

# Marshall Memo 184

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

May 5, 2007

## In This Issue:

1. The inner life of employees – and how bosses affect it
2. Teaching – and measuring - vocabulary
3. Eleven ways to improve students' writing
4. The perils – and potential – of formative/interim assessments
5. A New Mexico district boosts elementary reading achievement
6. Interim reading assessments in Boston
7. Does the DIBELS accurately identify students at risk of failure?
8. Dancing up a storm in gym class
9. A review of *The Power of the Positive No* by William Ury
10. Short item: Protocols online

## Quotes of the Week

“So much of what we call management consists of making it difficult for people to do work.”  
Peter Drucker (see item #1)

“Far and away the best boosts to inner work life were episodes in which people knew they had done good work and managers appropriately recognized that work.”  
Teresa Amabile and Steven Kramer (see item #1)

“It was a physical educator’s dream.”  
Linda Carson, West Virginia professor, remembering the first time she saw teenagers playing Dance Dance Revolution in an arcade (see item #8)

“When students write more frequently, their ability to think, reason, analyze, communicate, and perform on tests will improve. Writing is critical to student achievement.”  
Douglas Reeves (see item #3)

“One reason that American children, obsessed by laser tag and videogames, have been so turned off by history is that the traditional airbrushed version of the American past seems so unreal.”  
Michael Beschloss in “How to Make History Cool”, *Newsweek*, Apr. 30, 2007, p. 62-63

“I say we should start a revolution and quit making teachers fill out lesson plans for us but instead prepare for great classroom instruction.”  
Jan Borelli, Oklahoma principal, in her blog: <http://drjansblog.blogspot.com>  
Spotted in *Education Week*, May 2, 2007, p. 10

---

## 1. The Inner Life of Employees – and How Bosses Affect It

In this *Harvard Business Review* article with strong relevance to world of schools, business professor Teresa Amabile and consultant Steven Kramer report on their study of what's going on in the minds of employees during the day. There's the work, of course, but also a lot more: the person's feelings of happiness, pride, warmth, love, sadness, anger, frustration, and fear – and all the components of motivation: what the immediate task is, whether it's worthwhile, whether to do it, how to do it, and when to do it. This inner world is crucial to an organization's success – and also for its own sake. "People deserve happiness," say Amabile and Kramer. "They deserve dignity and respect. When we act on that realization, it is not only good for business. It affirms our value as human beings."

The article's most intriguing insights are about managers' impact on the inner world of people who work with them – for good and for ill. When the authors asked bosses what made the biggest difference to their people's inner world, most guessed it was things like giving an employee a pat on the back, providing emotional support, or injecting lighthearted fun into the workplace. All this is nice, say the authors, but two other managerial actions turned out to have a much more powerful effect on how people felt:

- *Helping people be successful in their work* – "When we compared our study participants' best days (when they were most happy, had the most positive perceptions of the workplace, and were most intrinsically motivated) with their worst days," write Amabile and Kramer, "we found that the single most important differentiator was a sense of being able to make progress in their work. Achieving a goal, accomplishing a task, or solving a problem often evoked great pleasure and sometimes elation. Even making good progress toward such goals could elicit the same reactions." In other words, doing well on the *substance* of one's job is a very big deal.

There's a flip side to this effect, say the authors. "Across our entire database, the worst days – the most frustrating, sad, and fearful days – were characterized by setbacks in the work. Again, the magnitude of the event is not important: Even seemingly small setbacks had a substantial impact on inner work life." Unfortunately, inept bosses often contribute to these bad days; as business guru Peter Drucker once wrote, "So much of what we call management consists of making it difficult for people to do work."

