



October 15, 2025

Amber Northern
Senior Advisor
Office of the Secretary
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue SW
Washington, DC 20202-6450

Re: Request for Information for Feedback on Redesigning the Institute of Education Sciences (IES)

[Docket ID: ED-2025-IES-0844]

Dear Dr. Northern,

As the national association representing education research, evaluation, and technical assistance organizations that partner with States, districts, and the Federal government to improve outcomes for all learners, [Knowledge Alliance](#) appreciates the Administration's commitment to assessing and strengthening the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) through this [Request for Information](#) (RFI). IES plays an essential role in maintaining a strong and effective education research and development (R&D) ecosystem.

In July of this year, KA sent a [letter](#) to Secretary of Education Linda McMahon that proposed a vision to strengthen and modernize the Federal education research and development (R&D) system, much of which occurs at IES. KA's recommendations below, which reiterate and build upon the recommendations in the letter, reflect continued learning and insights from the on-the-ground experience of our members and their deep partnerships with States, districts, and schools nationwide.

We appreciate the Secretary's commitment to making the strengthening of IES a national priority. This is a critical moment to strengthen the impact of Federal investments that support evidence-based teaching and learning in every State and community. The U.S. Department of Education's (ED) R&D system represents a critical cross-country link that can efficiently and effectively pool expertise and disseminate information that helps State and local education agencies scale what works to drive evidence-based outcomes for all students.

KA's response to this RFI provides concrete, actionable steps the Administration can take now—through administrative changes, strategic alignment, and modernization efforts—to make IES more coherent, responsive, and impactful. Below are KA's recommendations aligned to the specific areas of comment laid out in the RFI.

1. Function More Cohesively Across IES's Four Centers to Ensure that Shared Goals Drive Data Collection, Research Funding, and Technical Assistance.

To fully realize the goals of a modernized education R&D system, IES must operate as a coordinated enterprise and not four independent Centers. Each center has a clear and valuable mission, but each center's work should not sit in a silo. Greater cross-Center alignment would allow IES to set shared priorities, coordinate timelines, and reinforce efforts across research, statistics, evaluation, and dissemination. This coordination is essential for IES to fulfill its core purpose: to generate and translate empirical evidence that informs education policy and practice at the Federal, State, and local levels.

- **Set Strategic Priorities:** IES should convene teachers, parents, States, districts, and policymakers from across the country to identify a limited set of the most urgent education research priorities. Cohesive research priorities can catalyze the application of research to generate broader impact. Reconsider outdated agendas that do not reflect current challenges and continuously refresh within 3-5-year cycles.
 - **Create formal avenues for State Education Agencies (SEAs) and Local Education Agencies (LEAs) to Signal Demand:** This could include structured “wish lists” of pressing research questions, matchmaking platforms that connect practitioners and researchers, and opportunities for structured input into funding priorities and processes.
- **Ensure Leadership Fosters and Prioritizes Cross Center Collaboration:** For IES to act as a unified enterprise requires strong leadership at the top to set a clear vision, motivate all Centers to row in the same direction, and foster positive, collaborative relationships to align work across IES.
- **Create Cross-Center Collaboration Plan:** IES should develop a strategic plan that cuts across the Centers, outlining how they will work together to advance shared goals.
 - **Formalize Cross-Center Governance:** IES should consider cross-Center governance and communication structures, such as establishing regular joint planning sessions among the Commissioners and senior staff of NCER, NCSER, NCES, NCEE and NAEP to set priorities and coordinate timelines.
 - **Require Centers to Co-Develop Research Agendas:** Based on the research priorities, NCEE and NCER/NCSER could co-develop evaluation and research agendas, ensuring that NCEE evaluations build on what NCER/NCSER had learned, and that NCER/NCSER research informs NCEE designs. NCEE and NCER/NCSER could develop joint briefings and practitioner-focused syntheses that integrate research and evaluation findings.

- **Establish Cross-Center Working Groups:** IES could establish cross-Center working groups on limited research topics, with joint staff and external advisory input.
- **Encourage NCES Data Use in IES Funded Research:** IES could encourage NCER/NCSEER funded researchers to use NCES data to reduce data collection burden and increase comparability.

2. Better Meet the Needs of State and Local Leaders, Educators, Parents, Researchers, and State Education Agencies.

Parents want to know that their child's school is using evidence-based curriculum and practices. School leaders need tools and strategies that actually work. State and local decision makers need data and evidence to invest taxpayer dollars wisely. By sharpening research priorities and modernizing processes, IES has a powerful opportunity to ensure that evidence flows efficiently to the field, helping educators, families, and policymakers make informed decisions that improve outcomes for students.

