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**Abstract**

Research on the teaching and learning of mathematics has made significant progress in recent years. However, this work has had only limited impact on classroom instruction in many countries. We report on an eight-year project in which we partnered with several large urban school districts in the U.S. that were attempting to support mathematics teachers’ development of ambitious, inquiry-oriented instructional practices. We first give and overview of the project and describe these researcher-practitioner partnerships, which were conducted as design research studies at the system level. We then present findings as they relate to key elements of a coherent system for instructional improvement. These elements include: explicit student learning goals and an associate vision of high-quality mathematics instruction; curriculum materials and associated resources; pull-out teacher professional development; school-based teacher collaborative meetings; teachers’ informal professional networks; teacher leaders’ practices in providing job-embedded support for other teachers’ learning; and supplemental supports for currently struggling students. We conclude by arguing that additional studies are needed that frame large-scale instructional improvement as an explicit focus of investigation if mathematics education research is to realize its potential by contributing to improvements in the quality of mathematics instruction for large numbers of students.

**1 Introduction**

In this chapter, we describe an empirically grounded theory of action for improving the quality of mathematics teaching and students' learning on a large scale. This theory of action was developed in the course of an eight-year project in which we partnered with several large urban school systems in the U.S. In the first phase of the project (2007-2011), we partnered with four school systems that served a total of 360,000 students. In the second phase of the project (2011-2015), we continued our work with two of the districts for an additional four years. These collaborations provided a context in which we could test, revise, and elaborate the conjectures about school supports, district supports, and accountability relations for instructional improvement. These conjectures comprised our evolving theory of action.

We first clarify the national context in which we worked by discussing aspects of the U.S. educational policy that influenced our work with the leaders of the four educational systems. We then describe how we collaborated with the leaders and outline the process of testing and revising our conjectures. Against this background, we give an overview of the current iteration of the theory of action for instructional improvement at scale that we developed while working with district leaders.

**2 Background: The U.S. educational system**

The U.S. educational system is decentralized and there is a long history of local control over schooling. Each U.S. state is divided into a number of independent school systems or school districts. In rural areas, districts might serve less than 1,000 students whereas some urban districts serve more than 100,000 students. In the U.S. context, urban districts are the largest jurisdictions in which it is feasible to design and implement comprehensive sets of supports for improving the quality of instruction (Supovitz 2006).

The role of the U.S. federal government in education has been quite limited historically when compared with most other industrialized countries. However, in 2001, the U.S. Congress passed a national policy called the "No Child Left Behind" (NCLB) act. Under this legislation, states were given financial incentives to design and implement mathematics standards for student achievement, tests to assess whether students are attaining the standards, and mechanisms for holding schools accountable for increasing scores on those tests. However, the tests developed by most states emphasized procedural skills at the expense of conceptual understanding and problem solving (Shepard 2002). The results of these assessments are consequential in that schools that fail to produce adequate gains in student achievement are sanctioned and, if necessary, reconstituted with a new principal and teaching staff. Not surprisingly, most school and districts responded by "teaching to the test". As a result, procedurally-oriented assessments came to drive a reform that was intended to focus on rigorous content standards (Resnick & Zurawsky 2005). It was within this national policy context that we recruited four partner districts that were among the minority that focused on improving the quality of mathematics instruction so that students would develop both conceptual understanding and procedural fluency.