So what can the boss do to help people get that positive rush associated with real progress – have a sense of *efficacy* in their jobs? Amabile and Kramer's study pointed to the following:

- Setting clear goals for the organization and for individual workers, so that each employee has a sense of what his or her job is and why it matters to the team, the organization, and the organization's customers (as opposed to muddled, confused, or haphazardly changed goals, or goals from middle managers that were not in synch with overall goals, leading to a sense of confusion and futility in daily work);
- Providing direct help (versus hindrance);
- Providing adequate resources and time (versus inadequate resources or unnecessary time pressure);
- Reacting to successes and failures with a learning orientation (versus a purely evaluative orientation).

Unfortunately, many employees report that they get very little of this kind of support from their bosses – and the effect on their inner life and productivity is palpable. Amabile and Kramer say that “when goals are not articulated clearly, work proceeds in wrong directions and performance suffers. Less directly, the frustration of spinning one's wheels sours inner work life, leading to lower motivation; people facing seemingly random choices will be less inspired to act on any of them. And there is a further effect. When a manager's actions impede progress, that behavior sends a strong signal. People trying to make sense of why higher-ups would not do more to facilitate progress draw their own conclusions – perhaps that their work is unimportant or that their bosses are either willfully undermining them or hopelessly incompetent.”

- *Managing with a human touch* – Almost as important as a sense of efficacy was being treated decently by the boss. Amabile and Kramer noticed that there was often a helpful synergy between being treated well and a sense of progress in their work. “Far and away the best boosts to inner work life,” they say, “were episodes in which people knew they had done good work and managers appropriately recognized that work.” When the opposite occurred, there was a negative synergy: “Praise without real work progress, or at least solid efforts toward progress, had little positive impact on people's inner work lives and could even arouse cynicism... [G]ood work progress without any recognition – or, worse, with criticism about trivial issues – could engender anger and sadness.”

Amabile and Kramer conclude with a strong statement of how much all this matters. “Managers' day-to-day (and moment-to-moment) behaviors matter not just because they directly facilitate or impede the work of the organization. They're also important because they affect people's inner work lives, creating ripple effects on organizational performance. When people are blocked from doing good, constructive work day by day, for instance, they form negative impressions of the organization, their coworkers, their managers, their work, and themselves; they feel frustrated and unhappy; and they become demotivated in their work. Performance suffers in the short run, and in the longer run, too. But when managers facilitate progress, every aspect of people's inner work lives is enhanced, which leads to even greater progress. This positive spiral benefits the individual workers – and the entire organization.

Because every employee's inner work life system is constantly operating, its effects are inescapable.”

“Inner Work Life: Understanding the Subtext of Business Performance” by Teresa Amabile and Steven Kramer in the *Harvard Business Review*, May 2007 (Vol. 85, #5, p. 72-83), no e-link available

## 2. Teaching – and Measuring – Vocabulary

In this article in *Reading Research Quarterly*, Berkeley professors David Pearson and Elfrieda Hiebert and Stanford professor Michael Kamil look at the “vexing question” of how to assess students’ vocabulary knowledge and growth – and what we need to learn to improve these assessments.

Vocabulary is closely tied to reading comprehension, say the authors – studies typically find correlations ranging from .6 to .8 – but correlation is not causation. There are three possible explanations for the close link between students’ vocabulary knowledge and their reading proficiency:

- The instrumentalist hypothesis – Learning words *causes* better reading comprehension.
- The verbal aptitude hypothesis – Some students have large vocabularies and read well, but the root cause of both is that they have strong innate verbal aptitude.
- The knowledge hypothesis – Some students have large vocabularies and read well, but the root cause is that they have acquired more knowledge of the world around them.

Which of these is the most accurate? The answer has direct bearing on a school’s theory of action for teaching words and improving students’ reading.

American schools have been putting more emphasis on direct vocabulary instruction in recent years, which suggests that many educators believe the first hypothesis. But Pearson, Hiebert, and Kamil report that, so far, studies have found a *weak* link between direct vocabulary instruction and improved reading. They suggest three possible reasons for this:

- First, that it’s a myth that learning more vocabulary carries over to reading proficiency.
- Second, that learning new words helps when students are reading the texts in which those words are taught, but doesn’t carry over to other contexts.
- Third, that our measures of vocabulary don’t adequately capture the link between vocabulary instruction and reading comprehension.

