacher sees it’s a problem common to all teachers and not personal. For example, the principal might say, “In this school, we don’t yell at our kids, and I

want you to understand what happens when you do. When you're yelling, you can't hear students, so they can talk even more, and they're also losing respect for you.”

Of course teachers sometimes resist directives, as happened when Baeder told a teacher that it was unacceptable not to plan his math lessons. The teacher insisted that it was fine to wing it every day, and told Baeder to stop coming to his classroom, go back to his office, and do his job. Fortunately Baeder got backup from his boss and from the union representative and the teacher started planning lessons.

• *Reflective feedback* – This often involves asking questions after a visit – for example, *What are some ways you could get students to start asking higher-order questions, so they can take more leadership in directing class discussions?* “Because teaching is complex professional work, we can’t make teachers’ decisions for them,” says Baeder. “[B]y asking the right questions at the right time, we can prompt the kinds of thinking that can help teachers improve their practice... The sweet spot for most instructional leaders is helping teachers understand the impact their instruction is having on students. In other words, our greatest opportunity is in helping teachers move from performance-aware to impact-aware.”

Questions are also an opportunity for school leaders to show humility. When he moved from teaching middle-school science to being an elementary principal, Baeder knew very little about literacy and math instruction in the lower grades. Chatting with teachers after classroom visits, he found himself asking softball questions: *Tell me more about when you did ---, What were your goals for the lesson? What are you thinking you'll do next?* Baeder realized that post-visit conversations were falling into what he calls the “fake feedback game”:

- The administrator pretends to provide feedback.
- The teacher pretends to appreciate it – “Oh yeah, great point, Justin! I will definitely work on that and let you know how it goes. OK? Bye.”
- Both pretend teacher practice has changed as a result of the conversation.

In addition to the emptiness of these conversations, Baeder wasn’t learning anything about elementary literacy and math or getting insights into what was really going on in teachers’ heads.

“It was through these conversations that I discovered the true reason it’s so hard to change teacher practice,” he says. “Teacher behavior is like the tip of the iceberg, and teacher thinking is what’s beneath the surface.” He learned that asking *Why?* questions tended to make teachers defensive. *How?* questions were more likely to get teachers to engage in non-defensive reflection. Over time, he began asking questions that probed context (what happened before and after a visit); different perceptions and interpretations of the same events; the thinking behind decisions teachers made; adjustments they made to deal with unexpected events; alignment with curriculum expectations; and, most important, impact on student learning.

• *Reflexive feedback* – There are situations where neither the “boss” nor the “coach” approach is appropriate. Here’s an example. At one point in his principalship, Baeder noticed that kindergarten teachers weren’t implementing a schoolwide anti-bullying curriculum. Asked why, the teachers said they were trying but there simply wasn’t enough time in the schedule.

This could have been taken as excuse-making and complaining, but Baeder investigated and concluded that the teachers were absolutely right: the timing of recess didn't allow a big enough block to teach the anti-bullying lessons. He modified the schedule and the problem was solved.

“We must see the whole iceberg of practice,” says Baeder, “– what’s above and below the surface – but *the current the iceberg is floating in* matters even more.” The system within which teachers and school leaders are working can have an outsize impact on what happens in classrooms. *Reflexive* conversations are those in which teachers have a voice and know that the principal will take what they say seriously. “As a result,” he says, “they’re much more willing to invest effort in making changes in their practice – because they believe they’ll get the support they need.”

Over time, listening carefully to teachers talking about what was going on in the whole system helped Baeder make better decisions on professional development experiences for the staff; whom to hire for existing and newly created positions; where to allocate funds; and where he could most productively focus his time and attention.

“How Instructional Leaders Change Teacher Practice” by Justin Baeder in *The Principal Center*, July 6, 2018, <https://www.principalcenter.com/how-instructional-leaders-change-teacher-practice/>; Baeder can be reached at [justin@principalcenter.com](mailto:justin@principalcenter.com).