**3 Clarifying the problem of large-scale instructional improvement**

In approaching our work with the districts, we assumed that professional development (PD) designed to support teachers' learning would be essential, but we also assumed that PD would not by itself prove sufficient to support learning. Findings from a number of prior studies had indicated that the influence of teacher professional development on classroom practice is mediated by the school and district contexts in which teachers work (Blumenfeld et al. 2000; Cobb et al. 2003; Coburn 2003; Spillane 2005). Aspects of these contexts include the instructional materials to which teacher have access, the people to whom they are accountable and what they are held accountable for (e.g., principals' expectations for the structure and focus of lessons, see Cobb & McClain 2006; Elmore 2004), and formal and informal supports for teachers' improvement of their classroom practices (e.g., regularly scheduled teacher collaborative meetings, teachers' informal professional networks). Based on these prior research findings, we anticipated that instructional improvement at scale would involve reorganizing the school and district contexts in which teachers work so that those contexts support the ongoing improvement of teachers' instructional practices. This supposition in turn implicates the practices of mathematics coaches[[3]](#footnote-4), school leaders, and district leaders; the tools they use in their work; and the organizational routines in which they participate (Cobb & Smith 2008).

**4 Project overview**

As we have noted, the four partner districts were all responding to high-stakes accountability pressures by attempting to support and press for ongoing improvements in the quality of classroom instruction. The types of classroom instructional practices on which the districts focused involved achieving ambitious student learning goals by building on students' current reasoning. The development of ambitious instructional practices of this type requires significant learning for most U.S. mathematics teachers and involves reorganizing rather than merely elaborating or extending current practices (Franke, Kazemi & Battey 2007).

Our primary research goal in partnering with the districts was to develop a theory of action comprising: 1) a set of instructional policies or strategies intended to support teachers' (and others') learning, and 2) a rationale that justifies why it is reasonable to expect that these strategies will support instructional improvement (Argyris & Schon 1974, 1978). In preparation for our work with the districts, we developed a set of initial conjectures by drawing on the then current literature in mathematics education, teacher education, and educational policy and leadership. These conjectures were broad in scope and spanned curriculum materials and associated resources, teacher PD, teacher collaboration, school instructional leadership, and district leadership (Cobb & Smith 2008). We organized our work with the districts so that it would constitute a context in which to successively test, revise, and elaborate our conjectures, in the process developing an empirically grounded theory of action.

In consultation with district leaders, we selected approximately six middle-grades schools[[4]](#footnote-5) in each district that were representative of district schools in terms of their capacity for instructional improvement. We then recruited 30 middle-grades mathematics teachers in each district, the school leaders and the mathematics coaches who served these schools, as well as district leaders across central office units, for a total of approximately 50 participants in each district.[[5]](#footnote-6) The data collected in each district each year included: audio-recorded interviews conducted with all participants; online surveys for teachers, coaches, and school leaders; an assessment of teachers' and coaches' mathematical knowledge for teaching; video-recordings of two consecutive lessons in each teachers' classroom; video-recordings of professional development; and audio-recordings or video-recordings of teacher collaborative meetings.

Each year, we conducted a data collection, analysis, and feedback cycle in each district that involved 1) documenting the district's improvement strategies, 2) collecting and analyzing data to assess how these strategies were playing out in schools and classrooms, and 3) reporting the findings to the district together with recommendations about how the district might revise its strategies to make them more effective.[[6]](#footnote-7) Analysis of the districts' improvement strategies the following year indicated that they acted on a substantial proportion of our recommendations. This gave us an opportunity to investigate the conjectures on which our recommendations were based. The revisions we made in the course of successive data collection, analysis, and feedback cycles informed our theory of action, as did both a series a of retrospective analyses that we conducted on the data weh ad collected, and developments in the research literature (Cobb et al. 2013).

**5 Theory of action for instructional improvement in mathematics at scale**



*Figure 1*: Elements of a coherent instructional system

The current iteration of the theory of action comprises three top-level components: a *coherent instructional system[[7]](#footnote-8)*, *school leaders' practices* as instructional leaders in mathematics, and *district leaders' practices* in supporting the development of school-level capacity for instructional improvement. The first of these components, a coherent instructional system, in turn comprises four broad elements: *goals for students' mathematics learning* and a *vision of high-quality mathematics instruction*, *curriculum and assessments*, *a teacher learning (sub)system* (which includes pull-out PD, school-based teacher collaborative meetings, mathematics coaching, and teachers' informal networks), and *additional supports for currently struggling students* (see Figure 1). Because the responsibilities of U.S. school leaders[[8]](#footnote-9) as instructional leaders differ from those of school leaders in most other countries, we limit our discussion to the elements of a coherent instructional system in the remainder of this chapter.