The rest of the article examines the third explanation in some depth, with the goal of ruling it in or out. The authors speculate that “it might be that our instruction is improving vocabulary learning, which might lead to improvements in general comprehension, but the instruments we use to measure vocabulary are so insensitive that they prevent us from documenting the relationship.”

The authors start by asking what it means to *know* a word. They note that there are four types of vocabulary knowledge: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Usually the receptive kinds of word knowledge – listening and reading – are stronger than the productive kinds – speaking and writing. But how do we figure out if a student knows a word? The first vocabulary tests simply asked a student to define or explain a word – for example, what is a

“fork” used for? Around World War I, when large-scale testing began, there was a shift to multiple-choice test items of decontextualized words. Over the years, vocabulary tests have become more contextual, asking the meaning of words embedded in a sentence.

One insight from their research is that the way a vocabulary question is asked makes a big difference in how well students do. For example, here are four ways of testing whether students know a word:

1. A *gendarme* is a kind of: (a) toy, (b) person, (c) potato, (d) recipe
2. A *gendarme* is a kind of : (a) public official, (b) farmer, (c) accountant, (d) lawyer
3. A *gendarme* is a kind of: (a) soldier, (b) sentry, (c) law enforcement officer, (d) fire prevention official
4. One would most likely encounter a *gendarme* in: (a) New York, (b) Nice, France, (c) London, England, (d) New Orleans

The way the question is asked makes a difference. The more demanding the item, the more important it is that a student has a precise, nuanced, and sophisticated knowledge of the word. One-shot exposure to a new word will not give this kind of vocabulary knowledge, say the authors. The key to better understanding of words is the number of contexts in which students encounter a word. Repeated exposure in different contexts builds stronger and deeper word knowledge.

The authors return to what they believe are the gross inadequacies of current vocabulary tests. Pearson, Hiebert, and Kamil assert that there is no guiding principle for how words are chosen for these tests. Pretty much any word in the English language is fair game, as long as it spreads students out on a bell-shaped curve. And they believe this may be at the heart of the poor correlation between vocabulary instruction and reading proficiency.

What’s a better way of choosing words for vocabulary tests – and for classroom instruction? The authors suggest that a good principle would be focusing on so-called Tier 2 words – words that are harder than everyday, high-frequency, Tier 1 words (like *come, go, happy, some*), but not as specialized and domain-specific as Tier 3 words (e.g., *chlorophyll, photosynthesis, xylum*). Tier 2 words (such as *stunning, pranced, astonished*) are the language of sophisticated academic discourse and narrative fiction. Isabel Beck and her colleagues suggest that these are the words teachers should focus on and tests should assess, with Tier 1 words acting as the foil in multiple-choice questions (*pretty* for *stunning*, for example). The goal would be to see if students are moving beyond common words to more sophisticated, nuanced words, which is key to reading and writing proficiency. Of course students also need to learn Tier 3 words in science, math, and other subjects.

This seems to be the direction that vocabulary assessment is headed, report the authors. The new NAEP reading assessment, which will be introduced in 2009, will focus on Tier 2 words in context, measuring whether students know these words and/or can figure them out from the context of a passage. The new NAEP, when it’s introduced, will have a direct impact on the way vocabulary is taught in schools.

This can’t happen too soon, say the authors. Shortcomings in current vocabulary assessments, they say, continue to cloud the question of how teaching vocabulary affects

students' reading proficiency. Pearson, Hiebert, and Kamil are particularly interested in reaching consensus on the words that students need to know at each level and aligning those words with assessments – versus using the current norm-referenced approach to gauging vocabulary knowledge.

