Marshall Memo 1122

A Weekly Round-up of Important Ideas and Research in K-12 Education
January 26, 2026

In This Issue:

Quotes of the Week

"The most powerful moments in schools often happen far from a textbook or test. They happen when a student has to voice an idea clearly to an unfamiliar audience, manage a project without a script, or adapt when a plan falls short. It's when students discover that leadership can mean listening, that failure can mean progress, and that resilience isn't built from comfort but from challenge. These moments shape not just learning but life."

Vicki Phillips in "The Future Belongs to the Flexible" in *School Administrator*, January 2026 (Vol. 83, #1, p. 19-22); Phillips can be reached at vicki@ncee.org.

"Stories are 'psychologically privileged.' In other words, information is more likely to be understood and followed if presented in the form of a story."

Marcie Samayoa (see item #5)

"Making sure that every child has access to such instruction is an ethical responsibility. The Science of Reading narrative has that part absolutely right. But oversimplifying the story is not going to get us there. Reading is too complex and children are too varied for that to work."

Maren Aukerman (see item #3)

"An e-mail that takes up more than a single screen is probably a phone call disguised as a written missive. As a recipient, you can pick up the phone and call the sender, which could defuse tensions and encourage efficiency. As a sender, recognize that the more you type, the less they read."

Michael Portas in "Managing the Message: E-mail Survival" in *School Administrator*, January 2026 (Vol. 83, #1, p. 11); Portas is at michael.portas@pequannock.org.

"Orientation is about helping them find their way around the building, while onboarding is helping them find their place in the work itself."

Robyn Jackson (see item #7)

1. Using GenAI As a Butler, a Thinking Partner, and a Sparring Partner

In this *Monthly Dispatch*, Mike Kentz says most people aren't getting the most from generative AI tools. They type a question, get an answer, and use it. "This works fine for simple lookups," he says, "but for anything requiring judgment, creativity, or depth, this one-size-fits-all approach creates problems. You end up either over-relying on AI for tasks where you should be doing the thinking, or under-utilizing AI for tasks where it could genuinely expand your perspective."

Kentz suggests three ways that educators can engage with GenAI, each suited to different tasks:

• **The Butler** – Fetching a draft that you can look at critically and decide how to use. You should use butler mode when:

- You have expertise in the area in question.
- You know what the deliverable should look like.
- You can spot errors in content and tone.
- You've decided on the angle, structure, and must-haves of the product.

Here's an sample prompt that would save a teacher 45 minutes (before reading and editing): *Create a 10-question quiz on the causes of World War I for 10th graders. Make the tone straightforward but not dry. Cover the alliance system, militarism, imperialism, and the assassination of Franz Ferdinand. Make it multiple choice, with one "explain your reasoning" short answer at the end. Keep it to one page.*

• **Thinking partner** –Expanding options so you can choose. This is helpful in an area where the teacher has expertise but:

- You're not sure what you want.
- You need to see the landscape of possibilities before committing.
- You want angles and trade-offs, not a finished product.
- You're trying to avoid premature "butlering" – asking for a deliverable too soon.

This mode, says Kentz, "generates options, exposes assumptions, and helps you think – without locking you into anything." Here's an example of a prompt (it might produce too long a response and would need to be chopped into bite-sized pieces): *Be my brainstorming partner for teaching thesis statement writing to 9th graders. Give me 15 different approaches I could take – anything from traditional instruction to games to peer activities. For each one, give me a one-sentence description, one strength, and one limitation, then tell me which three you'd recommend for a class that's skeptical of writing and why*.

• **Sparring partner** – Challenging and deepening your thinking to pressure-test an idea before it goes live. Use this approach when:

- You're new to a topic and need to quickly build some depth.
- Your direction is unclear and you want to check out several options.
- You want to surface gaps, blind spots, or bias in your thinking.
- You're preparing for a skeptical audience, perhaps parents, administrators, students.

This mode is for practice, not a shortcut to actually publishing something. You don't need the chatbot to be right; you want it to force you to think through and defend your position. "Even weak objections," says Kentz, "can reveal something you hadn't considered."

