Appendix 1: Confidence Intervals and Statistical Significance
Confidence Intervals and Statistical Significance

Many of the tables, figures, and footnotes in the report provide information about whether the difference between estimated percentages is statistically significant. Statistical significance signals whether this difference is likely to be due to chance. If it appears that the difference in estimated percentages is due to chance (i.e., the difference is not statistically significant), then we cannot say that districts are more likely to do one thing than another.

For example, we estimate that 90% of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states strongly agreed or agreed that the CCSS are more rigorous than their state’s previous standards in math, while 5% of districts strongly disagreed or disagreed that the CCSS are more rigorous than their state’s previous standards in math. The difference between 90% and 5% is statistically significant, which indicates that the difference is larger than is likely to be explained by chance alone. Therefore, we can say that a higher percentage of districts agree than disagree that the CCSS are more rigorous than their state’s previous standards in math. However, 5% of districts strongly disagreed or disagreed that the CCSS are more rigorous than their state’s previous standards in math compared with 5% of districts that were not sure whether the CCSS standards were more rigorous than their state’s previous standards or not. This difference is not statistically significant, so we cannot say that a higher percentage of districts disagreed that the CCSS are more rigorous than their state’s previous standards in math than districts that were not sure.

One method of determining the statistical significance of the difference between two percentages is to compare the confidence intervals of the two percentages. Confidence intervals provide information about the accuracy of the estimated percentages. If the confidence intervals for two percentages do not overlap, then the difference is statistically significant. Exhibit 1 illustrates how ranges of estimated percentages (the confidence intervals) of districts experiencing funding increases or decreases are used to determine statistical significance.
Exhibit 1: Confidence intervals for Figure 1

District leaders’ views on whether the CCSS are more rigorous than their state’s previous standards in math (Math 2014)

Figure reads: In 2014, 90 percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states responded that they strongly agreed or agreed that the CCSS are more rigorous than the previous state standards in math. Five percent of district leaders strongly disagreed or disagreed with this statement, and 5 percent were not sure.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 90 (85, 94); 5 (3, 10); 5 (2, 8). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of district leaders who strongly agreed or agreed that the CCSS were more rigorous than the previous state standards in math is between 85 percent and 94 percent.

In this case, the bars depicting the confidence interval for the estimated percentage of districts that strongly agreed or agreed that the CCSS are more rigorous than their state’s previous standards in math and the confidence interval for the estimated percentage of districts that strongly disagreed or disagreed that the CCSS are more rigorous than their state’s previous standards in math do not overlap, indicating that the difference between the two percentages is statistically significant. Conversely, the bars depicting the confidence interval for the estimated percentage of districts that strongly disagreed or disagreed that the CCSS are more rigorous than their state’s previous standards in math and the confidence interval for the estimated percentage of districts that were not sure whether the CCSS are more rigorous than their state’s previous standards in math do overlap, indicating that the difference between the percentages is not statistically significant.

Appendix 3 provides confidence intervals for all the figures and tables that are reported in the main body of the report.
Appendix 2: Study Methods
Study Methods

This appendix describes the sampling procedures used to select potential districts to participate in the Center on Education Policy’s District Survey, 2014. Also described are the methods used to develop and administer the survey and the analytic process used to obtain population estimates from the survey responses. The survey was developed, administered, and analyzed with support from Policy Studies Associates, CEP’s contractor for this project.

Survey Sample

We started with the publicly accessible dataset from the 2010-2011 Common Core of Data Local Education Agency Universe Survey conducted by the National Center of Education Statistics (NCES). We chose to use the 2010-2011 edition of the dataset because at the time we drew the sample, the 2011-2012 was in preliminary form. This dataset contains information on 18,478 elementary and secondary education agencies located in the 50 states and the District of Columbia; Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the U.S. Virgin Islands; the Department of Defense schools; and the Bureau of Indian Education.

From the dataset of 18,478 education agencies, we removed the 7,223 agencies that did not match our study population criteria, for a total of 11,255 districts in the sample frame. Specifically, we removed the agencies that were located outside of the 50 states and the District of Columbia as well as in the five states that had not adopted the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) as of winter 2014 (Alaska, Minnesota, Nebraska, Texas, and Virginia). We also removed agencies that were not operating or that were regional education service agencies, federally and state-operated agencies, charter agencies, or designated as “other education agencies.”