“Vocabulary Assessment: What We Know and What We Need to Learn” by David Pearson, Elfrieda Hiebert, and Michael Kamil in *Reading Research Quarterly*, April/May/June 2007 (Vol. 42, #2, pp. 282-296), no e-link available

### **3. Eleven Ways to Improve Students' Writing**

“When students write more frequently,” says Douglas Reeves in the Center for Performance Assessment's newsletter, “their ability to think, reason, analyze, communicate, and perform on tests will improve. Writing is critical to student achievement.” The newsletter goes on to quote a recent Carnegie Corporation meta-analysis of strategies for improving students' writing:

- *Teach strategies.* “Explicitly and systematically teaching steps necessary for planning, revising, and/or editing text” has a 0.82 effect size, says the study.

- *Teach summarization.* When students are taught and frequently practice distilling the essence of a piece of writing, the effect size is 0.82.

- *Have students write collaboratively.* When students work in pairs or small groups to plan, draft, revise, and edit their compositions, the effect size is 0.75. Cooperative writing is especially helpful for low-achievers.

- *Set goals.* Telling students the purpose of writing assignments and assigning students specific, reachable goals for their writing has an effect size of 0.70.

- *Use word processing.* Allowing students to word-process their writing is helpful at every stage of the writing process and has an effect size of 0.55. It's especially beneficial for struggling writers.

- *Practice sentence-combining.* Teaching students to construct more complex and sophisticated sentences from shorter, simpler material enhances the quality of writing; it has an effect size of 0.55.

- *Use prewriting.* Having students create a prewriting organizer before their first draft improves the quality of writing and has an effect size of 0.32.

- *Use inquiry activities.* “Involving students in writing activities designed to sharpen their inquiry skills improves the quality of their writing,” says the Carnegie study. It has an effect size of 0.32.

- *Use process writing.* “Emphasizing real audiences, extending opportunities for writing, and providing opportunities to self-reflect” are key to improving writing, and have an effect size of 0.32.

- *Look at exemplars.* It helps when students look at models of good writing in different genres and consciously emulate them in their own writing. But if students read exemplars quickly and superficially, it doesn't help. “Instead, students need to tear the examples apart

until they can identify the specific tools the writer used to build the strong piece of writing,” says the study.

- *Write in the content areas.* Writing in social studies, science, and math is helpful, with an effect size of 0.25.

“Eleven Research-Based Tips for Improving Writing Instruction” by Alice Greiner in *Center for Performance Assessment Newsletter*, May 1, 2007

#### **4. The Perils and Potential of Formative/Interim Assessments**

“Testing has never been more ubiquitous,” writes *Education Week* reporter Lynn Olson in her introduction to two articles on formative/interim assessments. “Yet much of it is after the fact – long after instruction is done, the unit or even the school year is over, and teacher and students have moved on.” Olson describes the increasing use of during-the-year assessments in schools across the U.S. – and the worry shared by many experts that these assessments often become miniature versions of end-of-the-year state tests. But if they are done right, says Olson, formative/interim assessments “can produce among the largest achievement gains ever reported for educational interventions.” What does “done right” mean? Olson believes the assessments need to be accompanied by three things:

- A culture that embraces inquiry and data use.
- Ongoing, intensive professional development and coaching so teachers use assessment data well.
- Teachers following up on the question, “How should I teach differently in response?”

“Just-in-Time Tests Change What Classrooms Do Next” by Lynn Olson in *Education Week*, May 2, 2007 (Vol. 27, #35, p. 24),

<http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2007/05/02/35form-intro.h26.html>

#### **5. A New Mexico District Boosts Elementary Reading Achievement**

The Moriarty school district in New Mexico has significantly boosted students’ reading achievement with the following initiatives:

- An uninterrupted 90-minute block of reading instruction every day, with additional intervention time outside the reading block – 30 minutes for all students, 60 minutes for students who need the most help;
- In most schools, regrouping students by reading level for the main reading block (they call it “walk to read”); observers say that teachers getting to know students beyond their own classroom has engendered a culture of responsibility for all students.
  - Using a basal reading program (Harcourt Trophies);
  - DIBELS testing of all students three times a year to screen and group students for reading instruction, supplemented by more frequent one-minute progress-monitoring assessments.
- Using mCLASS, the Wireless Generation handheld Palm Pilot system to record and analyze DIBELS data using color-coded displays. This has given teachers rapid data on

reading skills and fluency that's helpful for adjusting groupings and deciding on interventions for struggling students. (The company claims that recording the data on handhelds saves teachers four or five days of paperwork a year.)