*5.1 Student learning goals and vision of high quality instruction*

As shown in Figure 1, goals for students' mathematical learning are central to the instructional system. In the United States, mathematics educators have reached a broad consensus on worthwhile learning goals, which include that students should develop both conceptual understanding of key mathematical ideas and procedural fluency in a range of mathematical domains (e.g., symbolic expressions, graphs, tables) and that they should also learn to communicate their mathematical reasoning effectively by mastering increasingly sophisticated forms of mathematics argumentation (including methods of proof) (National Council of Teachers of Mathematics 2000; National Governors Association for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers 2010). The associated vision of high quality mathematics instruction, on which there is broad consensus among U.S. mathematics educator researchers, was developed and justified by drawing on research on instructional practices that support students' attainment of the learning goals (Kilpatrick, Martin & Schifter 2003). As we have indicated, the four districts with which we partnered were attempting to support teachers’ development of forms of practice that were compatible with this vision.

We delineated the remaining three elements of the instructional system by mapping out from this vision, which serves to specify goals for teachers' learning (Elmore, Peterson & McCarthey 1996). In doing so, we drew on our work with the districts, the findings of our retrospective analyses, and the broader literature.

*5.2 Instructional materials and assessments*

The second element of a coherent instructional system concerns instructional materials and assessments, particularly formative assessments that can inform the ongoing improvement of instruction. High quality instruction that aims at conceptual understanding and procedural fluency involves engaging students in cognitively demanding tasks that have multiple entry points and can be solved in a range of different ways, thereby enabling the teacher to organize a productive discussion of students’ solutions (National Council of Teachers of Mathematics 2000). It is therefore important that the instructional materials that teachers use include such tasks (Stein & Lane 1996). Three of the four districts with which we worked had adopted a textbook series that was aligned with their ambitious goals for students’ learning. The fourth district developed its own curriculum and included cognitively demanding tasks.

A retrospective analysis of data collected from the first four years of our work with the districts confirms the importance of teachers using rigorous mathematical tasks as the basis for their instruction. Rosenquist, Wilhelm and Smith (2014) found that the student achievement of teachers who used cognitively demanding tasks was significantly higher than that of teachers who used procedurally oriented tasks, and that the difference was equivalent to between four and six weeks of additional instruction each year. This was the case even though the student assessments focused on procedural competence rather than conceptual understanding and the majority of teachers attempted to "proceduralize" tasks when they introduced them in their classrooms.

Our collaboration with the four districts also highlighted the importance of ensuring that assessments of students' learning align with ambitious student learning goals. Although the districts could not control the nature of state assessments, we noted that these assessments did become more aligned with the districts' goals for students' learning during the latter years of our partnership. During these years, the districts also attempted to support teachers' development of formative assessment practices (Black & Wiliam 1988). We found that although teachers did analyze student data during collaborative meetings, they typically did so to identify concepts that they needed to reteach. It was rare for teacher groups to try and explain why their students struggled with particular concepts by analyzing how they had taught those concepts. This finding suggests that many U.S. teachers will need sustained support if they are to relate assessments of their students' learning to their instruction, thereby informing ongoing improvement of that instruction.

*5.3 Teacher learning (sub)system*

The vision of high quality instruction located at the center of the instructional system constitutes the goal for teachers' learning. The third element of the system is a (sub)system of supports for teachers' development of ambitious instructional practices. As we have noted, the development of such practices involves significant learning for most U.S. teachers. Our analysis of video-recordings of the participating teachers' instruction indicates that this was the case for our partner districts.