The dataset also included agencies that were component(s) of a supervisory union, sharing a superintendent and administrative services with other local school districts. In these cases, we retained the agency defined as the “supervisory union” and removed the component agencies associated with the unions. We removed the local education agencies (LEAs) that did not directly educate students through the employment of teachers and the operation of school buildings; many of these agencies represented towns that sent their students to neighboring districts or cooperative districts. Finally, we also removed agencies that solely served special segments of the population, such as vocational centers or schools for special education students. Exhibit 2 summarizes the edits that we made to the dataset to arrive at our sample frame.
### Exhibit 2: Variables Used to Build Sample Frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Variable Description</th>
<th>Use*</th>
<th>LEAs Subtracted</th>
<th>Unduplicated Deletions**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIPST</td>
<td>American National Standards Institute (ANSI) state code</td>
<td>Eliminated LEAs from locations outside of the 50 states and the District of Columbia AND states who have not adopted the CCSS (X&gt;56, X=02, X=27, X=31, X=48, X=51; n=2,642)</td>
<td>2,642</td>
<td>2,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOUND</td>
<td>The boundary change indicator is a classification of changes in an education agency’s boundaries since the last report to NCES</td>
<td>Eliminated LEAs that had closed (X=2; n=185) or were temporarily closed (X=6; n=28). Eliminated one LEA in which a new agency has since opened and includes it.</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>2,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>Agency type code</td>
<td>Eliminated agencies defined as “regional education service agencies” (X=4; n=1,137), “state-operated agencies” (X=5; n=243), “federally operated agencies” (X=0), “charter agencies” (X=7; n=2,070), and “other education agencies” (X=8; n=130)</td>
<td>3,580</td>
<td>6,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNION</td>
<td>Indicator linking supervisory units and component agencies</td>
<td>Eliminated agencies that were represented in the dataset as component agencies of a “supervisory union.” Eliminated LEAs from CA (n=12), IN (n=2), ME (n=66), NH (n=176), NYC (n=33), and VT (n=293); eliminated supervisory unions from MT (n=56).</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>7,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH</td>
<td>Number of schools associated with the agency</td>
<td>Eliminated LEAs that did not directly educate students (n=102)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>7,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Eliminated LEAs that served special populations of students (n=47)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7,223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit reads: The FIPST variable eliminated LEAs that existed outside the 50 states and the District of Columbia and who have not adopted the CCSS; this variable netted 2,642 deletions, which brought the total number of unduplicated deletions to 2,642.

* The “X” stands for the variable name in each row.

** The unduplicated count is cumulative from top to bottom.

### Survey Development

The challenge in developing the survey was to strike a reasonable balance between minimizing the response burden and collecting enough data to describe how LEAs are responding to local efforts to implement to Common Core State Standards (CCSS). The survey included 22 questions across a variety of topics including: district views on the Common Core, CCSS-aligned
curriculum, collaboration, teacher and principal CCSS-related professional development, SEA assistance, assessments, outreach efforts, and challenges.

As part of survey development, we sent a draft of the instrument to superintendents in eight LEAs. We asked the superintendents to review the instrument and provide feedback on the appropriateness and clarity of the wording and on the focus of the survey questions. We also asked them to estimate the amount of time required to complete the survey and to indicate who else in their districts might be involved in responding to individual items. The final version of the survey reflects the feedback that we received.

Survey Administration

In March 2014, CEP contacted the superintendents of the districts in the sample to explain the purpose of the survey and to provide background information on CEP and its previous reports and research on district-level implementation of the CCSS. A week later, we emailed the survey to the local superintendents. We sent a reminder email a few days after emailing the survey. Two weeks later we sent a reminder email to non-responding emails. We also followed up by phone to non-responding districts.

Districts returned surveys between the end of March and the middle of June 2014. We received completed responses from 211 of the 390 districts, 16 partial responses, and 27 refusals in our sample; this corresponds to a response rate of 65 percent. Given our previous work with school districts and our understanding of the current climate of data requests from districts, we anticipated a 50 percent response rate at the outset of the survey. If we assume that district non-response occurred at random, then the response rate does not affect the representativeness of the survey findings.

Data Analysis

To obtain the population estimates from the sample responses, we multiplied survey responses by one of two sets of weighting factors specific to the respondent’s stratum. The first set of weighting factors were developed to adjust the achieved samples in each stratum to reflect the proportion of districts in states adopting the CCSS. The second set of weighting factors was also stratum-specific and used for analyses of responses to questions concerning districts in consortia-member states, including questions 14 through 19 and the second half of question 20. These weights adjusted the achieved sample to reflect the proportion of districts in the population of states participating in one of the two state consortia that are developing CCSS-aligned assessments. Exhibit 3 shows the resulting weights.
### Exhibit 3. CCSS adopting and consortia-member state survey population, response rates, and weights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Type</th>
<th>Number (and percent) of districts in the sample frame</th>
<th>Number (and percent) of district responses</th>
<th>Population Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>615 (5.5%)</td>
<td>12 (5.7%)</td>
<td>51.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>2541 (22.6%)</td>
<td>47 (22.3%)</td>
<td>54.0638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>2008 (17.8%)</td>
<td>44 (20.9%)</td>
<td>44.6222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>6091 (54.1%)</td>
<td>108 (51.1%)</td>
<td>56.3981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>11,255 (100%)</td>
<td>211 (100%)</td>
<td>206.3342</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Questions for districts in states adopting the CCSS**

**City**
- Number: 615 (5.5%)
- Number of responses: 12 (5.7%)
- Population weight: 51.2500

**Suburb**
- Number: 2541 (22.6%)
- Number of responses: 47 (22.3%)
- Population weight: 54.0638

**Town**
- Number: 2008 (17.8%)
- Number of responses: 44 (20.9%)
- Population weight: 44.6222

**Rural**
- Number: 6091 (54.1%)
- Number of responses: 108 (51.1%)
- Population weight: 56.3981

**Totals**
- Number: 11,255 (100%)
- Number of responses: 211 (100%)
- Population weight: 206.3342

**Questions for districts in consortia-member states (Questions 14-19, part of 20)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Type</th>
<th>Number (and percent) of districts in the sample frame</th>
<th>Number (and percent) of district responses</th>
<th>Population Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>567 (5.7%)</td>
<td>11 (5.8%)</td>
<td>51.5455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>2,475 (24.5%)</td>
<td>46 (24.6%)</td>
<td>53.8043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>1,779 (17.6%)</td>
<td>36 (19.3%)</td>
<td>49.4167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>5,266 (55.2%)</td>
<td>94 (50.3%)</td>
<td>56.0213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>10,087 (100%)</td>
<td>187 (100%)</td>
<td>210.7877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit reads: There are 615 city districts in the sample frame; there are 20 city districts in the sample. Twelve city districts responded to the survey.