- Grade-level team meetings at least once a month to analyze the DIBELS and other data. "DIBELS is a screen," said one teacher. "It doesn't tell you how to change your instructional strategies. Pushing that is where we are now."

- Sharing the data with parents during back-to-school nights and in parent/teacher conferences.

"Instant Read on Reading, In Palms of Their Hands" by Lynn Olson in *Education Week*, May 2, 2007 (Vol. 27, #35, p. 24, 26, 28, 31, 33),  
<http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2007/05/02/35form-nm.h26.html>

## 6. Interim Reading Assessments in Boston

This *Education Week* article describes Boston's FAST-R tests (Formative Assessments of Student Thinking in Reading). The tests consist of short passages (mostly taken from released state tests), each followed by ten multiple-choice questions and one open-response question. The tests measure a few key skills, including finding evidence explicitly stated in the passage, telling the implicit meaning of words in context, and identifying the main idea of the passage. FAST-R, created by the non-profit Boston Plan for Excellence, was piloted in 18 volunteer schools in 2003-04 and is now being used in more than 50 Boston schools covering grades 3-12. The tests are "no-stakes" – the results are not sent to Boston's central office and are not used to measure each school's progress.

Teachers administer the FAST-R tests, then send them to the Boston Plan for scoring and review. Using wrong-answer analysis, students' answers are rated as follows:

- Correct;
- Near miss (the answer is correct based on the text but irrelevant to the question);
- Misread (the student misunderstood the text);
- Out of bounds (the answer was not based on the text but plausible based on the student's own prior knowledge).

One or two weeks after students take the tests, teachers get a color-coded graph for their class showing the pattern of responses by student and item, along with information on students' race, gender, special-education, and ELL status. Teachers also receive guides with information on each reading passage – the difficulty, grade range, structure, purpose, vocabulary, style, and features that might cause problems for some students. Teachers also get "learning profile" and "learning trajectory" worksheets to gather data on each student's reading status and anticipate how students will do on each FAST-R test.

Once teachers receive the results, "data coaches" from the Boston Plan meet with teachers and look at the reports, track students' progress (or lack thereof), and think about next steps. In one discussion in an elementary school described in the *Education Week* article, a teacher (prodded by the coach) concluded that she should use more inference questions and get students reading more challenging books. As they visit different schools, data coaches see big



variations in the quality of discussion. It helps if the principal, the assistant principal, or the literacy coach sits in on data meetings; schools where this is true have usually gotten in the habit of using data in multiple settings.

Teachers, principals, and literacy coaches like FAST-R, according to an external evaluation, but the challenge has been getting new users to see it as more than just test prep. “We really do believe that FAST-R is giving teachers information to help them get kids to the next level,” said Ellen Guiney, the Boston Plan’s director. She is hopeful that students will transfer skills to all kinds of reading. “...I do think formative assessment is absolutely a part of the answer to the puzzle of instructional improvement.”

