



Materials, Measures, and What Matters

**How District Leaders Are
Building Coherent Systems
for HQIM Implementation**



Maggie Hannan, Drew Nucci,
and Rebecca Perry

September 2026

© 2026 WestEd. All rights reserved.



Suggested citation: Hannan, M., Nucci, D., & Perry, R. (2026). *Materials, measures, and what matters: How district leaders are building coherent systems for HQIM implementation*. WestEd.

WestEd is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization that aims to improve the lives of children and adults at all ages of learning and development. We do this by addressing challenges in education and human development, increasing opportunity, and helping build communities where all can thrive. WestEd staff conduct and apply research, provide technical assistance, and support professional learning. We work with early learning educators, classroom teachers, local and state leaders, and policymakers at all levels of government.

For more information, visit [WestEd.org](https://www.wested.org). For regular updates on research, free resources, solutions, and job postings from WestEd, subscribe to the *E-Bulletin*, our semimonthly e-newsletter, at [WestEd.org/subscribe](https://www.wested.org/subscribe).

This work was funded by the Gates Foundation. The findings and conclusions contained within are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect positions or policies of the Gates Foundation.

Contents

Introduction	1
About the Study	2
Methods	3
Findings	5
What Is Working?	6
Curricula can support overstretched and novice teachers.	6
Data and monitoring systems make implementation visible.	6
Implementation measures are coordinated.	7
Common implementation indicators are developing.	8
Pacing structures align with supplemental resources.	8
Professional learning builds teachers' curriculum understanding, offers opportunities to do the math, and is sustained through curriculum-based coaching conversations.	9
What Could Help?	10
Build partnerships around usable implementation data.	10
Continue to invest in understanding both implementation and impact.	10
Emphasize leadership-focused dissemination.	11
Explore opportunities for codeveloped, common, practical implementation measures that are useful to leaders across districts and states.	11
References	12
Appendix A. Interview Protocol	13
Interview Protocol: 30 Minutes with Administrators	13

Introduction	13
Questions	13
<i>Curriculum Usage</i>	13
<i>Supports and Structures [Only asked if there is enough time.]</i>	15
<i>Successes and Challenges [Only asked if there is enough time.]</i>	15

Introduction

A growing body of research argues that adopting a high-quality curriculum is one of the most consequential instructional decisions a district makes (Steiner, 2017; Koedel & Polikoff, 2017). High-quality instructional materials, also known as HQIM, are closely aligned with educational standards and are user-friendly for both teachers and students.



Typically, programs that use HQIM also feature evidence-based teaching methods and uphold a commitment to equity and inclusion, with supports to enable all students to access grade-level content (EdReports, n.d.; EdTrust-West, n.d.). They may also include guidance to facilitate implementation, such as recommendations about initial training and ongoing professional development. Increasingly, districts are choosing materials that are designated as HQIM by independent reviewers. For example, EdReports recommends HQIM for mathematics instruction under the rationale that materials designed to develop conceptual understanding and procedural fluency while elevating student reasoning and discourse provide a stronger foundation for high-quality learning experiences. Recently collected national data shows that nearly half of sampled K–8 districts have selected a high-quality, aligned core curriculum (Center for Education Market Dynamics, 2024).

HQIM implementation is quite challenging, but high-quality materials hold great promise for teaching and learning *when implemented well and with a high level of quality and alignment*. As we describe in prior reports (Perry et al., 2026, Hannan et al., 2026), the journey from the official curriculum to the enacted curriculum is mediated by many actors, including state education agencies, teachers, principals, district leaders, professional learning providers, and of course the students themselves. How each of these actors interacts with the curriculum shapes how it is used. District leadership is charged with managing this intricate process and building the supports teachers need to implement HQIM with a high degree of

quality. Understanding the experiences and needs of district leaders who are supporting HQIM adoption and implementation is essential for any district that is selecting, rolling out, or trying to deepen their use of HQIM.

To effectively lead HQIM uptake and implementation, district leaders must simultaneously **leverage and align existing instructional support resources** while also maintaining **insight into a wide array of classrooms through responsive data and information systems**. Developing these two kinds of systems is no small feat, and our findings highlight the ways that district leaders are creating this infrastructure across a variety of sites. These systems also allow leaders to balance change management with instructional improvement (Shand et al., 2026) by communicating with teachers about expectations, aligning messaging, and keeping a pulse on classroom instruction. Although the work involved in implementing HQIMs encapsulates all levels and parts of a system, these two approaches emerged in our interviews as particularly worthy of further exploration.