For survey findings presented in the report, we estimated both the standard error and confidence interval for each of the estimated response frequencies. The estimated standard error of a proportion provides information about the accuracy of the percentage estimate. The size of the standard error is influenced by the distribution of responses, the number of respondents, and the size of the population. Estimated standard errors are used to construct confidence intervals for the estimated percent. The confidence interval for a proportion indicates the degree of certainty that the true value for the population of all districts in the nation, or in a state that is a member of one of the two state consortia developing CCSS-aligned assessments, is included in a particular range. For proportions, the confidence interval is not symmetric relative to the estimated percent (except in the case where the estimated percent equals 50); this is because a proportion has a lower and upper bound (0 and 1, respectively), and the boundary affects the calculation of the interval. Additional information about the confidence intervals for specific responses is available in Appendix 3 accompanying the report.
Appendix 3: Confidence Intervals for Survey Responses
Exhibit 1: Confidence intervals for Figure 1

District leaders’ views on whether the CCSS are more rigorous than their state’s previous standards in math (Math 2014)

Figure reads: In 2014, 90 percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states reported that they strongly agreed or agreed that the CCSS are more rigorous than the previous state standards in math. Five percent of district leaders strongly disagreed or disagreed with this statement, and 5 percent were not sure.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 90 (85, 94); 5 (3, 10); 5 (2, 8). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of district leaders who strongly agreed or agreed that the CCSS were more rigorous than the previous state standards in math is between 85 percent and 94 percent.
Exhibit 2: Confidence intervals for Figure 1 (cont.)

District leaders’ views on whether the CCSS are more rigorous than their state’s previous standards in math (Math 2011)

Figure reads: In 2011, 58 percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states reported that they strongly agreed or agreed that the CCSS are more rigorous than the previous state standards in math. Twenty-two percent of district leaders strongly disagreed or disagreed with this statement, and 20 percent were not sure.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 58 (51, 65); 22 (17, 29); 20 (15, 27). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of district leaders who strongly agreed or agreed that the CCSS were more rigorous than the previous state standards in math is between 51 percent and 65 percent.
District leaders’ views on whether the CCSS are more rigorous than their state's previous standards in ELA (ELA 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent of district leaders (2014)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly agree or agree</strong></td>
<td>![Graph showing 91% strongly agree or agree]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly disagree or disagree</strong></td>
<td>![Graph showing 6% strongly disagree or disagree]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not sure</strong></td>
<td>![Graph showing 3% not sure]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure reads: In 2014, 91 percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states reported that they strongly agreed or agreed that the CCSS are more rigorous than the previous state standards in ELA. Six percent of district leaders strongly disagreed or disagreed with this statement, and 3 percent were not sure.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 91 (86, 94); 6 (3, 10); 3 (2, 7). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of district leaders who strongly agreed or agreed that the CCSS were more rigorous than the previous state standards in ELA is between 86 percent and 94 percent.
Exhibit 4: Confidence intervals for Figure 1 (cont.)

District leaders’ views on whether the CCSS are more rigorous than their state’s previous standards in ELA (ELA 2011)

Figure reads: In 2011, 57 percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states reported that they strongly agreed or agreed that the CCSS are more rigorous than the previous state standards in ELA. Twenty-one percent of district leaders strongly disagreed or disagreed with this statement, and 22 percent were not sure.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 57 (50, 64); 21 (16, 28); 22 (16, 29). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of district leaders who strongly agreed or agreed that the CCSS were more rigorous than the previous state standards in ELA is between 50 percent and 64 percent.
Exhibit 5: Confidence intervals for Figure 2

District leaders’ views on whether implementation of the CCSS will lead to improved skills in math (Math 2014)

Figure reads: In 2014, 76 percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states reported that they strongly agreed or agreed that implementation of the CCSS will lead to improved skills in math. Ten percent of district leaders strongly disagreed or disagreed with this statement, and 14 percent were not sure.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 76 (70, 81); 10 (6, 15); 14 (10, 20). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of district leaders who strongly agreed or agreed that implementation of the CCSS would lead to improved skills in math is 70 percent to 81 percent.
District leaders’ views on whether implementation of the CCSS will lead to improved skills in math (Math 2011)

Figure reads: In 2011, 55 percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states reported that they strongly agreed or agreed that implementation of the CCSS will lead to improved skills in math. Fifteen percent of district leaders strongly disagreed or disagreed with this statement, and 30 percent were not sure.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 55 (48, 62); 15 (11, 21); 30 (23, 37). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of district leaders who strongly agreed or agreed that implementation of the CCSS would lead to improved skills in math is 48 percent to 62 percent.
District leaders’ views on whether implementation of the CCSS will lead to improved skills in ELA (ELA 2014)

Figure reads: In 2014, 79 percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states reported that they strongly agreed or agreed that implementation of the CCSS will lead to improved skills in ELA. Eight percent of district leaders strongly disagreed or disagreed with this statement, and 12 percent were not sure.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 79 (73, 84); 8 (5, 13); 12 (8, 18). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of district leaders who strongly agreed or agreed that implementation of the CCSS would lead to improved skills in ELA is 73 percent to 84 percent.
District leaders’ views on whether implementation of the CCSS will lead to improved skills in ELA (ELA 2011)