Here's a sample prompt that, like the previous one, might produce a long answer. The trick is to chunk it and then engage in a back-and-forth with the chatbot: *Be a skeptical parent who's worried about screen time and AI dependency. Here's my plan: I want to use AI chatbots in my 7th-grade English class to give students real-time feedback on their drafts before peer review. Challenge this plan. Give me five legitimate concerns a parent might raise. Then suggest two modifications that might address those concerns without gutting the activity*.

"The Butler-Thinking-Sparring Framework: A Practical Guide to Working with AI" by Mike Kentz in *The Monthly Dispatch*, January 11, 2026; a shorter version of this article was summarized in Memo 1100.

Back to page one

2. A Vision for Effective Schools in the Age of AI

"We are at a crossroads," say the authors of this 64-page report from Transcend. They describe a *probable* path for K-12 schools in the age of artificial intelligence – continuing "industrial-era practices" that will leave young people "further behind in a rapidly changing world." They then suggest the key attributes of schools if we take a *preferable* path, which they believe is possible if educators handle new technologies in an effective manner.

• A whole-child focus – Every young person's mind, body, and heart is nurtured to promote holistic development and well-being.

• Connection and community – All learners are part of a supportive community in which they form meaningful, collaborative relationships with peers and adults and are deeply known, appreciated, and respected for who they are while also embracing the uniqueness of others.

• High expectations and rigorous learning – Every learner is treated as capable of excellence with access to appropriately challenging tasks that deepen understanding, broaden perspectives, strengthen higher-order thinking, and help them apply learning in new situations.

• Relevance – Learning connects young people's life experience, interests, goals, and prior knowledge to real opportunities and challenges in their local community and beyond.

• Customization – Learners experience flexibility in the focus, pace, setting, and sequence of learning, as well as variability in the resources and supports provided, ensuring each learner can succeed.

• Agency – Learners take charge of their experience in meaningful, developmentally appropriate ways, and through this they all have opportunities to affect both their life path and the world around them.

"A Better Path: Designing Learning for the Age of AI" by Transcend, January 2026

Back to page one

3. Phonics, Structured Literacy, and Comprehensive Literacy

In this lecture on literacy instruction at Ithaca College, Maren Aukerman (University of Calgary) begins with Tamika, a fourth grader who is reading at the first-grade level. "She had trouble reading words in isolation, including single-syllable words," says Aukerman. "When reading stories, she often figured out unknown words using context. She was in a rough spot with her reading."

According to the Science of Reading narrative, Tamika is an example of what happens when students don't have good phonics instruction in the early grades; she was taught to guess unknown words by the context and illustrations and was stuck because she didn't know how to sound out unknown words.

Actually, says Aukerman, Tamika had been in a reading program in the early grades that featured daily, explicit, structured phonics. Somehow the program failed to teach her decoding, and she improvised by using context to guess unknown words. When Aukerman worked with Tamika one on one, she made rapid progress – "a testament to her determination, interest, and ability to learn." The instruction that helped her learn to read, says Aukerman, involved much more than phonics.

"Tamika reminds us that there are no silver bullets," she says. "Yes, there are research-informed ways to teach reading. Making sure that every child has access to such instruction is an ethical responsibility. The Science of Reading narrative has that part absolutely right. But oversimplifying the story is not going to get us there. Reading is too complex and children are too varied for that to work."

Aukerman believes the current debate about literacy instruction can be broken down into three approaches: Phonics as Panacea; Structured Literacy; and Comprehensive Literacy.

• *Phonics as panacea* – This narrative has been amplified by the media, telling about children who didn't get good phonics instruction and suffered lifelong consequences because they never became proficient readers. There's no question that phonics helps children learn to read, says Aukerman; it unlocks a large portion of the system of English orthography. A small number of children can figure out reading without phonics, but for most children, it's a vital scaffold.

The Science of Reading movement correctly points out that some students have not had enough phonics and suffer significant consequences as a result. The movement has spotlighted these children and helped many of them learn to read well. The movement has also broadcast the message that we need to do a good job teaching phonics effectively in every primary-grade classroom – and train teachers who aren't currently proficient at teaching phonics.

But the Science of Reading narrative doesn't stop there, says Aukerman. It claims that Balanced Literacy is the reason for the current low levels of reading proficiency in the U.S. In fact, she says, reading scores were gradually trending upward during the heyday of Balanced Literacy, leveled off before Covid-19, and have trended downward since the Science of Reading movement. "There is no evidence that Balanced Literacy created a big crisis," she says, "nor that more phonics is changing things for the better at a national level."