There is evidence that, at least in the U.S. context, that PD alone is frequently insufficient for instructional improvements at scale that require teachers' significant reporganization of their current practices (Coburn 2003; Elmore 2004). Our partner districts all attempted to support teachers learning by providing PD, mathematics coaching, and time for mathematics teachers to collaborate during the school day. However, we found that these supports were not coordinated and typically differed in their intent and focus. For example, one-on-one coaching in teachers classrooms did not build on either the PD in which the teachers had participated or their work during teacher collaborative meetings. In the course of our partnerships with the districts, we came to see the importance of systematically coordinating these supports so that teachers' efforts to improve particular aspects of their practice in one setting either built on or foreshadowed their work in the other settings (Jackson & Cobb 2013).

5.3.1 Teacher professional development

In the U.S., districts often organize teacher PD for teachers from multiple schools by grade level. It is typically designed and led by either the districts' mathematics specialists[[9]](#footnote-10) or by an external contractor. Prior research indicates that PD has the potential to support instructional improvement provided:

* It is sustained over time and involves the same group of teachers working together (Darling-Hammond et al. 2009).
* It is close to practice (Ball & Cohen 1999), focuses on issues central to instruction, and is organized around the instructional materials that teachers are using in their classrooms.
* It involves both pedagogies of investigation and pedagogies of enactment (Grossman et al. 2009). Pedagogies of investigation entail analyzing and critiquing representations of practices, such as video-cases of teaching, in order to develop an image of high quality practice and to reflect on current practice. Pedagogies of enactment involve planning for and trying out intended forms of practice with the support of a facilitator who is an accomplished mathematics teacher (Forman 2003; Lave & Wenger 1991).
* It is led by facilitators who are adept at pursuing their agenda for teachers' learning by building on their ideas differentially, highlighting some of their contributions while letting others drop (Borko et al. 2015; Elliott et al. 2009).

All four districts provided significant amounts of teacher PD that was designed and lead by their mathematics specialists. However, our analyses indicated that this PD was frequently not of high quality. As our goal was to investigate and support the development of the districts' capacity to improve the quality of mathematics instruction, we did not step in by designing and leading teacher PD. Instead, we conducted a design-based research study in which we investigated how to support PD leaders in learning to design and facilitate high quality PD (Jackson et al. 2015). The details of the study are beyond the scope of this paper, but it is worth noting a few key findings. First, the participating mathematics leaders focused increasingly on central aspects of instruction. Second, they began to develop a vision of teacher PD as supporting teachers' development along a progression of increasingly sophisticated forms of practice. However, we also found that the extent to which mathematics leaders furthered their agenda for teachers' learning by pressing on their contributions differentially did not improve consistently. A retrospective analysis of the data collected in the course of the study resulted in conjectures about how we could improve our design for supporting PD leaders' learning (Wilson 2015).

This study illustrates that investigations that contribute to our understanding of what it takes to support instructional improvement on a large scale can be relatively modest in scope provided they target a key aspect of system-level capacity for instructional improvement. There is a need for such studies as the research base that can inform the design and implementation of instructional improvement strategies becomes increasingly thin the further one moves out from the classroom.

5.3.2 Teacher collaboration

At various points during our work with them, all four districts required that principals schedule time during the school day for mathematics teachers to work together. The interviews that we conducted with teachers indicated that they did indeed meet to work on instructional issues. This was not always the case when principals attempted to foster teacher collaboration either before or after school.

We assessed whether teachers' work in the collaborative meetings was likely to support their development of ambitious instructional practices by first considering the types of activities in which they engaged. Following Coburn and Russell (2008), we distinguished between low-depth and high-depth activities. Examples of low-depth activities include sharing instructional materials and coordinating the pacing of instruction so that all the participating teachers are teaching the same topics. Although these and other low-depth activities might enable teacher to refine their current teaching practices, they are unlikely to support them in fundamentally reorganizing those practices. Examples of high-depth activities include working mathematics tasks together in order to identify the central mathematical ideas and analyzing student work in order to identify the range of student thinking on which they can build during lessons. These activities can potentially provide teachers with opportunities to identify significant conceptual goals for students' learning and to use student work proactively to plan future lessons, not merely retrospectively to assess the extent to which prior lessons were successful (Cobb, Zhao & Dean 2009). These advances would represent significant progress in teachers' development of ambitious practices that align with the districts' agendas for instructional improvement.