Figure reads: In 2011, 58 percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states reported that they strongly agreed or agreed that implementation of the CCSS will lead to improved skills in ELA. Thirteen percent of district leaders strongly disagreed or disagreed with this statement, and 29 percent were not sure.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 58 (51, 65); 13 (9, 19); 29 (23, 36). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of district leaders who strongly agreed or agreed that implementation of the CCSS would lead to improved skills in ELA is 51 percent to 65 percent.
Exhibit 9: Confidence intervals for Figure 3

District leaders’ views on whether implementation of the CCSS will require new or substantially revised math curriculum materials (Math 2014)

Figure reads: In 2014, 88 percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states reported that they strongly agreed or agreed that implementation of the CCSS will require new or substantially revised math curriculum materials. Eight percent of district leaders strongly disagreed or disagreed with this statement, and 4 percent were not sure.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 88 (83, 92); 8 (5, 13); 4 (2, 7). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of district leaders who strongly agreed or agreed that implementation of the CCSS will require new or substantially revised math curriculum materials is between 83 percent and 92 percent.
Exhibit 10: Confidence intervals for Figure 3 (cont.)

District leaders’ views on whether implementation of the CCSS will require new or substantially revised math curriculum materials (Math 2011)

Figure reads: In 2011, 64 percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states reported that they strongly agreed or agreed that implementation of the CCSS will require new or substantially revised math curriculum materials. Sixteen percent of district leaders strongly disagreed or disagreed with this statement, and 20 percent were not sure.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 64 (56, 70); 16 (12, 22); 20 (15, 27). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of district leaders who strongly agreed or agreed that implementation of the CCSS will require new or substantially revised math curriculum materials is between 56 percent and 70 percent.
Exhibit 11: Confidence intervals for Figure 3 (cont.)

District leaders’ views on whether implementation of the CCSS will require new or substantially revised ELA curriculum materials (ELA 2014)

Figure reads: In 2014, 82 percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states reported that they strongly agreed or agreed that implementation of the CCSS will require new or substantially revised ELA curriculum materials. Twelve percent of district leaders strongly disagreed or disagreed with this statement, and 5 percent were not sure.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 82 (76, 87); 12 (9, 18); 5 (3, 10). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of district leaders who strongly agreed or agreed that implementation of the CCSS will require new or substantially revised ELA curriculum materials is between 76 percent and 87 percent.
District leaders’ views on whether implementation of the CCSS will require new or substantially revised ELA curriculum materials (ELA 2011)

Figure reads: In 2011, 56 percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states reported that they strongly agreed or agreed that implementation of the CCSS will require new or substantially revised ELA curriculum materials. Twenty-two percent of district leaders strongly disagreed or disagreed with this statement, and 23 percent were not sure.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 56 (48, 63); 22 (17, 28); 23 (17, 30). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of district leaders who strongly agreed or agreed that implementation of the CCSS will require new or substantially revised ELA curriculum materials is between 48 percent and 63 percent.
District leaders’ views on whether implementation of the CCSS will require fundamental changes in math instruction (Math 2014)

Figure reads: In 2014, 89 percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states reported that they strongly agreed or agreed that implementation of the CCSS will require fundamental changes in math instruction. Six percent of district leaders strongly disagreed or disagreed with this statement, and 5 percent were not sure.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 89 (84, 92); 6 (4, 10); 5 (3, 9). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of district leaders who strongly agreed or agreed that implementation of the CCSS will require fundamental changes in math instruction is between 84 percent and 92 percent.
Exhibit 14: Confidence intervals for Figure 4 (cont.)

District leaders’ views on whether implementation of the CCSS will require fundamental changes in math instruction (Math 2011)

Figure reads: In 2011, 50 percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states reported that they strongly agreed or agreed that implementation of the CCSS will require fundamental changes in math instruction. Twenty-nine percent of district leaders strongly disagreed or disagreed with this statement, and 21 percent were not sure.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 50 (43, 57); 29 (23, 36); 21 (16, 28). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of district leaders who strongly agreed or agreed that implementation of the CCSS will require fundamental changes in math instruction is between 43 percent and 57 percent.
Exhibit 15: Confidence intervals for Figure 4 (cont.)

District leaders’ views on whether implementation of the CCSS will require fundamental changes in ELA instruction (ELA 2014)

Figure reads: In 2014, 86 percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states reported that they strongly agreed or agreed that implementation of the CCSS will require fundamental changes in ELA instruction. Eight percent of district leaders strongly disagreed or disagreed with this statement, and 7 percent were not sure.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 86 (80, 90); 8 (5, 12); 7 (4, 11). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of district leaders who strongly agreed or agreed that implementation of the CCSS will require fundamental changes in ELA instruction is between 80 percent and 90 percent.
District leaders’ views on whether implementation of the CCSS will require fundamental changes in ELA instruction (ELA 2011)