Are lots of teachers teaching phonics the wrong way, or neglecting it completely? In fact, says Aukerman, for decades most teachers have been teaching phonics an average of 31 minutes a day, using either synthetic or analytical phonics. (Both approaches have an almost identically strong research record, according to the 2000 National Reading Panel report.) "So the idea that there is a crisis in literacy teaching is not firmly grounded in evidence," she says, "not from the achievement numbers, and not on the basis of classroom practice." Yes, there is room for major improvement in children's reading, but phonics is not the root of the problem.

Science of Reading proponents say that some widely used reading programs should be tossed out. But many of them, says Aukerman, are research based and use synthetic or analytical phonics. Reading Recovery, a one-on-one tutoring program for first graders, has also been a target. In fact, says Aukerman, Reading Recovery includes both synthetic and analytical phonics, as well as fluency and comprehension work using connected text. The highly selective What Works Clearinghouse ranked it first among over 200 literacy interventions it reviewed.

Meanwhile, several highly touted phonics programs adopted by states in the wake of the Science of Reading movement have not fared well in rigorous studies – including Orton Gillingham. "I have no doubt that there are some wonderful teachers out there using and adapting these programs in ways that work for kids," says Aukerman. "I also don't doubt that individual children have been helped by them. But in order to call them research-based, elevate them above other possible approaches, and mandate their use, the bar needs to be higher."

Okay, but isn't it true that dialing up phonics is helpful? That sounds logical, says Aukerman, but spending more time on phonics has trade-offs. She cites studies showing that students focusing heavily on phonics have lower reading fluency, perhaps because they're bogged down in sounding words out, or because they're spending less time reading real texts. It is true that children with weaker word recognition skills benefit from more phonics. "So we need to make sure children who do need more phonics are getting it," says Aukerman, "but we can't assume that providing it to all children will be beneficial overall."

In addition, the National Reading Panel was clear that phonics should not be the dominant component of a reading program, and subsequent studies have reinforced this point. Phonics is essential, but other components contribute more to the end goal: good comprehension.

• *Structured Literacy* – A new synthesis of reading research is emerging under this moniker. It includes the Big Five from the NRP – phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension – and has similarities to Balanced Literacy and Scarborough's Rope. But Structured Literacy puts more emphasis on certain characteristics of *how* reading

should be taught: explicit, sequential, prescriptive, diagnostic, and cumulative. This is a significant difference from Balanced Literacy, which has been agnostic on how to teach.

• *Comprehensive Literacy* – This leads Aukerman to the most recent approach to reading instruction: Comprehensive Literacy. This approach, she believes, "enables us to home in on what the research actually says." Here are the six ways it differs from Structured Literacy:

- Research methods – looking at the bigger picture of reading proficiency, versus the micro-components of reading;
- The role of the teacher – flexible and adaptive, versus implementing a program; getting students to elaborate on their thinking and engage with each other;
- Understandings about literacy – both emphasize background knowledge, but Comprehensive Literacy puts more emphasis on children's own experiences;
- Understandings about children – the key role of engagement and enjoyment (one study found that children made better gains reading to dogs than to an adult);
- Affective goals – more play and emphasis on intrinsic enjoyment of reading and cultural responsiveness;
- Content goals – Comprehensive Literacy goes beyond the NRP Big Five, including oral language, discussion, reasoning with text, critical thinking, and digital literacy.

Aukerman's conclusion: we should stop using the term "science of reading," freighted as it is, and adopt Comprehensive Literacy as the best way to explore and refine the most effective methods to teach beginning reading.

"Toward Comprehensive, Research-Informed Literacy Instruction: Thinking With, Against, and Beyond the Science of Reading" by Maren Aukerman, Ithaca College of Education Freedom Lecture, February 22, 2024; Aukerman is at maren.aukerman@ucalgary.ca.

Back to page one

4. Timothy Shanahan on When to Start Teaching Reading

In this online article, Timothy Shanahan (University of Illinois/Chicago) answers a teacher's question about the best age for children to be taught to read. There's no definitive research on the subject, says Shanahan – but plenty of strong opinions on the ideal start time, the supposed harm associated with teaching reading too early or too late, and how children in Finland are doing (reading instruction there starts late, but many children come to school already reading and there are cultural, economic, and linguistic factors at work).