- **Prioritize Research that Addresses Pressing State and Local Needs:** Federal investments must support research that addresses the questions educators, school leaders, and policymakers are asking. Research should be conducted *with* the field, not just *on* it. In addition to including States and district voices in the strategic priority-setting process mentioned above, IES should:
 - **Reconstitute the National Board of Education Sciences (NBES):** The make-up of NBES should be changed to better reflect and respond to State and local needs. While statute requires a mix of researchers and individuals knowledgeable about education needs, in practice, NBES has often been dominated by researchers. The administration could appoint stakeholders such as State Chiefs, Teachers of the Year, District leaders representing urban, rural, and suburban schools, and family engagement leaders who understand the information needs of families.
 - **Convene NBES Working Groups:** IES could instruct NBES to convene recurring panels or working groups, such as a State Chief Advisory Group or Parent Advisory Network, whose input would flow directly into IES's priority setting and dissemination strategy. These groups would not replace NBES but would formalize stakeholder input in a way that currently happens only informally or through ad hoc comment periods.
 - **Elevate NBES Visibility:** IES could consider elevating NBES as a public forum to spotlight State and local innovations, invite testimony from field leaders, and hold public sessions to surface real-time needs.

- **Ensure Research is Usable:** Research must yield meaningful and actionable insights and findings must be translated into practical tools and guidance that can easily be understood and accessed by parents, teachers, principals, and State and district administrators. Consider including parents and families as an intended audience by strengthening collaborations with Federally funded family engagement centers and parent networks that help interpret and communicate evidence to families and communities.
 - **Create Faster Research Tracks:** Create faster research tracks for high-need topics, using IES's Seedlings to Scale model as an example, to ensure research keeps pace with evolving field needs.
 - **Support Rapid Cycle Tools:** Rapid-cycle tools, such as NCES's School Pulse Survey, can conduct quick data collection and provide iterative insights to States and districts so they can make decisions in real time. Consider re-envisioning NCES's previous (but not currently in existence) Quick Response Information System ([QRIS](#)), which was used for time-sensitive, issue-orientated data quickly and with minimal response burden; The Fast Response Survey System ([FRSS](#)), which focused on collecting data at the elementary and secondary school levels and from public libraries; and the Postsecondary Education Quick Information System ([PEQIS](#)), which collected fast response data at the postsecondary level.
 - **Support Both Foundational and Applied Research:** IES should continue to invest in foundational research (neuroscience, the learning sciences, developmental science) and their implications for teaching and learning, as well as applied research on best practices in areas ranging from school organization and educator development to specific areas of teaching and learning such as literacy, mathematics, and science.
- **Address Internal IES Review Processes to Improve Timeliness and Knowledge Mobilization:** IES should consider developing an internal review matrix that differentiates timelines and expectations by product type, ensuring appropriate rigor balanced against timeliness and value added. For NCEE, NCER, and NCSE, IES could look to models used by research offices outside the Federal statistical system, such as the Administration for Children and Families (ACF).
- **Support Implementation and Communication:** Meeting the needs of parents, teachers and school leaders requires not just producing evidence but ensuring that it is communicated effectively and put into practice.
 - **Prioritize Addressing the Last Mile Challenge:** To ensure that research and evidence reach classrooms and inform real-world practice, IES should focus on how findings are communicated, disseminated, and integrated into IES-funded studies, tools, publications, and other outputs. IES should also establish a focused effort to ensure that IES and its major investments (RELs and R&D

Centers) have expert support for communications and training, enabling research teams to apply effective communication strategies and receive ongoing feedback for improvement. To be clear, this does not necessarily mean producing more resources or products, but rather being intentional about how findings are translated and delivered—for example, through integration into existing SEA, REA, and LEA professional learning systems and teacher preparation programs.

- **Modernize Outreach:** Once these resources are created, IES should invest in modern outreach efforts, using strategies like professional associations (like the National Rural Education Association), social media (including platforms not currently being used) and other modern technology, and coaching structures in school districts, to reach educators frequently. Establish an evidence-based approach for continuous improvement of these methods. This would require a formative feedback loop for IES internally and perhaps a centralized project that supports this process for IES' for major investments (R&D center and RELs, for example).
- **Spotlight Districts/State Success Stories:** IES should create a culture that prioritizes the use of research among education leaders by recognizing and elevating districts that successfully implement evidence-based strategies (e.g., a recognition program akin to Blue Ribbon Schools).
- **Hold Annual State Leader Convenings:** IES should facilitate annual convenings of State leaders to foster shared learning and support for local implementation.
- **Sharing What Works and What Doesn't:** It would also be useful for IES to take a more proactive role in advising about what doesn't work, especially when certain practices or programs are widespread and reviews of evidence have already been conducted.
- **Balance User Needs:** IES must balance its responsiveness to various stakeholders (State and local leaders, educators, parents, researchers, and State Education Agencies) as well as Federally funded research that has broad scientific generalizability, ensuring that findings can inform policy and practice across diverse contexts.