Figure reads: In 2011, 50 percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states reported that they strongly agreed or agreed that implementation of the CCSS will require fundamental changes in ELA instruction. Twenty-seven percent of district leaders strongly disagreed or disagreed with this statement, and 22 percent were not sure.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 50 (43, 57); 27 (22, 34); 22 (17, 29). This means, for example, that we are 95% certain that the actual percentage of district leaders who strongly agreed or agreed that implementation of the CCSS will require fundamental changes in ELA instruction is between 43 percent and 57 percent.
Figure reads: Thirty-seven percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states reported that they expected to complete implementation of a CCSS-aligned curricula in math in all schools in school year 2013-14 or before. Thirty-two percent of district leaders reported that they expected to complete implementation in school year 2014-15, 27 percent reported that they expected to complete implementation in school year 2015-16 or later, and 4 percent were not sure.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 37 (30, 45); 32 (25, 39); 27 (21, 34); 4 (2, 9); 36 (29, 43); 23 (17, 30); 6 (3, 10); 36 (29, 43); 34 (27, 41); 23 (17, 30); 8 (5, 13); 30 (23, 37); 34 (27, 41); 30 (24, 38); 7 (4, 11). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of district leaders who reported that they expected to complete implementation of a CCSS-aligned curricula in math in all schools in school year 2013-14 or before is between 30 percent and 45 percent.
School year in which districts expect to complete key implementation milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequately prepare all ELA teachers to teach the CCSS</th>
<th>SY 2013-14 or before</th>
<th>SY 2014-15</th>
<th>SY 2015-15 or later</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adopt CCSS-aligned textbooks and other instructional materials</th>
<th>SY 2013-14 or before</th>
<th>SY 2014-15</th>
<th>SY 2015-15 or later</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have the necessary technological infrastructure to administer CCSS-aligned assessments</th>
<th>SY 2013-14 or before</th>
<th>SY 2014-15</th>
<th>SY 2015-15 or later</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure reads: Thirty-three percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states reported that they expected to adequately prepare all ELA teachers to teach the CCSS in school year 2013-14 or before. Thirty-six percent of district leaders reported that they expected to complete implementation in school year 2014-15, 24 percent reported that they expected to complete implementation in school year 2015-16 or later, and 7 percent were not sure.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 33 (26, 40); 36 (29, 44); 24 (19, 31); 7 (4, 12); 21 (16, 28); 29 (23, 36); 34 (27, 41); 16 (12, 23); 32 (25, 41); 29 (21, 37); 26 (19, 34); 14 (9, 21). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of district leaders who reported that they expected to complete implementation of a CCSS-aligned curricula in math in all schools in school year 2013-14 or before is between 26 percent and 40 percent.
Exhibit 19: Confidence intervals for Table 2

Challenges related to funding, curriculum materials, staffing, professional development, and time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Major challenge</th>
<th>Minor challenge</th>
<th>Not a challenge</th>
<th>Too soon to tell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finding adequate resources to support all of the activities necessary for implementing the CCSS</td>
<td>67% (60, 73)</td>
<td>25% (20, 32)</td>
<td>7% (4, 11)</td>
<td>2% (1, 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying and/or developing the curriculum materials necessary to implement the CCSS</td>
<td>45% (39, 52)</td>
<td>45% (38, 52)</td>
<td>9% (5, 14)</td>
<td>1% (0, 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having adequate district staff expertise to implement all aspects of the CCSS</td>
<td>42% (35, 49)</td>
<td>44% (37, 51)</td>
<td>22% (17, 28)</td>
<td>7% (4, 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing high-quality professional development and other support to ensure that teachers are able to implement the CCSS instructional activities</td>
<td>46% (37, 51)</td>
<td>10% (7, 15)</td>
<td>10% (7, 15)</td>
<td>2% (1, 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having enough time to implement the CCSS before consequences (i.e., school accountability, teacher evaluations) are tied to student performance on the CCSS-aligned assessments</td>
<td>67% (60, 73)</td>
<td>22% (17, 28)</td>
<td>7% (4, 11)</td>
<td>4% (2, 8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure reads: Sixty-seven percent of districts in Common Core-adopting states reported that finding adequate resources to support all of the activities necessary for implementing the CCSS was a major challenge, 25 percent indicated it was a minor challenge, 7 percent responded that finding resources was not a challenge, and 2 percent said it was too soon to tell if this was a challenge or not.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 67 (60, 73); 25 (20, 32); 7 (4, 11); 2 (1, 5); 45 (39, 52); 45 (38, 52); 9 (5, 14); 1 (0, 4); 42 (35, 49); 42 (35, 49); 10 (7, 15); 2 (1, 5); 67 (60, 73); 22 (17, 28); 7 (4, 11); 4 (2, 8). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of districts in Common-Core adopting states who reported that finding adequate resources to support all of the activities necessary for implementing the CCSS was a major challenge is between 60 percent and 73 percent.
Assessment-related implementation challenges

Preparation for the implementation of new CCSS-aligned assessments

Identifying resources to acquire the necessary technological infrastructure to administer the assessments

Figure reads: Fifty percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states reported that preparing for the implementation of new CCSS-aligned assessments was a major challenge, 42 percent indicated it was a minor challenge, 7 percent responded that such preparation was not a challenge, and 1 percent said it was too soon to tell if this was a challenge or not.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 50 (43, 57); 42 (35, 49); 7 (4, 12); 46 (38, 54); 41 (33, 49); 14 (9, 20); 0 (0, 0). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of districts in Common Core-adopting states that reported that preparing for the implementation of new CCSS-aligned assessments was a major challenge is between 43 percent and 57 percent.
Exhibit 21: Confidence intervals for Table 4

Challenges related to resistance to the CCSS and outreach

Figure reads: Twenty-five percent of districts in Common Core-adopting states reported that overcoming resistance to the CCSS from within the K-12 system was a major challenge, 49 percent indicated it was a minor challenge, 22 percent responded that such resistance was not a challenge, 3 percent said it was too soon to tell if this was a challenge, and 1 percent said it was not a district activity.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 25 (20, 32); 49 (42, 56); 22 (17, 28); 3 (1, 7); 1 (0, 4); 34 (28, 41); 39 (33, 46); 18 (12, 24); 6 (3, 10); 3 (1, 6); 1 (0, 4). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of districts in Common Core-adopting states reporting that overcoming resistance to the CCSS from within the K-12 system was a major challenge is between 20 percent and 32 percent.
Exhibit 22: Confidence intervals for Table 4 (cont.)