In addition to assessing the types of activities in which teachers engaged, we also took account of how those activities were enacted during teacher collaborative meetings. A retrospective analysis of teacher collaborative groups that were productive indicates that the teachers connected students, content, and instructional practice as they enacted high-depth activities (Horn & Kane 2015). An enactment that focuses solely on students might account for students' failure to learn as expected in terms of characteristics attributed to students (e.g., their perceived mathematical capable and motivation to learn mathematics). An enactment that connects students and content might account for students' failure to learn by proposing that a particular concept is difficult for seventh graders. In contrast, an enactment that connects students, content, and instructional practice might account for students' failure to learn by proposing that the way the teachers had taught a particular concept made the concept difficult for seventh graders.

We found that only a minority of teacher collaborative groups engaged in high-depth activities, and only a small proportion of these groups enacted high-depth activities in ways that were likely to support the development of ambitious instructional practices. This indicates the importance of ensuring that teacher collaborative groups include a facilitator who can influence both the types of activities in which the group engages and how those activities are enacted. In our view, at least one member of the group should already have developed relatively accomplished instructional practices, should be constituted as leader in the group, and should press other members on high-leverage issues (e.g., asking, "where's the mathematics?" after group members have solved a mathematics problem together) (Cobb & Jackson 2011; Horn et al. in press). Teachers whose instructional expertise is respected by other group members would be good candidates for the role of facilitator. However, in three of the four districts in which we worked, only a small proportion of the teachers had made significant progress in developing ambitious instructional practices. We therefore recommended to these districts that a mathematics coach attend teacher collaborative meetings whenever possible and serve as the facilitator when present. One advantage of this arrangement is that coaches might connect work during collaborative meetings to PD sessions, and might also build on this work when they support group members one-on-one in their classrooms. In doing so, they would play a pivotal role in coordinating these supports so that they constitute a (sub)system for teachers' learning.

5.3.3 Mathematics coaching

In our view, the general rationale for the role of coaches, who are expected to support both groups of teachers as they plan and analyze their instruction and individual teachers as they interact with their students in the classroom, is reasonably compelling. Research on the development of complex professional practices has documented the importance of co-participating in a practice with a more knowledgeable other (Grossman et al. 2009; Lave & Wenger 1991). Tharp and Gallimore (1988: 89) argued that co-participation with a more accomplished colleague supports learners in ways that language alone cannot do: "the development of common understanding of purposes and meanings of the activity, [and] the joint engagement in cognitive strategies and problem solving are all aspects of interaction that influence each participant". The work of coaches who can act as more accomplished colleagues appears to be crucial in the U.S. context given that significant learning is required for most teachers if they are to develop ambitious instructional practices. This was particularly the case for the three partner districts in which only a small minority of teachers had made significant progress in developing such practices.

Given the potentially important contribution of coaching to instructional improvement efforts, it is unfortunate that current research on mathematics coaching, and on content-focused coaching more generally, provides only limited guidance on designing and implementing coaching initiatives. For example, few studies have examined the types of activities in which coaches might engage individual teachers and groups of teachers to support improvements in their classroom practice. We therefore conducted a conceptual analysis of the various types of coaching activities reported in the literature to identify those that are potentially productive in terms of teacher learning opportunities (Gibbons & Cobb 2014). Because relevant research on coaching is sparse, we drew on the teacher education literature to develop criteria for determining whether the various coaching activities were likely to give rise to significant teacher learning opportunities. This analysis resulted in the identification of four potentially productive activities that involve coaches working with groups of teachers: 1) engaging in mathematics, 2) examining student work, 3) analyzing carefully selected video of classroom instruction, and 4) engaging in lesson study. The remaining two potentially productive activities involve coaches working with individual teachers: 5) modeling instruction and 6) co-teaching. Clearly, the warrant for these findings is weaker than we would like as they are based on a conceptual analysis rather than empirical studies that investigated teachers’ learning as they engage in the activities with an accomplished coach. Nonetheless, the findings did enable us to make recommendations about coaching to our partner districts that were based on more that anecdotes and unsubstantiated opinions.