3. Improve the Timeliness, Accuracy, and Accessibility of IES Statistics and Research Products.

IES plays a vital role in producing high-quality, trusted education resources and data that inform decision making across the country. As States and districts increasingly rely on timely, actionable information to guide policy and practice, there is a significant opportunity to build on IES's strengths by modernizing data collection, reporting, and dissemination. By streamlining reporting processes, enhancing accessibility and visualization tools, and adopting more flexible

dissemination strategies, IES can ensure its data remain both rigorous and relevant, supporting educators, policymakers, and families with the information they need, when they need it.

- **Modernize Data Collection and Reporting:** IES plays a unique role in producing high-quality, comparable national data. Modernizing IES data collections to deliver more timely insights is critical for meeting State and local needs. In addition to prioritizing rapid cycle data collection, KA recommends that IES:
 - **Reduce Reporting Burden:** IES should fix bottlenecks and reduce reporting burden of IES surveys, building on modernizations like the creation of Edas in 2024 which streamlined State reporting and made data available to the public faster. IES could support burden reduction by working more closely with data-producing offices in ED. IES could offer expertise in the design of data collections through the use of statutory review (prior to the Paperwork Reduction Act process), the use of standards (Common Education Data Standards), training and information about how to improve the efficiency of State data systems and data governance, and the use of business rules to improve data quality at submission.
 - **Make Data Collections and Research More Relevant:** Make it possible to see results by State in NCES sample surveys by reimagining existing sampling methodologies. For example, offer States the option to opt into State-representative samples or rotate State-focused cycles across years, similar to NAEP TUDA. This would give States access to timely, comparable data that can be used to track trends within their own State and make meaningful cross-State comparisons. Additionally, provide incentives for State, district, or school participation.
- **Enhance Accessibility and Usability:** Improved data visualization tools and user-friendly reporting platforms would make NCES data more accessible to State and local leaders, researchers, and the public. IES should prioritize formats and dissemination strategies that support timely decision making at the State and local levels.
 - **Leverage Social Media and Influencers:** IES should leverage new ways of getting information to teachers, such as teacher networks, influencers, or practitioner-facing marketplaces like Teachers Pay Teachers.
 - **Balance Rigor and Relevance:** While accuracy remains foundational, IES should balance methodological rigor with timeliness and relevance. IES could explore strategies such as establishing different review pathways based on project complexity, setting clearer timeline expectations, or providing more real-time feedback loops to accelerate project approval without compromising quality.
 - **Digitally Tag IES Products:** IES should digitally tag its products so Federal and State policymakers can more easily track where and how Federal research and statistics are being accessed, referenced, and used. These insights could help

IES and its partners understand who is using which products, target future investments toward the most used dissemination channels, and identify which data are most valuable in practice, informing decisions about where surveys or data collections could be streamlined or refined. Tying together research studies and data assets provides transparency, validates findings, and drives evidence-based decision making. IES could provide links to the data assets available on the Open Data Platform to researchers to help drive evidence-based studies.

- **Adopt Interim Dissemination Strategies:** Allow for the release of preliminary or formative findings at key milestones during the course of a study, rather than waiting until the study's conclusion. Providing timely updates throughout a study would enable policymakers, teachers, and researchers to benefit from emerging insights, inform ongoing decision making, and accelerate the translation of evidence into practice while maintaining appropriate safeguards for data quality and rigor.

4. Maximize the Utility of Federal and Other Education Program Evaluations.

Federal evaluations generate critical evidence that informs decision making across States and communities. By leveraging national evaluations to focus on cross-State priorities and sharing findings in ways that are timely and accessible, IES can help policymakers and practitioners make smarter investments and scale approaches that work.

- **Leverage National Evaluations to Inform Practice:** The Federal government is uniquely positioned to conduct national evaluations of promising approaches and serve as the trusted voice for scaling solutions that are proven to work.
 - **Expand Evaluations:** Expand evaluations to address system-level questions, moving from isolated interventions to study how programs scale in varying contexts. Expand evaluation approaches to include developmental, implementation, and policy-focused studies, meeting the needs of varied timelines and audiences.
 - **Implementation:** Require evaluations to include practical guidance to support the use and application of findings. Support materials should help stakeholders improve programs effectively at every level—teachers, school leaders, and districts—with tailored guidance for each role. Incorporate stakeholder debriefs for program leaders throughout the evaluation life cycle. This ensures that findings are discussed, understood, and used for adjustments, particularly during formative stages.
 - **Focus Evaluations on Cross-State Priorities:** National evaluations should focus on addressing cross-State priorities and producing findings that are actionable for practitioners and policymakers.
 - **Prioritize Timely Distribution of Evaluation Findings:** Evaluation findings should be disseminated in a timely, accessible manner to inform State program and budget decisions.