“Homegrown Tests Measure Critical-Reading Skills” by Lynn Olson in *Education Week*, May 2, 2007 (Vol. 27, #35, p. 32-33),

<http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2007/05/02/35form-fastr.h26.html>

## **7. Does the DIBELS Accurately Identify Students At Risk of Failure?**

In this *Elementary School Journal* article, four researchers from the University of Michigan report on a study of Grade 1-3 students in 44 Michigan schools in the first year of Reading First implementation. The purpose of the study was to see if measures of students’ reading fluency would accurately predict students’ achievement on a spring reading test. Students were given the DIBELS subtests in the fall, winter, and spring, and took the ITBS in the spring. Here are the findings:

- The DIBELS significantly predicted year-end ITBS reading achievement.
- The DIBELS benchmarks for oral reading fluency identified 80% of the second graders and 76% of the third graders who ended up reading below the 25<sup>th</sup> percentile on the ITBS.
- 35% of second graders and 45% of third graders who were identified as at-risk early in the year made enough progress to achieve on grade level or above on the ITBS.
- However, 32% of second graders and 37% of third graders whom the DIBELS benchmarks for oral reading fluency identified as being at *low risk* of reading failure ended up reading below grade level on the spring ITBS.

The last finding troubled the researchers, and they did a careful analysis of what was going on. Their conclusions:

- “Although good readers tend to be fluent readers (in terms of speed and accuracy of oral reading),” say the authors, “fluency does not ensure good comprehension. Fluent text reading and reading comprehension tap both common and independent aspects of the reading process.” What’s needed is an accurate measure, as early in the year as possible, of students who are under-achieving in reading and are not responding to classroom instruction. “Just as a thermometer as an indicator of general health would not be the sole measure to diagnose illness and prescribe treatment, DIBELS should be used in conjunction with other assessment procedures.” Their recommendation: teachers should supplement the DIBELS with comprehension and vocabulary assessments at the beginning of the year to get a better sense of

students' reading status and more accurately identify students who will need extra help. This would prevent significant numbers of students from slipping through the cracks.

- The researchers note that the DIBELS assesses each student's *status* at three points in the year, not their reading *gains* over time. In addition, they believe the DIBELS is not accurate at predicting students who will and will not score in the bottom 25<sup>th</sup> percentile in the spring. Their recommendation: use the supplementary DIBELS progress-monitoring assessments at frequent intervals during the year to assess students who have been identified as being at risk and who are not responding well to instruction.

“Are Fluency Measures Accurate Predictors of Reading Achievement?” by Stephen Schilling, Joanne Carlisle, Sarah Scott, and Ji Zeng in *Elementary School Journal*, May 2007 (Vol. 107, #5, p. 429-448), no e-link available

## 8. Dancing Up a Storm in Gym Class

According to this *New York Times* article, physical education teachers in West Virginia, California, Hawaii, and at least seven other states have begun using the video game, Dance Dance Revolution (D.D.R.), to get students exercising vigorously. Here's how it works. The school invests between \$70 and \$800 in a television, game console, and special floor mats. As a song plays, arrows scroll up the screen pointing forward, back, left, or right and students step on the corresponding arrows on their mat, trying to keep up and follow the rhythm of the song.

Students seem to love the activity. In the Morgantown, West Virginia middle school visited by the *Times* reporter, a class of seventh graders shrieked with delight when they realized it was D.D.R. day, sprinted across the gym, and began dancing furiously to a techno song called “Speed Over Beethoven.” Bill Hines, their phys. ed. teacher, smiled: “I’ll tell you one thing,” he said, “they don’t run in here like that for basketball.”

The idea of using D.D.R. in schools was the brainchild of Linda Carson, a West Virginia University physical education professor, when she saw teenagers playing the game in an arcade. “There were all these kids dancing and sweating and actually standing in line and paying money to be physically active,” she said. “And they were drinking water, not soda. It was a physical educator’s dream.” After D.D.R. was introduced in some schools, Carson did follow-up studies and found significant health benefits for children who played the game on a consistent basis, especially for those who were overweight.

D.D.R. in school is part of a broader reorientation of phys. ed. to lifelong fitness. “Traditionally, physical education was about team sports and was very skills oriented,” says Chad Fenwick, phys. ed. director in Los Angeles, which is using D.D.R. in 40 schools. “What you’re seeing is a move toward activities where you don’t need to be so great at catching and throwing and things like that, so we can appeal to a wider range of kids.”