We want to honor the experiences of district and school leaders—and the researchers, technical assistance providers, and policy makers who support them—by giving a clearer picture of the leadership practices in play in districts across the nation. By highlighting district leaders' strategies across geographically distributed sites, this brief offers realistic models for leading implementation through use of existing tools. Both teaching and educational leadership can be lonely work, and drawing connections across contexts and curricula can offer important insights for leaders. HQIM are a promising, compelling tool, and many actors are investing in, and evaluating, their use. By bringing visibility to these district leaders' strategies, we hope to help all of these actors engage with HQIM implementation more thoughtfully, practically, and productively. To that end, we also offer brief recommendations for related role groups. Empowered by such information, the field can better support district and school leaders in working toward meaningful supports and structures for HQIM uptake.

About the Study

This study is part of a large project that aims to understand the impact and implementation of HQIM, especially Illustrative Mathematics (IM). In this study, however, we focused on middle school mathematics HQIM more broadly. Throughout 2025 and 2026, we have been conducting an ongoing interview series with leaders in school districts across the country that have adopted at least one high-quality mathematics curriculum for grades 6–8. We asked them how teachers in their districts use the curriculum, what supports and structures surround math instruction, and what they consider their successes and challenges to date.

We reported previously on the Massachusetts context (Hannan et al., 2026), and this study expands our focus to investigate 11 new districts in 7 additional states, prioritizing larger districts and expanding beyond just the IM materials. Our data are drawn from this ongoing interview series, in which team members conduct a brief 30-to-45-minute interview with a district-level leader related to their adoption and implementation of a mathematics HQIM in the middle grades (see Appendix A for the protocol). Although this data collection is ongoing, we chose to conduct interim analyses to meet the current considerable appetite for understanding HQIM implementation.

Methods

Interviewees—typically, mathematics-knowledgeable district administrators such as curriculum directors—spoke with us at various points in their implementation journey. Several districts featured in this study were in their 1st year of HQIM uptake, and others reported using the curricula for approximately 2–4 years. In some cases, different schools within the same district had different levels of experience with the curriculum, especially in the case of an open-source curriculum like IM. In other cases, district staff were unsure about the exact timeline. Therefore, implementation variation across implementation timeline is not the focus of this analysis.

In interviews, we explored curriculum usage by asking which HQIM the district uses for grades 6–8, when and why they adopted it, and what other instructional resources teachers drew from. We then asked administrators to rate each middle school on two dimensions: how many teachers use the adopted curriculum as their primary resource (A = most, B = some, or C = few) and how closely teachers adhered to it without supplementing or omitting (A = rarely, B = occasionally, or C = frequently). Then, to understand their successes and challenges, we asked them to explain why they rated each school as they did. We invited them to tell us what is working well in math teaching and learning in their district and where leaders see room for improvement. To understand the supports they think are key, we asked about the district’s instructional expectations, the kinds and frequency of math professional learning teachers receive, and how the district monitors implementation through observations, walk-throughs, and data collection.

We recorded interviews with permission, kept them confidential, and replaced all identifying information with pseudonyms.

Table 1. Interviewed Districts, Region, HQIM in Use, Year of Adoption

District	Region	HQIM in use	Year of adoption (grades 6–8)
Harris	Mid-Atlantic	IM	2024–25
Lamburg	West Coast	IM	about 2018–19
Reeves	Midwest	IM, CPM	about 2018–19 (IM)
Intermountain	West Coast	Amplify Desmos	pilot in 2022 adoption in 2026–27
Marble	Mid-Atlantic	Amplify Desmos, enVision, IM	2022–23 (IM)
Cabler	West Coast	Amplify Desmos	2025–26
Gambina	South	Eureka Math ²	2026–27
Coneflower	West Coast	i-Ready Classroom Mathematics/ Ready Math	2019–20
Hale	South	Eureka	2021–22
Marley	East Coast	Amplify Desmos	pilot in 2025–26 adoption in 2026–27
Bluebell	South	HMH Into Math	2022–23

Findings

Across all contexts, there was wide variability in how district leaders described their middle schools' use of and adherence to HQIM as their primary teaching resource. These approaches offer practical ideas for district instructional leaders to use in their own context and guide further research and technical assistance for districts taking up HQIM. The shifts these districts described are exactly those that HQIM are designed to produce: rigorous, grade-level tasks; student-centered discourse; and reasoning made visible. These shifts also suggest that the challenging leadership work involved for implementation is worthwhile and that additional opportunities exist to support practitioners who implement HQIM.