[Back to page one](#)

#### **4. A New York City Physics Teacher Reflects on His Craft**

In this *Chalkbeat* article, Alex Zimmerman profiles award-winning New York City physics teacher Seth Guñals-Kupperman, who 20 years ago had a less-than-inspiring experience as a student at the Bronx High School of Science. Classes at this elite school often consisted of teachers writing facts on the board for students to regurgitate on exams. “When I was in high school, I remember loving physics,” says Guñals-Kupperman “but it felt too often like my high-school teacher was the one having all the fun, and we were focused too much on getting right answers, not discovering anything for ourselves. I became a teacher to show him and other science teachers how to do more than just talk to students from behind a desk.”

Guñals-Kupperman was especially critical of traditional science labs, in which students are told various facts and then carry out a lab to “test” the facts. “But of course it’s not a test,” he says, “since students know what the outcome is supposed to be... This is both bizarre and a-scientific. An experiment can only be called such if you don’t know the outcome already. Instead of conducting these confirmation labs, a teacher can switch to a discovery lab: nobody knows what will happen (though everyone has ideas, assumptions, and expectations). There are curiosity, investment, and a community of learners all able to check in with each other – i.e., scientists!”

So science lessons should be inductive, says Guñals-Kupperman. “Pretty much every experiment in science is one in which the ‘correct answer’ is that there is a relationship of some sort between two variables. But there are so many key examples where two things that seem related aren’t actually related at all. Instead of telling the students that more massive objects

fall the same way lighter objects do (which can be demonstrably false due to air resistance), I don't just demonstrate it; I make them run an experiment." Student groups drop objects of different mass, collect data, and notice patterns, discuss differences in data from different groups, and grasp the concept at a deeper level.

Guiñals-Kupperman is passionate on the relevance of his subject. "Physics explains how your phone works," he says, "the bus, train, airplane, and car you ride in, and why buildings and bridges are built the way they are. Also, physics represents a way of knowing: One complaint by students is often that physics is too mathematical. But another interpretation can be that physics shows you how math can be used to solve problems, manufacture cars, rockets, explain tackle football, ballet, and building construction."

Guiñals-Kupperman has strong views on professional development. "Teachers hate being lectured to about how they shouldn't lecture," he says. Teachers want practical stuff, and PD workshops should put them in "student mode," modeling a real classroom environment. He's a big proponent of group work and using 3 x 2-foot whiteboards for group problem-solving, checking for understanding, and noticing what students doodle on them. He doesn't believe classrooms should be silent. "But it's productive noise," he says. He passes along the best advice he got in his first year of teaching: never spend more time grading an assignment than your students spent completing it. Homework shouldn't be busywork, but should "demand the maximum thinking on the part of the student while making it clear for me what they have right and how to remediate what they don't."

On the current hot topic of increasing diversity in New York City's eight selective high schools, Guiñals-Kupperman is a proponent of the kind of diversity he had in Bronx Science in the 1990s. "I think a major strength of a high school can be the often mind-blowing realization that there are kids from places, with backgrounds and lived realities far away from your own, who deserve the same rigorous, challenging environment where you can collaboratively nerd out about engineering, calculus, Chaucer, the Cuban Revolution, and irregular verbs. I think one of the greatest cultural strengths of major cities is their diversity; I relish opportunities to give our specialized high school students that strength."

"How I Teach: Having Once Found Science Dull As a Student, This New York City Teacher Now Strives for a More Engaging Approach" by Alex Zimmerman in *Chalkbeat*, July 6, 2018, <https://bit.ly/2KU6boU>

*[Back to page one](#)*

## **5. How Can a Good Math PD Program Have So Little Impact?**

In this *Teachers College Record* article, Heather Hill (Harvard University), Douglas Lyman Corey (Brigham Young University), and Robin Jacob (University of Michigan) report on their three-year study of the implementation of the Math Solutions program in fourth- and fifth-grade classrooms in a diverse East-coast school district. The program, based on the work of Marilyn Burns, emphasizes engaging, high-cognitive-demand tasks that allow students to develop their own solutions to mathematical problems, often in collaboration with other students. In addition to extensive PD on the program, including teachers solving tasks,

discussions of best practices, videos of students working with challenging math problems, and lesson planning, teachers received supplemental curriculum materials – books, detailed lesson plans, and written explanations.