Challenges related to resistance to the CCSS and outreach

Figure reads: Forty-two percent of districts in Common Core-adopting states reported concern about state officials reconsidering the adoption of the CCSS or putting the implementation of the CCSS on hold was a major challenge, 20 percent indicated it was a minor challenge, 24 percent responded that such resistance was not a challenge, 3 percent said they weren’t sure, and 1 percent reported that it was not a district activity.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 42 (36, 49); 20 (15, 26); 24 (19, 31); 8 (5, 12); 3 (1, 6); 4 (2, 7); 27 (21, 34); 50 (44, 57); 18 (13, 24); 3 (1, 6); 2 (1, 5). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of districts in Common Core-adopting states reporting that overcoming resistance to the CCSS from within the K-12 system was a major challenge is between 36 percent and 49 percent.
Exhibit 23: Confidence intervals for Figure 5

Outreach to explain how the CCSS are more rigorous than previous standards

Figure reads: Eighty-four percent of districts in Common Core-adopting states reported that they had conducted outreach to various stakeholders to explain how the CCSS are more rigorous than previous state standards.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 84 (79, 89). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of district leaders reporting that they had conducted outreach to various stakeholders to explain how the CCSS are more rigorous than previous state standards is between 79 percent and 89 percent.
Exhibit 24: Confidence intervals for Table 5

Targets of outreach to explain how the CCSS are more rigorous

Figure reads: Eighty-seven percent of districts in Common Core-adopting states have conducted outreach targeted to principals and teachers to explain how the CCSS are more rigorous than previous state math and ELA standards.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 87 (81, 91); 77 (70, 83); 62 (55, 69); 11 (7, 16); 5 (3, 9). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of districts in Common Core-adopting states reporting that they have conducted outreach targeted to principals and teachers to explain how the CCSS are more rigorous than previous state math and ELA standards is between 81 percent and 91 percent.
Exhibit 25: Confidence intervals for Figure 6

Outreach to explain why scores on CCSS-aligned tests may be lower than on previous tests

Figure reads: Seventy-six percent of districts in Common Core-adopting states reported that they had conducted outreach to various stakeholders to explain why scores on CCSS-aligned tests may be lower than on previous state math and ELA assessments.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 76 (70, 82). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of district leaders reporting that they had conducted outreach to various stakeholders to explain why scores on CCSS-aligned tests may be lower than on previous state math and ELA assessments is between 70 percent and 82 percent.
Exhibit 26: Confidence intervals for Table 6

Targets of outreach to explain why student performance on CCSS-aligned assessments may be lower than on previous assessments

Figure reads: Seventy-nine percent of districts in Common Core-adopting states have conducted outreach targeted to principals and teachers to explain why student performance on CCSS-aligned assessments may be lower than on previous assessments.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 79 (72, 84); 57 (50, 64); 45 (38, 52); 9 (6, 15); 4 (2, 8). This means, for example, that we are 95% certain that the actual percentage of districts in Common Core-adopting states that have conducted outreach targeted to principals and teachers to explain why student performance on CCSS-aligned assessments may be lower than on previous assessments is between 72 percent and 84 percent.
Exhibit 27: Confidence intervals for Table 7

Percentage of districts collaborating with other entities on CCSS implementation activities

Figure reads: Fifty-four percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states reported that they have collaborated with one entity on professional development for teachers on CCSS-aligned curriculum. Twenty-seven percent of districts reported they have collaborated with two entities, 13 percent reported collaborating with three entities, 5 percent reported collaborating with four entities, and 1 percent reported collaborating with five entities.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 54 (47, 61); 27 (21, 34); 13 (9, 19); 5 (3, 10); 1 (0, 4); 61 (54, 68); 27 (21, 35); 10 (6, 15); 1 (0, 4); 1 (0, 4); 56 (49, 63); 23 (18, 30); 17 (12, 23); 2 (1, 6); 1 (0, 5); 58 (50, 66); 25 (19, 33); 11 (7, 18); 3 (1, 8); 1 (0, 5). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of districts in Common Core-adopting states that report that they have collaborated with one entity on professional development for teachers on CCSS-aligned curriculum is between 47 percent and 61 percent.
Percentage of districts collaborating with other entities on CCSS implementation activities

Figure reads: Seventy percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states reported collaborating with one entity on the development of benchmark or interim assessments to measure student mastery of the CCSS. Twenty percent of districts reported collaborating with two entities, 8 percent reported collaborating with three entities, 1 percent reported collaborating with four entities, and 2 percent reported collaborating with five entities.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 70 (61, 77); 20 (14, 27); 8 (4, 14); 1 (0, 6); 2 (1, 7); 65 (55, 74); 27 (19, 36); 6 (3, 12); 0 (0, 0); 3 (1, 8); 79 (70, 86); 16 (10, 25); 2 (0, 7); 2 (1, 8); 1 (0, 7). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of districts in Common Core-adopting states that report that they have collaborated with one entity on professional development for principals to prepare them to be instructional leaders around the CCSS is between 61 percent and 77 percent.
Exhibit 29: Confidence intervals for Table 8

Percentage of districts collaborating with various entities on professional development

Collaborated with other entities on providing CCSS-related professional development for teachers on CCSS-aligned curriculum?