It's true that children are sponges for learning new words from 18 months to five years old, but making the connection to reading via phonological awareness is a new hurdle. "There is no convincing evidence," says Shanahan, "that four-year-olds will learn to read more quickly or easily than would be the case a year or three later."

On the other hand, he continues, starting early does increase the amount of time available for children to become proficient at reading: "The reason for starting early isn't to capture some magic window of neural plasticity, but to make the window as big as possible." An early

start also helps identify students who are having difficulty so they can get appropriate support right away. In this early phase, teachers and parents should be paying close attention to how students are responding, especially how happy and invested they appear to be.

Parents should start reading to their babies right after they're born, talk and sing, and as they get older, show them how to write their names, teach the alphabet and letter sounds, and build their love of reading. Vocabulary, background information, and ideas are an essential foundation for reading, says Shanahan: "Knowledge is the primary driver of comprehension. The more children (and adults) know, the better their listening comprehension and, later, reading comprehension." There's nothing developmentally inappropriate with starting early building children's knowledge.

Once children are in school, the right pedagogy is key. "Keeping lessons brief and lively makes great sense with young children," says Shanahan, "and it doesn't hurt with older ones either." Use songs and chants to teach phonemic awareness, and play games with letters and sounds, make-believe post offices, restaurants, and libraries. When older kids aren't reading well, it's usually because the wrong methods were used in the early grades, not because of when reading instruction began.

"When Should Reading Instruction Begin?" by Timothy Shanahan in *Shanahan on Literacy*, January 24, 2026; Shanahan can be reached at shanahan@uic.edu.

Back to page one

5. Unpacking Tier 3 Science Words So Students Understand

In this *Scientists in the Making* article, California high-school science teacher Marcie Samayoa addresses the challenge of using technical science vocabulary like *photosynthesis* – words that are essential to student proficiency. The mistake many teachers make when they introduce Tier 3 words, says Samayoa, is presenting them with a complex definition – for example: *Photosynthesis is the process by which certain organisms convert light energy into chemical energy, producing glucose from carbon dioxide and water*.

Why not do that? For many students, the definition produces cognitive overload because they're not familiar with some or all of the eight terms (or the way they're used in this context): *process, organisms, convert, light energy, chemical energy, produce, glucose,* and *carbon dioxide*. The result is befuddlement, and even if students memorize the definition, the meaning is still murky.

How can teachers introduce challenging words in a way that doesn't overload students' brains and helps them understand key concepts? Samayoa suggests the following meaning-making process:

• Step 1: Organize Tier 3 words by function. For every science topic, she says, there is always an overarching idea and its component parts, for example:

- The water cycle: *evaporation, condensation, precipitation, clouds, sun* tell how water is recycled on Earth.

- Chemical reaction: *reactants, products, bonds, energy, atoms* explain how substances change into new substances.
- Photosynthesis: *carbon dioxide, water, stomata, light energy, chloroplasts, chlorophyll, chemical energy, glucose, oxygen* describe how plants make food from sunlight.

"By separating Tier 3 words into two categories," says Samayoa, "the overarching idea and its components, it can help you see and understand how smaller details fit into the bigger scientific idea and help guide your explanations."

• Step 2: Define Tier 3 words using student-friendly definitions and context, and use Tier 1 words in the definitions, while explaining the science concept. For example:

- *Photosynthesis* – how plants make their own food using air, water, and light;
- *Carbon dioxide* – a gas plants take in from the air;
- *Water* – a liquid plants take in from the soil;
- *Chloroplasts* – tiny parts inside leaves where food is made;
- *Chlorophyll* – a green material inside leaves that takes in sunlight;
- *Light energy* – energy that comes from sunlight;
- *Chemical energy* – energy saved inside food;
- *Glucose* – a sugar that plants use as food;
- *Oxygen* – a gas plants send out into the air.

• Step 3: Introduce Tier 3 words through a narrative. "Stories are 'psychologically privileged,'" says Samayoa. "In other words, information is more likely to be understood and followed if presented in the form of a story." Here's how the narrative might go, with the teacher illustrating each stage with a diagram of a plant:

"Just like people, plants need food to survive. But the way they get food is different from how we get food. Let's go over how plants make food." Through questions and answers, the teacher guides students through carbon dioxide in the air providing food to plants, going through the stomata in the leaves (helping students sound out stomata), plants' need for water, how it comes up through the roots – and so on, using sentence frames to review the steps and getting students working with partners to rehearse and check their understanding of each one.