What did we learn about what it looks like when HQIM are implemented well? We heard from leaders that HQIM uptake is associated with observable shifts toward conceptual understanding, mathematical discourse, and centering student thinking in the classroom. Some districts described changes to instruction that transformed what mathematics looked like in classrooms. Harris had been tracking these shifts with walk-throughs:

We went from about 58.5 percent of teachers putting grade-level work that's aligned to the aspects of rigor ... to now we're at 67 percent of, like, that happening. ... We went from one out of every four kids having the opportunity to share their thinking with each other to now, like, closer to a third of kids.

Hale pointed to downstream evidence in students themselves: "My kids just being able to do math. ... You can see how fluent they are when they leave middle school to go to high school." Lamburg described a broader culture shift: "There was a drive for, we need to get kids talking about math again. ... Illustrative Math is very discourse-heavy and just very exploratory." Coneflower reported that "teachers realize the value in having students talk about their thinking," even while acknowledging "it still remains a challenge for a lot (of teachers) of how to get (students) to do that."

What Is Working?

Curricula can support overstretched and novice teachers.

HQIM potentially saving teachers planning time came up in several interviews, most clearly with district leads who described working with newer teachers or smaller staffs. A leader from Cabler described a teacher who “just really loves how [HQIM] has all of the thinking work that she would put into creating curriculum in one place” and noted the materials include “the tools for differentiation, for assessment, for supporting Multilingual Learners.” Intermountain made the same point: “The lessons are ready to go there. Good teacher supports, ... the student workbooks are really good, that they kind of mimic what’s on the screen.” Gambina framed their adopted curriculum as “a very good bridge curriculum to get teachers in ... in a day and age where our teacher population is either novice or inexperienced and new to the profession.” A leader from Coneflower shared how HQIM can support aligned planning but emphasized that aligned planning alone is not enough: “I think it helps people be aligned. I don’t know if it always supports high-quality instructional practices.”

Districts often justify HQIM in terms of student outcomes. But for teachers, the materials can offer a valuable reduction in their planning burden. That relief is one reason teachers may buy in and one reason buy-in can be more difficult when materials are hard to use. HQIM can also offer structure and guidance for newer teachers, another promising possibility of these materials.

Data and monitoring systems make implementation visible.

Many districts highlighted the development of data systems that made implementation visible. These data-generation systems vary in focus and consistency but represent a shift toward managing curriculum implementation as a coherent project rather than as a one-time event. The districts created processes to generate actionable data that could help them support improving implementation over time.

At Intermountain, district staff established several implementation criteria that principals were expected to check against, such as that adopted materials were in use, that the materials were within 2 weeks of the pacing guide, and that teachers were administering exit tickets. Cabler’s leader described analyzing “on-pace data for every school,” leveraging a TNTP partnership for walk-throughs, and using implementation surveys to track the extent to which teachers’ practices were aligned with the curriculum. Harris ran “beginning, middle,

and end-of-year walks” and connected the resulting data to the work of district math academic coaches. Coneflower pointed to a combination of i-Ready and Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBA) results plus walk-through tools that “look for the degree of student talk and engagement and the quality of questioning.” Gambina required administrators to participate in observations and walk-throughs alongside the district math team. Similarly, a leader from Gambina shared their process for aligning district and school-based implementation indicators:

Our math team does observations and walk-throughs, and they do a lot of those trainings side by side to make sure that they are up to speed on exactly what they should be looking for. And then the second part is a lot of those sessions—we require our administrators to be in on them as well, especially the ones that are on campus. So, as they are conducting their walk-throughs and observations, they're also able to identify effective implementation.

A leader from Marble also talked about the role of curriculum-embedded assessment in their implementation data systems, reflecting on how they allow the district’s instructional staff to understand classroom-level pacing during early implementation.

Implementation measures are coordinated.

If there is a single dominant theme in our findings, it is the difficulty of sustaining an HQIM instructional approach that diverges from traditional classroom practices. Even in districts in which teachers are using HQIM as a core curriculum with little supplementation, the way they are using them often reverts to a familiar pattern: the teacher at the front of the classroom, walking students through mathematical procedures with little conceptual discourse or authentic engagement in standard mathematical practices.