Collaborated with other entities on providing professional development to prepare teachers to use CCSS-aligned assessment data to inform instruction?

Collaborated with other entities on professional development for principals to prepare them to be instructional leaders around the CCSS?

Figure reads: Fifty-four percent of districts in Common Core-adopting states reported that they have collaborated with the SEA on providing CCSS-related professional development for teachers on CCSS-aligned curriculum. Sixty-one percent of districts reported collaborating with other districts in the state, 5 percent reported collaborating with other districts in other states, 20 percent reported collaborating with institutions of higher education, 15 percent reported collaborating with non-profit organizations, 6 percent reported not collaborating with any entity, and 3 percent reported not being sure.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 54 (47, 60); 61 (55, 68); 5 (3, 9); 20 (15, 26); 15 (10, 20); 6 (4, 10); 3 (2, 7); 52 (45, 59); 53 (46, 60); 7 (4, 11); 15 (11, 21); 15 (10, 20); 11 (7, 16); 4 (2, 7). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of districts in Common Core-adopting states reporting that they have collaborated with the SEA on providing CCSS-related professional development for teachers on CCSS-aligned curriculum is between 47 percent and 60 percent.
Exhibit 30: Confidence intervals for Table 9

Percentage of districts collaborating with various entities on CCSS-related curriculum development, funding, outreach, and interim assessment development

Figure reads: Forty percent of districts in Common Core-adopting states reported that they have collaborated with the SEA on developing CCSS-aligned curriculum materials. Forty-nine percent of districts reported collaborating with other districts in the state, 7 percent reported collaborating with other districts in other states, 11 percent reported collaborating with institutions of higher education, 16 percent reported collaborating with non-profit organizations, 17 percent reported not collaborating with any entity, and 7 percent reported not being sure.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 48 (42, 56); 50 (43, 57); 5 (3, 9); 13 (9, 18); 15 (10, 20); 10 (7, 15); 3 (2, 7); 40 (33, 47); 48 (42, 56); 7 (4, 11); 11 (8, 16); 16 (11, 22); 17 (12, 23); 7 (4, 11). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of districts in Common Core-adopting states reporting that they have collaborated with the SEA on professional development for principals to prepare them to be instructional leaders around the CCSS is between 42 percent and 55 percent.
Exhibit 31: Confidence intervals for Table 9 (cont.)

Percentage of districts collaborating with various entities on CCSS-related curriculum development, funding, outreach, and interim assessment development

Figure reads: Thirty-five percent of districts in Common Core-adopting states reported that they have collaborated with the SEA on parent/public information and outreach efforts around the CCSS. Twenty-six percent of districts reported collaborating with other districts in the state, 3 percent reported collaborating with other districts in other states, 4 percent reported collaborating with institutions of higher education, 8 percent reported collaborating with non-profit organizations, 38 percent reported not collaborating with any entity, and 6 percent reported not being sure.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 35 (29, 42); 26 (20, 33); 3 (2, 7); 4 (2, 8); 8 (5, 12); 38 (32, 45); 6 (4, 11); 35 (29, 42); 34 (28, 41); 5 (3, 9); 7 (4, 12); 13 (9, 18); 25 (20, 32); 4 (2, 8). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of districts in Common Core-adopting states reporting that they have collaborated with the SEA on parent/public information and outreach efforts around the CCSS is between 29 percent and 42 percent.
Exhibit 32: Confidence intervals for Figure 7

Participation of superintendents, principals, and teachers in SEA informational meetings on the CCSS

Figure reads: In 2014, 87 percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopted states reported that superintendents, principals, and/or teachers participated in SEA meetings that provided information about the standards. Eight percent of district leaders reported that superintendents, principals, and/or teachers did not participate in SEA meetings, 4 percent reported that they weren’t sure, and 1 percent reported that the SEA did not hold meetings that provided information about the standards.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 87 (82, 91); 8 (5, 13); 4 (2, 7); 1 (0, 4). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of district leaders who reported that superintendents, principals, and/or teachers participated in SEA meetings that provided information about the standards is between 82 percent and 91 percent.
Exhibit 33: Confidence intervals for Figure 7 (cont.)

Participation of superintendents, principals, and teachers in SEA informational meetings on the CCSS

Figure reads: In 2014, 32 percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states reported that superintendents, principals, and/or teachers participated in SEA meetings that provided information about the standards and that the meetings were very helpful. Sixty-three percent of district leaders reported that superintendents, principals, and/or teachers participated in SEA meetings and that the meetings were somewhat helpful, and 5 percent reported that superintendents, principals, and/or teachers participated in SEA meetings and that the meetings were not helpful.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 32 (26, 39); 63 (56, 70); 5 (3, 9). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of district leaders who reported that superintendents, principals, and/or teachers participated in SEA meetings that provided information about the standards is between 26 percent and 39 percent.
Exhibit 34: Confidence intervals for Figure 8

Staff receiving advice and/or assistance about the CCSS from the SEA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Not an SEA activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of district leaders (2014)</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure reads: In 2014, 79 percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states reported that they had received advice and/or technical assistance. Fourteen percent of district leaders reported that they received no advice and/or technical assistance, 5 percent reported that they weren’t sure, and 2 percent reported that receiving advice and/or technical assistance was not an SEA activity.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 79 (73, 84); 14 (10, 19); 5 (3, 9); 2 (1, 5). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of district leaders who reported that they had received advice and/or technical assistance is between 73 percent and 84 percent.
Exhibit 35: Confidence intervals for Figure 8 (cont.)