Despite all this seemingly high-quality work, the program had only a modest effect on teachers' mathematical knowledge and virtually no impact on classroom practices and student outcomes. Drawing on teacher surveys, interviews, and observations, Hill, Corey, and Jacob found that these disappointing results were not explained by teachers' lack of will (many teachers said they were asking better questions and making other recommended classroom changes), their failure to make sense of the program, or insufficient resources. Rather, the lack of impact on teaching and learning resulted from four problems:

- *Organizational barriers* – The district's policies and lack of support were mentioned by more than half the teachers, and the composite list constitutes implementation hell: state and district math standards and assessments were updated during the initiative; there were three different district superintendents during the implementation period; an effective district math coordinator (who acted as a "fixer" for problems) retired; teachers were often not able to attend trainings because of lack of scheduling support; teachers lacked adequate access to technology to engage in an online community between PD sessions; the district's curriculum objectives, pacing guides, and frequent benchmark tests were not synched to the Math Solutions curriculum; there was a mismatch between the heterogeneous grouping advocated by Math Solutions and the district's policy of homogeneous grouping; and the time required for Math Solutions lessons often didn't fit into schools' schedule blocks.

- *Overly ambitious curriculum goals* – Teachers appeared not to grasp the full implications of the Math Solutions program and ended up implementing conventional-looking math instruction. For example, the researchers observed teachers asking good *Why?* questions but then accepting procedural answers from students. In addition, cognitively complex tasks and open-ended discussion prompts were rarely used to their full potential.

- *Weak instructional press* – The Math Solutions professional developers, although they had good materials and a positive attitude, didn't push teachers very hard to improve their craft and engage in meaningful mathematical work. Instead, they focused on lighter pedagogical fare and didn't insist on the development of the knowledge and skills necessary to implement the program effectively. This was especially evident when lessons were critiqued. The reason seems to have been that Math Solutions PD providers feared that pushing the teachers for more-rigorous mathematical work might disrupt their relationships with teachers and result in participants not returning for more training. The researchers suggest another reason: "the 'culture of nice' and privatization of instruction [closing their classroom doors] that exists within schools, and under which teachers are protected from questions about their professional judgment and expertise."

- *Not differentiating to bring all teachers up to speed* – Teacher participants had a wide range of prior experience with this type of mathematics, from very basic to moderately sophisticated. Hill, Corey, and Jacob observed that the PD often didn't successfully meet these different needs, and as a result, the classroom implementation of model lessons was very

uneven. “The Math Solutions program, at the time we studied it, focused more on creating a new vision for instruction than on providing the technical skills to support that vision,” conclude the researchers. “But these technical skills – launching tasks so that students can profitably work, responding to student ideas – may be necessary before high-quality implementation can proceed.”

“Dividing by Zero: Exploring Null Results in a Mathematics Professional Development Program” by Heather Hill, Douglas Lyman Corey, and Robin Jacob in *Teachers College Record*, June 2018 (Vol. 120, #6, p. 1-42), <http://hub.mspnet.org/index.cfm/29016>; Hill can be reached at [heather\\_hill@gse.harvard.edu](mailto:heather_hill@gse.harvard.edu), Jacob at [rjacob@umich.edu](mailto:rjacob@umich.edu).