"Only after all the component words are explained," says Samayoa, "does the teacher name the process as photosynthesis. By teaching the component words first through a narrative and then introducing the overarching word last, the teacher ensures that students have some of the foundational knowledge needed to understand photosynthesis as a system of connected steps." Part of the final stage is explaining the morphology of the word: *photo* meaning light and *synthesis* meaning to make. "This makes sense," concludes the teacher telling the story, "because the plant uses light energy from the sun to make food."

"Words That Make Science Click" by Marcie Samayoa in *Scientists in the Making*, January 17, 2026; Samayoa can be reached at scientistsinthemakingblog@gmail.com.

Back to page one

6. Using Young Students' Everyday Knowledge in Math Assessments

In this *Journal of the Learning Sciences* article, Jennifer Randall (University of Michigan) and three co-authors say that many primary-grade math assessments focus on sorting and rank-ordering students and identifying deficits rather than recognizing and cultivating their diverse ways of knowing and thinking. A deficit-focused approach is especially problematic with students of color, who often know more than educators think they do. By using students' everyday experiences as part of math assessments, say Randall et al., it's possible to reimagine assessment "as a culturally responsive, asset-based process that validates students' lived experiences while illuminating their computational competencies."

The researchers interviewed families and teachers and identified two areas – riding a bus and visiting a doctor – where students' "funds of knowledge" might reveal their understanding of math concepts. The goal was to help teachers uncover and develop computation skills that students already possessed. The researchers designed learning tasks that explored students' thinking to see if their skills could be applied to simple computer programing in Scratch.

• The bus task – Students were asked to think through a bus route on a simplified neighborhood map as children, parents, and elderly people were picked up for a community dinner at their school. The task tapped into students' algorithmic and sequential thinking and *if-then* logic.

• The health care task – Students were asked to look at a variety of medical instruments – stethoscope, thermometer, aspirin, tongue depressor, bandages – and say how they might be used in a visit to a doctor. This task tapped into understanding how each tool is used and sequential thinking – the order of events in the visit, that a shot is given before the bandage is applied – and the broader purpose of the visit.

"By designing assessment tasks that center students' everyday knowledge and community/family-based experiences," say Randall et al., "we are not merely validating their backgrounds; we are building assessments that position those cultural practices as essential, ongoing resources for learning… While this work is still evolving, we see great promise in continuing to develop assessments that both reflect and preserve the dynamic lived experiences of students, particularly as they engage with content areas like computer science."

"Investigating and Assessing Informal Computational Thinking in Grades K-2: A Funds of Knowledge Approach" by Jennifer Randall, Darrell Earnest, Neena Thota, and Shani Mensing in *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, September-October 2025 (Vol. 34, #4, pp. 526-570); Randall can be reached at jennrand@umich.edu.

Back to page one

7. Onboarding a Newly Hired Administrator

In this article in *Principal Leadership*, Robyn Jackson (Buildership University) distinguishes between *orienting* and *onboarding* a new assistant principal (for example). "Orientation is about helping them find their way around the building," she says, "while

onboarding is helping them find their place in the work itself." The key elements of effective onboarding:

• Define their role in terms of the school's vision. Instead of telling the new colleague they'll handle discipline, say they'll support teachers to handle discipline in ways that help kids make better choices. Instead of saying they're in charge of the eighth-grade team, describe how the team should be working with curriculum and assessment to promote high and equitable student achievement. Shifting from a list of duties to the new administrator's role in the school's overall mission "creates ownership from day one," says Jackson.

• Describe expected outcomes in each area of responsibility. For example, the goal of assigning students to homerooms is to ensure equitable class lists and that every student has an adult advocate. The goal of reviewing curriculum unit plans is to make sure they're aligned with standards and the instructional sequence moves students toward mastery of skills and knowledge. The goal of evaluating teachers is to provide feedback and support that makes them more effective in their classrooms and grow professionally in specific ways.