- **Strengthen Return-on-Investment Analysis and Timeliness:** Rigorous evaluation plays a critical role in determining whether programs are working and whether Federal investments are achieving intended results. IES should continue to invest in evaluations that help policymakers understand both program effectiveness and cost-effectiveness.

5. Strengthen Partnerships with Other Federal Agencies or Between State Agencies to Align Data and Reduce Redundancy.

Stronger partnerships across Federal and State agencies can help create a more connected and efficient education data ecosystem. Building on existing infrastructure—such as the Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS)—and fostering collaboration between key partners like the RELs and Comprehensive Centers will streamline processes, enhance data quality, and ensure that information flows more seamlessly across levels of the system.

- **Coordinate with Comprehensive Centers:** IES should continue to facilitate and strengthen cooperation between RELs and Comprehensive Centers (CC) to ensure coordination of services for the SEAs and LEAs they serve.
- **Coordinate Across Agencies:** Coordinate across agencies (IES, NSF, NIH) to reduce duplication and data burden.
- **Longitudinal Studies:** Study the utilization of the existing IES-supported national longitudinal data collections to assess how they are being used by researchers and policymakers and where the gaps are. Examine areas for consolidation and expansion including data collection frequency, precision of sampling frames, and continuity over time.
- **Explore Inferential Research:** Explore the potential of inferential research and experiments being conducted through national data collections, in addition to descriptive analytics over time.
- **Prioritize SLDS:** Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) can lessen State reporting burden. SLDS uses Common Education Data Standards (CEDS) that make reporting for Federally mandated data collections easier and makes those collections more timely. IES should continue to provide States with resources and technical assistance to support SLDS in their States.
- **Make CEDS the Common “Data Language” Across All Four IES Centers and IES-Funded Work:** Recommend CEDS-aligned definitions for new and existing elements, use the CEDS governance process to add/modify elements, and publish authoritative crosswalks so one State submission can serve multiple collections (e.g., Defect’s, CCD, CRDC). This reduces one-off definitions, improves comparability, and lowers burden given CEDS’ role as the voluntary, cross-sector standard.

- **Use CEDS to Strengthen Cross-Agency Alignment (HHS, USDA, DOL) and Reduce Redundant Reporting:** Co-develop crosswalks and extend CEDS via the open community process for shared outcome metrics (e.g., WIOA employment/earnings time horizons) and build on prior multi-office alignment efforts (e.g., “single use” APR) to create durable, reusable definitions.
- **Improve Timeliness and Accuracy By Moving Validation “Upstream” with CEDS-Based Rules and Shared Assets:** Embed CEDS-driven business rules, prefill, and API-based submissions in Federal collections; reuse SLDS grantees’ Scalable Data Use (ScDU) workgroup outputs (templates, validations, code) so States aren’t solving the same problems repeatedly; and reestablish community office hours anchored in CEDS to speed troubleshooting.

6. Improve Mechanisms for Disseminating and Scaling Evidence-Based Practices, Including the Work of the RELs, WWC, and R&D Centers.

IES has built a strong foundation for producing high-quality evidence through the RELs, the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC), and its network of R&D Centers. There is now a significant opportunity to build on this foundation by strengthening dissemination pathways and scaling strategies so that evidence can more consistently inform decision making in classrooms, districts, and States. By clarifying roles, modernizing tools, and expanding partnerships, IES can help ensure that research findings are communicated clearly, reach the right audiences, and are used to address shared educational priorities across the country.

- **Leverage Regional Education Laboratories:** RELs should continue to focus on supporting State and local data and evidence needs aimed at addressing the most pressing challenges schools and States face. RELs should:
 - **Provide a REL Menu:** The REL Program should provide user-friendly “menus” or brochures that clearly explain the RELs’ services and examples of their work, tailored for State chiefs and agency leaders.
 - **Foster a “Yes REL” Culture:** Current IES staff reviews often involve multiple, sequential rounds of review for technical assistance projects and meeting agendas which leads to significant delays. IES should consider faster or alternative IES staff review processes to be more responsive to State and district needs.
- **Build Mechanisms for Scaling and Replicability:** Build on and expand IES’s mechanisms to maximize the impact of evidence-based policies and practices by prioritizing strategies that make interventions easier to adopt, adapt, sustain, and scale. Embed scaling and replicability considerations in R&D to move evidence into practice.