*[Back to page one](#)*

## **6. Books To Get First Graders Thinking**

In this article in *The Reading Teacher*, Laura Beth Kelly and Lindsey Moses (Arizona State University/Tempe) suggest several children’s books that foster inferential discussions among first graders:

- *This Is Not My Hat* by Jon Klassen
- *Wolves* by Emily Gravett
- *Yo! Yes?* by Chris Raschka
- *Drum, Chavi, Drum!/Toca, Chavi, Toca!* By Mayra Lazara Dole
- *Please, Mr. Panda/Por Favor, Sr. Panda* by Steve Antony
- *Stella Brings the Family* by Miriam Schiffer
- *Adelita: A Mexican Cinderella Story* by Tomie dePaola
- *The True Story of the Three Little Pigs* by Jon Scieszka
- *Goldilocks and the Three Dinosaurs* by Mo Willems

“Children’s Literature That Sparks Inferential Discussions” by Laura Beth Kelly and Lindsey Moses in *The Reading Teacher*, July/August 2018 (Vol. 72, #1, p. 21-29), <https://ila.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/trtr.1675>; the authors can be reached at [lbkelly@asu.edu](mailto:lbkelly@asu.edu) and [lindsey.moses.1@asu.edu](mailto:lindsey.moses.1@asu.edu).

*[Back to page one](#)*

© Copyright 2018 Marshall Memo LLC

*If you have feedback or suggestions,  
please e-mail [kim.marshall48@gmail.com](mailto:kim.marshall48@gmail.com)*

# About the Marshall Memo

## ***Mission and focus:***

This weekly memo is designed to keep principals, teachers, superintendents, and other educators very well-informed on current research and effective practices in K-12 education. Kim Marshall, drawing on 48 years' experience as a teacher, principal, central office administrator, writer, and consultant lightens the load of busy educators by serving as their "designated reader."

To produce the Marshall Memo, Kim subscribes to 60 carefully-chosen publications (see list to the right), sifts through more than a hundred articles each week, and selects 5-10 that have the greatest potential to improve teaching, leadership, and learning. He then writes a brief summary of each article, pulls out several striking quotes, provides e-links to full articles when available, and e-mails the Memo to subscribers every Monday evening (with occasional breaks; there are 50 issues a year). Every week there's a podcast and HTML version as well.

## ***Subscriptions:***

Individual subscriptions are \$50 for a year. Rates decline steeply for multiple readers within the same organization. See the website for these rates and how to pay by check, credit card, or purchase order.

## ***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 running count of articles)
- Headlines for all issues
- Reader opinions
- About Kim Marshall (bio, writings, consulting)
- A free sample issue

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

- The current issue (in Word and PDF)
- All back issues (Word and PDF) and podcasts
- An easily searchable archive of all articles so far
- The "classic" articles from all 14+ years

## ***Core list of publications covered***

Those read this week are underlined.

All Things PLC  
American Educational Research Journal  
American Educator  
American Journal of Education  
American School Board Journal  
AMLE Magazine  
ASCA School Counselor  
District Management Journal  
Ed. Magazine  
Education Digest  
Education Next  
Education Update  
Education Week  
Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis  
Educational Horizons  
Educational Leadership  
Educational Researcher  
Edutopia  
Elementary School Journal  
English Journal  
Essential Teacher  
Exceptional Children  
Go Teach  
Harvard Business Review  
Harvard Educational Review  
Independent School  
Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy  
Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk (JESPAR)  
Kappa Delta Pi Record  
Knowledge Quest  
Language Arts  
Literacy Today  
Mathematics Teaching in the Middle School  
Middle School Journal  
Peabody Journal of Education  
Phi Delta Kappan  
Principal  
Principal Leadership  
Reading Research Quarterly  
Responsive Classroom Newsletter  
Rethinking Schools  
Review of Educational Research  
School Administrator  
School Library Journal  
Social Education  
Social Studies and the Young Learner  
Teachers College Record  
Teaching Children Mathematics  
Teaching Exceptional Children  
The Atlantic  
The Chronicle of Higher Education  
The Education Gadfly  
The Journal of the Learning Sciences  
The Language Educator  
The Learning Professional (formerly Journal of Staff Development)  
The New York Times  
The New Yorker  
The Reading Teacher  
Theory Into Practice  
Time Magazine