Staff receiving advice and/or assistance about the CCSS from the SEA

Percent of district leaders (2014)

Figure reads: In 2014, 32 percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states reported that the advice and/or technical assistance they received from SEA staff was very helpful. Sixty-one percent of district leaders reported that the advice and/or technical assistance they received from SEA staff was somewhat helpful, and 8 percent reported that the advice and/or technical assistance they received from SEA staff was not helpful.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 32 (25, 39); 61 (53, 68); 8 (4, 13). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of district leaders who reported that the advice and/or technical assistance they received from SEA staff was very helpful is between 25 percent and 39 percent.
Exhibit 36: Confidence intervals for Figure 9

Participation in and ratings of SEA-led professional development on the CCSS

Figure reads: In 2014, 70 percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states reported that teachers in their district participated in SEA-led professional development on the CCSS. Twenty percent reported that no teachers participated in SEA-led professional development on the CCSS, 8 percent reported that they were not sure, and 2 percent said that professional development on the CCSS for teachers was not an SEA activity.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 70 (64, 76); 20 (15, 26); 8 (5, 12); 2 (1, 5). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of district leaders who reported that teachers in their district participated in SEA-led professional development on the CCSS is between 64 percent and 76 percent.
Figure reads: In 2014, 31 percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states reported that they found the SEA-led professional development in their district to be very helpful, 65 percent found the professional development to be somewhat helpful, and 4 percent reported the professional development was not helpful.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 31 (24, 39); 65 (57, 73); 4 (2, 8). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of district leaders who reported that they found the SEA-led professional development in their district to be very helpful is between 24 percent and 39 percent.
Exhibit 38: Confidence intervals for Figure 9 (cont.)

Participation in and ratings of SEA-led professional development on the CCSS

Figure reads: In 2014, 69 percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states reported that principals in their district had participated in SEA-led professional development initiatives, 23 percent reported that principals in their district had not participated in SEA-led professional activities, 7 percent reported not being sure, and 1 percent reported that SEA-led professional development for principals was not an SEA activity.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 69 (62, 75); 23 (18, 29); 7 (5, 12); 1 (0, 3). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of district leaders who reported that principals in their district had participated in SEA-led professional development initiatives is between 62 percent and 75 percent.
Exhibit 39: Confidence intervals for Figure 9 (cont.)

Participation in and ratings of SEA-led professional development on the CCSS

Figure reads: In 2014, 28 percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states reported that the SEA-led professional development initiatives for principals to help them serve as instructional leaders on CCSS implementation were very helpful, 67 percent reported that the initiatives were somewhat helpful, and 5 percent reported that the initiatives were not helpful.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 28 (21, 36); 67 (59, 75); 5 (2, 9). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of district leaders who reported that the SEA-led professional development initiatives for principals to help them serve as instructional leaders on CCSS implementation were very helpful is between 21 percent and 36 percent.
Exhibit 40: Confidence intervals for Figure 10

District receipt of SEA-developed or SEA-recommended curriculum aligned to the CCSS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>71%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not an SEA activity</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of district leaders (2014)

Figure reads: In 2014, 71 percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states reported that their district had obtained SEA-developed or recommended curriculum guides and/or materials, 17 percent reported not obtaining SEA-developed or recommended curriculum guides and/or materials, 10 percent reported not being sure, and 1 percent reported that the development of such curriculum guides and/or materials was not an SEA activity.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 71 (65, 77); 17 (13, 23); 10 (7, 15); 1 (0, 4). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of district leaders who reported that their district had obtained SEA-developed or recommended curriculum is between 65 percent and 77 percent.
Exhibit 41: Confidence intervals for Figure 10 (cont.)

District receipt of SEA-developed or SEA-recommended curriculum guides and/or materials aligned to the CCSS

Figure reads: In 2014, 33 percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states reported that the SEA-developed or recommended curriculum guides and/or materials that they obtained was very helpful, 64 percent reported that the SEA-developed or recommended curriculum guides and/or materials were somewhat helpful, and 3 percent reported that the SEA-developed or recommended curriculum guides and/or materials were not helpful.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 33 (26, 41); 64 (55, 71); 3 (1, 8). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of district leaders who reported that the SEA-developed or recommended curriculum that they obtained was very helpful is between 26 percent and 41 percent.
Challenges related to state assistance

Receiving adequate guidance from the SEA to inform the implementation of the CCSS

Receiving adequate guidance from the SEA to inform the implementation of CCSS-aligned assessments

Figure reads: Thirty-one percent of district leaders in Common Core-adopting states reported that receiving adequate guidance from the SEA to inform the implementation of the CCSS was a major challenge, while 46 percent indicated it was a minor challenge, 21 percent responded that such guidance was not a challenge, and 3 percent said it was too soon to tell if this was a challenge or not.

Note: The 95 percent confidence intervals for the estimates in the figure are as follows: 31 (25, 37); 46 (39, 53); 21 (16, 27); 3 (1, 6); 36 (30, 43); 39 (33, 46); 22 (17, 28); 2 (1, 6). This means, for example, that we are 95 percent certain that the actual percentage of districts in Common Core-adopting states reporting that preparing for the implementation of new CCSS-aligned assessments was a major challenge is between 25 percent and 37 percent.