Two seventh graders in the West Virginia school visited by the *Times* reporter concurred. “I like that you get to listen to music and you don’t have to be on a team or go anywhere special to play,” said Anna Potter, 12. “If you do baseball or basketball, people get really competitive about it.” Her friend, Mikayla Leombruno, 13, agreed: “And you don’t have to be good at it to get a good workout.”

“P.E. Classes Turn to Video Game That Works Legs” by Seth Schiesel in the *New York Times*, Apr. 30, 2007, [http://www.nytimes.com/2007/04/30/health/30exer.html?\\_r=1&oref=slogin](http://www.nytimes.com/2007/04/30/health/30exer.html?_r=1&oref=slogin)

## 9. A Review of *The Power of a Positive No* by William Ury

In this *CommonWealth Magazine* review of William Ury’s new book, *The Power of a Positive No*, Charles Euchner summarizes Ury’s basic message: People avoid uttering the word “No” because they confuse it with total rejection and worry that saying No will damage future interactions. “No may be the most important word in our vocabulary,” writes Ury, “but it is the most difficult to say well. At the heart of the difficulty in saying No is the tension between *exercising your power* and *tending to your relationship*.” We tend to take the easy way out and say Yes, which makes us accommodators and avoiders.

Ury suggests a three-step approach to this perennial problem: First, Yes! Second, No. Third, Yes?

- *Yes!* Reach inside yourself and assert your deepest values. Putting them on the table, says Ury, is the first step to being able to say No.

- *No.* Push back on demands that run counter to your values. This is crucial, because when wrong is not addressed – or when we’re in denial about it – the wounds can fester. But it’s important to have a Plan B when you say No, says Ury – an alternative to use when the other side won’t take No for an answer. Having a Plan B can force a stubborn opponent to respond.

- *Yes?* Use the conflict to probe for new possibilities, seeking a common Yes! for you and the other person.

This process parallels the structure of storytelling, from ancient times to Hollywood, writes Euchner. “In Act I, the hero develops and affirms his deepest values. In Act II, he confronts a great foe and fights back. In Act III, the great struggle opens new possibilities for all concerned.”

The toughest challenge in conflicts, says Ury, is respecting the other side despite your anger. Ury was asked in the early stages of the Iraq war if that would include Saddam Hussein, and he said it would. Professional hostage negotiators believe the only way to get through to hostage-takers is to treat them with politeness and respect. It’s the key to opening their mind.

“With All Due Respect: The Power of a Positive No Keeps the Lines of Communication Open” by Charles Euchner in *CommonWealth Magazine*, Spring 2007 (Vol. 12, #2, p. 99-100), <http://www.massinc.org/index.php?id=27>

## 10. Short Item:

*Protocols online* – In this article in *The Learning Principal*, Pat Roy gives a helpful link to protocols for looking at student work and discussing interim assessment data developed by the Annenberg Foundation and the Coalition for Essential Schools:

<http://www.lasw.org/protocols.html>

“Deep Content Knowledge: A Key to Quality Instruction” by Pat Roy in *The Learning Principal*, National Staff Development Council, May 2007 (Vol. 2, #8, p. 3)

© Copyright 2007 Kim Marshall

***Do you have feedback? Is anything missing?***

*If you have comments or suggestions, if you saw an article or web item in the last week that you think should have been summarized, or if you would like to suggest additional publications that should be covered by the Marshall Memo, please e-mail: [kim.marshall8@verizon.net](mailto: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 36 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 (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
- Why the Marshall Memo?
- Publications read
- Article selection criteria
- Topics covered
- 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  
Atlantic Monthly  
Catalyst Chicago  
CommonWealth Magazine  
Daily EdNews  
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  
Teachers College Record  
TESOL Quarterly  
Theory Into Practice  
Times Educational Supplement, Magazine