

Name: Sara Kloek, Vice President, Education and Children’s Policy

Group: Software & Information Industry Association

Primary Contact Email: skloek@siaa.net

[p.9, Line Number: 1, Section 102(15)]

- Feedback: Change the Evidenced-Based definition to the same definition as used in the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).
- Brief context: The definition of “evidence-based” varies from the well-established definition as used in ESSA. As drafted, the current definition would limit certain IES-funded educational activities and dissipation to only those activities that demonstrate “a statistically significant effect on improving relevant outcomes.” The definition further limits the research designs to only those “capable of casual inference, particularly randomized-control trials.” If this definition is enacted, it would be in direct conflict of AREA’s goal to make IES’ research more actionable and responsive to states and districts, and will impose a huge barrier on innovation. We recommend to use the same definition as ESSA Section 8002(21)
 - (21) EVIDENCE-BASED.—
 - (A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term ‘evidence-based’, when used with respect to a State, local educational agency, or school activity, means an activity, strategy, or intervention that—
 - (i) demonstrates a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes based on—
 - (I) strong evidence from at least 1 well- designed and well-implemented experimental study;
 - (II) moderate evidence from at least 1 well- designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental study; or
 - (III) promising evidence from at least 1 well- designed and well-implemented correlational study with statistical controls for selection bias; or
 - (ii)(I) demonstrates a rationale based on high- quality research findings or positive evaluation that such activity, strategy, or intervention is likely to improve student outcomes or other relevant outcomes; and
 - (II) includes ongoing efforts to examine the effects of such activity, strategy, or intervention.

[p. 28, Line Number: 20-21, Section 116(c)(4)]

- Feedback: Add another type of qualification of appointed member to Board of Directors.
- Brief context: Having direct expertise from the education technology field will be specifically important to add to the diversity of knowledge of the board. Further, this adds another area of expertise to the voting board, with a person that is well-versed in education technology research. It could be an additional qualification, written as (v).
 - Proposed Language:

- “At least 1 individual with expertise in applying education research in education technology products, preferably from research/analytics position, whether that product is for-profit or non-profit.”

[pg. 110, Line Number: 6-12, Section 155 (c)(2)(B)]

- Feedback: Clarify language in this section to clarify that the federal government will not be developing educational tools or curricula for use in the classroom.
 - Current language:

“develop and disseminate evidence-based products or tools designed to improve teaching and learning in order to provide all students, particularly each subgroup of students, access to high-quality educational opportunities and to improve educational outcomes, particularly student academic achievement.”
 - Proposed language:

“support the development and dissemination of evidence-based practices and resources to assist the knowledge or understanding of findings of scientifically valid research to improve teaching and learning in order to provide all students, particularly each subgroup of students, access to high-quality educational opportunities and to improve educational outcomes, particularly student academic achievement.”
- Brief Context: The current language in the discussion draft could cause confusion and lead to the development of tools at a federal level which seems outside of the scope of the mandate of the What Works Clearinghouse.