In addition to identifying potentially productive activities, it is also important to understand what coaches need to know and do in order to realize the potential learning opportunities when they enact them with teachers. Recent work indicates that coaches should be accomplished mathematics teachers who have relatively deep mathematical knowledge for teaching (Borko et al. 2015; Elliott et al. 2009). We built on these studies by conducting a case study of a coach who was skilled at working with individual teachers in their classrooms (Gibbons & Cobb, in press). In doing so, we were able to identify five coaching practices that accounted for the focal coach's expertise in working one-one-one with teachers: (a) specifying long-term goals for the teachers' learning; (b) assessing teachers' current instructional practices; (c) locating teachers' current instructional practices on a trajectory of teachers' learning;(d) identifying next steps for teachers' learning, and (e) designing activities to support that learning. In addition, we identified two forms of knowledge that were implicated in the coach's enactment of these practices: (a) a sophisticated vision of ambitious mathematics instruction, and (b) an envisioned trajectory of teacher's development of ambitious instructional practice. As these findings are based on a single case, we consider them to be provisional and open to revision in light of future investigations. In the interim, they provide some guidance for districts that are attempting to support coaches in working more effectively with teachers in their classrooms.

As we have made clear, research on coaching in mathematics and in other disciplines is still at an early stage. It is therefore a prime area for future research, including case studies and design research studies that are feasible as dissertation studies. In our view, it will be important to locate these investigations of coaching within the context of a teacher learning (sub)system and a more encompassing instructional system, and to justify particular coaching activities in terms of teacher learning opportunities.

5.3.4 Teacher networks

Prior research indicates that teacher networks can be a key support for teachers' improvement of their instruction (Frank & Zhao 2005). In contrast to the three types of support for teachers' learning that we have discussed thus far, teacher networks cannot be intentionally designed because they are emergent phenomena that are constituted as individual teachers decide to turn to a colleague for advice about instruction. However, there is evidence that district improvement strategies can influence both to whom teachers turn for instructional advice and the types of advice they seek (Coburn & Russell 2008; Penuel et al. 2009). For example, it seems reasonable to conjecture that teachers who use a common set of instructional resources, participate together in PD, and work together in collaborative meetings will be more likely to trust and hold each other accountable, and to turn to each other for instructional advice (Cobb & Jackson 2011).

Researchers who investigate teacher networks distinguish between who teachers *select* to turn to for advice and the *influence* that these interactions have on teachers' knowledge and practice. A retrospective analysis of our network data indicates that teachers whose instructional practices were more sophisticated were more likely to seek instructional advice (Garrison et al. 2014). We speculate that this could be because instruction becomes increasingly problematic for teachers when they begin to move beyond procedurally oriented practices. This analysis also found that teachers tended to seek advice from colleagues whose students had higher value-added achievement scores rather than colleagues whose instructional practices were more sophisticated. However, a follow-up case study clarified that who teachers turned to for advice was influenced by the extent to which the principal's and coach's visions of high quality mathematics instruction were aligned (Rigby, Larson & Chen 2014). In particular, teachers turned to colleagues who had higher value-added scores when the principal pressed them to raise test scores. However, they sought advice from colleagues who had developed more sophisticated practices when the principal and coach both pressed them to improve the quality of their instruction.