Reeves named this challenge: “There’s a gravitational pull toward direct instruction. ‘Let me just show you how to do this,’” with a parallel comment that teachers can “turn it into direct instruction ... and just [make it] algorithmic, procedural.” Lamburg’s description of this dynamic was similar: “Our growth area is still ... engagement with discourse and... proper planning. Trying not to make it ... direct instruction the entire time. We’re falling back into old habits.” Coneflower gave the most concrete picture:

I see a lot of examples of teachers putting the student workbook under a doc camera and walking them through it and showing them what to fill in the blank, which is ... using the resource but using it quite differently than it’s intended.

Harris made the same observation: teachers “might be skipping all of the conversations and the math language routines and just walking the kids through how to do something instead of ... the kids [having] it in front of them. But it’s not being used the way that, like, it should

be.” Cabler framed the issue as one of depth: they are “seeing the curriculum ... in use. It’s just the depth to which it’s being used,” with too little student-to-student talk.

This pattern matters for two reasons. First, it means that surface-level fidelity measures (Are the materials being used? Is there supplementation? Are teachers on pace?) are limited as ways to really understand implementation fidelity. A walk-through that confirms the workbook is open in every classroom may miss that the instructional approach has been quietly converted into something the developers explicitly designed against. Second, it suggests that adoption alone, even of excellent materials, is not enough to dislodge deeply established habits and must be supported by ongoing high-quality, curriculum-based professional learning.

Common implementation indicators are developing.

Districts that had developed concrete, written implementation indicators tended to speak about implementation more precisely than those that had not. Intermountain’s four-indicator framework—adopted materials being used with integrity, pacing within 2 weeks of the guide, exit tickets being given, and pacing more generally—gave principals a small, memorable list to which they could anchor walk-throughs. Harris picked “a few indicators that we thought would be most important” from the [IMplementation Reflection Tool](#) and combined them with the [Achieve the Core Instructional Practice Guide](#).

These shared indicators create a common language for principals, coaches, and teachers, which supports tracking instructional shifts over time and helps teachers understand how they are being evaluated. For example, a district leader from Marble explained that common learning experiences related to data and student performance with the curriculum were helpful. They helped to clarify that teachers would be assessed on content and curriculum alignment, making substitution and supplementation less enticing to teachers.

Pacing structures align with supplemental resources.

Pacing showed up across districts as both a support and a tension. Several districts had developed structures to keep teachers within range of a common scope and sequence. Coneflower writes weekly pacing for teachers and “put[s] it in their gradebook for them,” making the expected pace visible at the point of instruction. Reeves’s common assessments serve a similar function: “We did some work several years ago around common assessments. ... We gained a lot of ground in terms of [the] consistency in which topics are covered throughout the year.”

Several districts also described curating supplemental resources that align with, rather than compete with, the core curriculum. Lamburg purchased a supplemental resource “which is aligned with IM” and placed extensions and project work in Microsoft’s OneNote where

teachers could find them easily. Reeves permits IXL supports for teachers who want more practice for students who are behind grade level. This approach to curation clarifies instructional expectations while offering clear routine and structure for teachers.

Professional learning builds teachers' curriculum understanding, offers opportunities to do the math, and is sustained through curriculum-based coaching conversations.

Across districts, leaders pointed to professional learning as the lever that translated curriculum adoption into actual change. The point that recurred most across districts was that professional learning had to involve teachers engaging in mathematical practices and discourse around mathematical concepts. The specific structures varied—vendor-led sessions, summer institutes, unit unpacking, studio days, monthly internalizations, book studies—but a common thread was structured, sustained, curriculum-anchored work. Hale noted that new teachers, especially those entering through alternative routes, often lack the conceptual foundation needed to teach the materials as intended: “A challenge are your new teachers who...are not education majors who are coming in to teach. They don’t understand the why. And so, when you don’t understand the why, you can’t teach the kids the why.” With HQIM’s focus on conceptual understanding, they offer opportunities for new teachers to develop their own mathematical capacities. Intentionally aligned professional learning can offer powerful opportunities for this capacity building.

Across districts, the most consistently valued professional learning was the kind in which teachers actually worked the curriculum’s problems together. Intermountain said it directly: “There’s nothing better than actually doing math. ... Let’s do the math. Let’s see what the exit ticket’s like.” Hale described bringing in their vendor “once a month to provide ... professional development for them so ... they know how to teach the concept before they get to the module itself.” The district facilitates these 3-hour sessions so that, as the leader put it, teachers “learn how to do the math before teaching it.” These “lets’ do the math” approaches were practical and specific, helping teachers grapple with authentic problems of practice.