• Develop a 12-week plan for increasing ownership. The new administrator continuously self-assesses in each area of responsibility:

- I haven't started working on this yet.
- I am learning but there is still a way to go.
- I now understand the success criteria and am ready to take ownership.
- I've begun to take ownership but still need support.
- I have full ownership for this area.

"This simple but powerful framework keeps the focus on growth, not just compliance," says Jackson. "It ensures both you and the new hire can see progress, anticipate where more support is needed, and celebrate where ownership is achieved."

• Establish a communication rhythm that supports ownership. Every two weeks is a good frequency for check-in meetings, each time addressing two questions: (a) Where are you right now on the ownership continuum in each area of responsibility? and (b) What do you need from me to move to the next level? In each meeting, the supervisor gives feedback and suggestions to build confidence and success. Between check-in meetings, supervisor and new hire choose how to address quick questions and share ideas – texting, e-mail, phone.

• Conduct a 12-week review. "This is more than a simple evaluation," says Jackson. "It represents a milestone moment where you can reflect on their progress, celebrate their growth, and clarify their next steps as the new hire fully assumes ownership of their role." Each meeting has three parts: (a) self-assessment on the success criteria; (b) evidence of progress and feedback on areas for improvement; and (c) focusing on what success looks like in the months ahead in each area.

• Regularly check in. The focus in subsequent meetings is (a) evidence of progress on the success criteria; (b) reflective conversations on what's working and challenges that need to be addressed; and (c) two-way feedback on how things are going and what supports the new administrator needs to be successful.

"Beyond Orientation" by Robyn Jackson in *Principal Leadership*, January 2026 (Vol. 26, #5, pp. 34-37)

Back to page one

8. How to Handle a Meeting on Problematic Student Behavior

In this *Edutopia* article, Sam Parmerlee suggests a way of structuring educator meetings about challenging student behavior that prevents the all-too-frequent "spiral of negativity" and focuses on solutions:

• Celebration – The facilitator has each educator name an area where the student in question has improved or is doing well – anything positive. This humanizes the student and prevents the negative behavior from being the only focus of the meeting.

• Strengths – Participants name specific areas in which the student does well – for example, responds well to predictability and structure like a visual schedule for the day and a morning check-in meeting when the schedule changes.

• Behavior and barriers – Parmerlee suggests setting a three-minute timer for listing the student actions that necessitated the meeting and the skills the student needs to learn.

• Targeted intervention – The group brainstorms possible interventions needed to get the student to avoid problematic behaviors and improve. The facilitator might guide the discussion with sentence starters like:

- *I notice the student struggles in math…*
- *The student responds well to new staff members…*
- *One of this student's strengths is reading…*
- *I wonder what would happen if we…*

These four steps, concludes Parmerlee, move meetings "from furious ones to curious ones, where we see the whole student beyond the behavior they present to us."

"Facilitating Solutions-Oriented Meetings About Student Behavior" by Sam Parmerlee in *Edutopia*, January 9, 2026

Back to page one

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 54 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 early Tuesday (there are 50 issues a year). Every week there's a podcast and HTML version. Artificial intelligence is not used.

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
- Article selection criteria
- Publications (with a count of articles from each)
- Topics (with a count of articles from each)
- Headlines for all issues
- Reader opinions
- About Kim Marshall (including links to articles)
- A free sample issue

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

- The current issue (in Word or PDF)
- All back issues (Word and PDF) and podcasts
- An easily searchable archive of all articles so far
- The "classic" articles from all 20 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
ASCD SmartBrief
Cult of Pedagogy
District Management Journal
Ed Magazine
Education Gadfly
Education Next
Education Week
Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis
Educational Horizons
Educational Leadership
Educational Researcher
Edutopia
Elementary School Journal
English Journal
Exceptional Children
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
Kappan (Phi Delta Kappan)
Knowledge Quest
Language Arts
Language Magazine
Learning for Justice (formerly Teaching Tolerance)
Literacy Today (formerly Reading Today)
Mathematics Teacher: Learning & Teaching PK-12
Middle School Journal
Peabody Journal of Education
Principal
Principal Leadership
Psychology Today
Reading Research Quarterly
Rethinking Schools
Review of Educational Research
School Administrator
School Library Journal
Social Education
Social Studies and the Young Learner
Teachers College Record
Teaching Exceptional Children
The Atlantic
The Chronicle of Higher Education
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
Urban Education