This finding about who teachers turned to for advice is significant given the finding of another retrospective analysis which indicates that teachers' interactions with colleagues whose instructional practices were more sophisticated supported the development of the advice seeking teacher’s practices (Sun et al. 2014). This analysis also found that the level of sophistication of the practices of the most accomplished teacher in a school was related to overall improvement in quality of instruction in the school.

Taken together, these findings extend previous work by indicating that network interactions can also be an important support for teachers' learning when the focus is on ambitious instructional practices. The findings also indicate the crucial contribution that teachers whose instructional practices are relatively sophisticated can make to instructional improvement efforts. In our view, a key aspect of school and district instructional leadership involves identifying such teachers and leveraging their expertise.

*5.4 Supplemental supports for currently struggling students*

This final element of a coherent instructional system emerged as significant only after we had begun working with our partner districts. As part of their responses to high stakes accountability pressures, all four districts invested significant resources to identify and provide supplemental instruction to students who were likely to perform badly on state assessments. This supplemental instruction typically included either tutoring or additonal, second mathematics classes that were procedurally oriented and focused on so-called basic skills. In formulating recommendations to the districts, we came to the conclusion that the primary goal of supplemental supports should be to enable students who were currently struggling to participate fully in and learn from the instruction in their primary mathematics classes. We also concluded that the issue of supplemental supports has broad relevance, as some students are likely to be poorly served in most classrooms including those in which the teacher is striving to develop ambitious instructional practices.

In an effort to ensure that our recommendations to the districts were empirically grounded, we conducted a literature search to identify studies that addressed this issue in the context of ambitious student learning goals. However, we found few studies that were sufficiently robust to risk using them as a basis for district-level improvement strategies (cf. Confrey 2011; Nomi & Allensworth 2009). We therefore drew on the analyses of the district' supplemental supports that we conducted each year. These analyses indicated that tutoring was unlikely to support students' attainment of ambitious learning goals because it was procedurally focused and because the tutors typically received little if any professional development. However, there were some indications that second mathematics classes were more promising when the same teacher also taught the students' primary mathematics class and when the teacher's goal was to prepare students for the primary class. We therefore recommended that the districts attempt to meet the needs of currently struggling students by assigning the same teacher to the two classes whenever possible, and support the close coordination of the two classes when this was not feasible. We also suggested that districts provide teachers of second classes with professional development and curricular resources that were specific to meeting the needs of currently struggling students. We took care to signal to district leaders that we regarded our recommendations as provisional as there was little research on which we could draw. In our view, there is an urgent need for studies that address this significant gap in the research literature.

**6 Conclusion and discussion**

In the first part of this chapter, we gave an overview of the approach we took for partnering educational systems to investigate what it takes to support improvements in the quality of mathematics instruction on a large scale. We then described a key component of our theory of action for instructional improvement—a coherent instructional system—and gave particular attention to the teacher learning (sub)system. It is important to acknowledge that the theory of action was developed in the U.S. educational context. Some adaptations will therefore be required to take account of how educational systems are organized in other countries. However, we anticipate that the general approach of framing instructional improvement at scale as a problem of organizational learning will prove relevant across national contexts.

The project on which we reported is large, spanned multiple years, and required significant funding. We therefore took care to clarify that relatively small studies that investigate the development of key aspects of system-level capacity for instructional improvement can also make significant contributions. The field of mathematics education has make significant progress in documenting trajectories of students' learning in specific mathematical domains, clarifying instructional practices that support students' attainment of worthwhile learning goals, and investigating PD models for supporting teachers development of those practices. However, this work has had only limited impact on typical mathematics instruction in most countries. There is abundant evidence that the standard approach of researchers developing innovative instructional materials and models and then handing them over to practitioners for implementation is ineffective. There is a pressing need for investigations that challenge this seemingly take-for-granted division of labor between researchers and practitioners by framing large-scale instructional improvement as an explicit focus of investigation. In the absence of such investigations, mathematics education research is unlikely to realize its potential and contribute to improvements in the quality of mathematics instruction for large numbers of students.
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