Several districts built coaching capacity from multiple sources, creating more sustained professional learning structures. Harris employs district math academic coaches whose work with teachers is “centered around implementing the curriculum and, like, the indicators on the rubric” and is supplemented by walk-through tools. Coneflower reported that “every school has an instructional coach,” with central facilitators in middle schools “on Tuesdays and Wednesdays meeting with the grade-level teams.” The pattern across districts is that curriculum-based and goal-oriented coaching is a vital support.

What Could Help?

The 11 districts in this sample differ in size, geography, demographics, and the specific HQIM they adopted. But the themes that emerged in our conversations with them are remarkably consistent, and accounts of implementation are virtually indistinguishable across different curricula, suggesting that HQIM associated efforts can be both platform agnostic and effective. Although there is much in common across platforms, the variability in implementation across schools that districts described is striking. Several districts described pockets of practice that simply did not include the adopted curriculum. These pockets persist not because districts haven't tried to address them, but because the tools districts have—central professional learning, walk-throughs, messaging—are insufficient when site-level support and reinforcement is absent.

With all the interest in investing in and supporting HQIM, how might those in helping roles—like funders, policymakers, researchers, and technical assistance providers—support this deep systems-change work?

Build partnerships around usable implementation data.

Although *data-based decision-making* is an all too familiar phrase in education, district and school leaders rarely have access to the data they need to make informed choices about organizational performance and teacher development. District leaders are creating implementation measurement systems with little time or support for that work, which is often considered the purview of researchers and evaluators. External partners could offer additional capacity for leaders who are building and maintaining these measurement systems and could help them develop innovations and efficiencies.

Continue to invest in understanding both implementation and impact.

It is critical to understand the extent to which HQIM are impacting student learning. It is also critical to understand *how* they do so in various contexts if the results are to be replicated. Research and technical assistance should balance rigorous impact studies with practical implementation investigations. As promising results emerge from districts and states that are using HQIMs, researchers, policymakers, and technical assistance providers could

follow those results by asking implementers, “How did you accomplish this?” and learning from the response.

Emphasize leadership-focused dissemination.

A central tension in district leadership is, on the one hand, the need for leaders to come together to learn from one another, and on the other, the highly constrained and busy work schedules typical for district leaders. Cross-district networks and communities enjoy significant popularity for this reason, but the time to attend these events is finite and limited. To meet leaders where they are as they implement HQIM, researchers, policymakers, funders, and technical assistance providers could share what is learned from leaders’ work on implementation widely with the field, tailoring resources for maximum application and accessibility.

Explore opportunities for codeveloped, common, practical implementation measures that are useful to leaders across districts and states.

One of the key challenges in education is the variability between district and state contexts. HQIM do not make up one standard curriculum, but they do create some consistency in content across sites, which offers significant benefits for students, families, and teachers. As HQIM are increasingly adopted, offering implementation measurement systems *designed for district leaders* could reduce the research design burden these leaders face. This would present a challenging design project given the many constraints and idiosyncrasies of districts across the county. However, developing shared strategies, like those discussed in our findings, could be a powerful tool for implementation and scale.

References

Center for Education Market Dynamics. (2024). *K–8 math curriculum quality: The state of district-led selection by region 2024*. <https://www.cemd.org/k-8-math-curriculum-quality-the-state-of-district-led-selection-by-region-2024/>

EdReports. (n.d.). *Frequently asked questions*. <https://edreports.org/about/faqs>

EdTrust-West. (n.d.). *California High-Quality Instructional Materials Learning Community: Resource page*. <https://west.edtrust.org/california-high-quality-instructional-materials-learning-community-resource-page/>

Hannan, M., Rainier, S., & Perry, R. (2026). *Beyond curriculum adoption: What district leaders are saying about using Illustrative Mathematics*. WestEd. <https://www.wested.org/resource/beyond-curriculum-adoption/>

Koedel, C., & Polikoff, M. (2017). Big bang for just a few bucks: The impact of math textbooks in California. *Evidence Speaks Reports*, 2(5), 1–7. https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/es_20170105_polikoff_evidence_speaks.pdf

Perry, R., Nucci, D., Walters, K., McKinney, D., Nielsen, S., & Hannan, M. (2026). *Measuring what matters: Considerations for measuring the implementation of high-quality instructional materials in mathematics*. WestEd. <https://www.wested.org/resource/measuring-what-matters-considerations-for-measuring-the-implementation-of-hqim-mathematics/>

Shand, R., Chu, E., Gurny, M., McCarty, G., & Turchin, S. (2026). Curriculum implementation and change management: A new framework. *AERA Open*, 12, <https://doi.org/10.1177/23328584261466663>

Steiner, D. (2017). Curriculum research: What we know and where we need to go. *Standards Work*. Johns Hopkins Institute for Education Policy. <https://jscholarship.library.jhu.edu/bitstreams/c40cb1d9-cc79-416c-a842-bd2a83e62758/download>

Appendix A. Interview Protocol

Interview Protocol: 30 Minutes with Administrators

Introduction

[Researcher should briefly re-introduce themselves.] Thanks so much for taking time to speak with me today. I'm hoping to learn more about math curriculum usage in your district, particularly around three areas:

- How teachers in your district use the curriculum
- Supports and structures around math instruction in your district
- Successes and challenges around math instruction in your district

This interview will be confidential, so we will not share any personally identifying information. We may use quotes in reports to our funder, the Gates Foundation, but we would either use them anonymously, or we would request your permission to attribute them to you.

Do you have any questions so far?

I would also like to record this interview so that we can fully engage in the conversation now. The recording would just be used to complete our notes later. Would that be OK with you?

Questions

Curriculum Usage

1. Which curriculum, or curricula, do you use in your district for math in grades 6-8?
2. What school year did the district start using it?
3. Do you know the reasons why your district chose that curriculum?
4. What is your opinion of the curriculum? What are teachers' opinions of the curriculum?
5. What other instructional resources do teachers use as a primary resource?
 - a. Do all teachers use that resource? If not, which teachers use it?

6. Broadly, how would you describe curriculum implementation across the schools in the district? [Pause for a response to the broad question and follow up with the probe.]
- Do you think you know enough about implementation in the school(s) to be able to rate how each school uses the curriculum?
 - Condition A:** The respondent is not aware of school-level implementation. Ask who else we might talk with to get that information and then skip questions 7-8 and ask questions 9-15.
 - Condition B:** The respondent is aware of school-level implementation. Ask questions 8-15 only if there is time.
7. (If yes to Q6) We are hoping to understand curriculum implementation at each middle school, so I'm going to ask you for two ratings for each school.
- First, we want to understand consistency of use across a group of teachers within each school. When you think about teachers' use of the math curriculum as their primary instructional resource, would you say that at the school: (a) most teachers use the curriculum as their core resource, (b) some teachers do, (c) few teachers do (it's hit or miss)?
 - Second, we want to understand consistency of use for each teacher: how they use the core curriculum by either supplementing it or omitting units and lessons. Would you say that that, generally, teachers at the school: (a) mostly use the curriculum as written and rarely supplement or omit units or lessons, (b) supplement or omit from the curriculum on occasion, (c) supplement or omit from the core curriculum frequently.

School	Use of curriculum as primary instructional resource:	Use of curriculum without supplementation or omission:
	a. Most teachers use the curriculum as core b. Some teachers use the curriculum as core c. Few teachers use the curriculum as core	a. Teachers mostly use the core curriculum as written, rarely or never supplementing or omitting b. Teachers supplement or omit from the curriculum on occasion c. Teachers supplement or omit from the curriculum frequently
School 1 name		
School 2 name		

8. (If this doesn't come up earlier) Does the way teachers use the curriculum match district expectations?

Supports and Structures [Only asked if there is enough time.]

9. What is the main focus of your district's math instruction this year?
10. What kinds of math professional learning do teachers receive in your district?
- a. Probe for: who provides it, whether it's focused on the curriculum or general practices
11. How often do teachers receive professional learning?
12. In what ways does the district try to understand the impact of the professional learning and how teachers are implementing the curriculum? For example, what do observations or walk throughs look like at your district?
- a. What data is collected?
 - b. How is that information used?

Successes and Challenges [Only asked if there is enough time.]

13. What do you think is going well with math teaching and learning, using your core curriculum, in your district?
- a. Probe for: Do you have a specific example that comes to mind?
14. What are some areas for improvement when it comes to math teaching and learning?
- a. Probe for: Do you have a specific example that comes to mind?
15. Do you have any other thoughts you'd like to share about math curriculum, teaching, or learning in your district?

Thanks so much for your time!