- **Clarify the Purpose of, and Modernize, the WWC:** The What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) remains an essential part of IES's role, establishing standards for research rigor, providing essential evidence use infrastructure, and maintaining an independent, trusted evidence base. As an infrastructure hub that assesses and curates the education research evidence base, the WWC's primary audiences include decision makers including those within ED and IES, the RELs, and local education agencies. The WWC's role is to leverage its database of high-quality evidence to identify and disseminate evidence-based practices and interventions. For example, the RELs are best positioned, given their close relationships with local education agencies, to use the understanding of evidence provided by the WWC to develop toolkits that support agencies, schools, and educators to implement evidence-based policies and practices. The WWC facilitates intentional handoffs to entities with deep connections to practice for translation and implementation. Modernizing WWC should involve clarifying its role in building stronger, systematic dissemination pathways to and through RELs and other intermediaries.
- **Evaluate Extensions of the WWC Practice Guides:** The WWC's *practice guides* have long served as a valuable way to translate research into practical, actionable recommendations. Emerging efforts to create *toolkits* based on these guides represent a promising approach but should be carefully evaluated to determine whether they effectively extend and enhance the use of practice guide content.
- **Clarify Communication Pathways and Improve Accessibility:** The WWC should set aside resources to review requests from the public. WWC should establish a point person to provide online submission checklists and vendor training modules for those submitting research for review. IES should improve the WWC user interface so that it more directly answers questions that are top-of-mind for local decision makers.
- **Increase Review Capacity Through Partnerships:** The demand for evidence reviews far exceeds the WWC's current capacity. IES could address the need for increased capacity by creating partnerships with philanthropic organizations, nonprofits, and academic centers to use the same evidence standards, allowing these partners to then help supplement Federal review capacity.
- **Improve Timeliness and Transparency:** The WWC should publish clear timelines for reviews and allow vendors to track the status of their submissions. IES might also explore interim "pre-review badges" for interventions that meet initial methodological thresholds, potentially using AI screening to assist with the labor-intensive activities in conducting evidence reviews. These steps would improve the speed and predictability of the review process without compromising rigor.

- **Modernize ERIC and Other Knowledge Platforms:** Leverage AI to make IES research more user-friendly and accessible for various audiences (e.g. educators, school and district leaders, parents/families, industry leaders, and local and State leaders).
- **Continue to Leverage ERIC as a Dissemination Tool:** Given ERIC's extensive coverage of educational topics and its wide array of resources, IES may wish to explore further opportunities to utilize ERIC as both a repository and a dissemination platform. ERIC offers State and local leaders, educators, parents, researchers, and students access to Federally funded research and an expansive collection of education-related materials (exceeding 2.1 million records) and could be modified to provide stakeholders with enhanced data and connections.
- **Prioritize Educator Preparation Programs:** Place more attention on grounding educator preparation programs in evidence: they are a perfect target for practical products based on research. Consider webinars and IES conference attendance to engage educator preparation programs on how they can adapt evidence-based practices.

7. Modernize IES Peer Review, Grantmaking, and Contracting Processes to Encourage Innovation while Maintaining Rigor.

IES's grantmaking and contracting processes have long set a high bar for rigor and quality. Building on this strength, there is an opportunity to make these processes more agile and responsive to the needs of States, districts, and researchers. By updating timelines, aligning funding priorities with the field, and engaging practitioners more systematically, IES can maintain its high standards while fostering innovation and ensuring that Federal research investments are timely, relevant, and impactful.

- **Improve the Timeliness of Research Grant Competitions:** IES should reintroduce the system of two application cycles per year and create faster research review tracks for high-need or time-sensitive topics.
- **Orient Requests for Information with Needs of the Field:** Requests for Applications (RFAs) should be revised to explicitly require applicants to situate their work within identified State and local priorities or Federal learning agendas. Review panels should be oriented not only to assess individual proposals but also to consider the coherence of all of the funded proposals with national needs.
 - **Replace Letters of Support with a Two-Step Process:** Replace the letter of support requirement included in many RFAs with a two-step partnership engagement process: (1) at the proposal stage, applications should provide a rationale and preliminary plan for collaboration with SEAs/LEAs; and (2) at the award stage, grantees should submit a comprehensive engagement plan and

updated letters of support before funds are released ensuring that the research is meeting the needs of the education community.

- **Engage Practitioners and Policymakers in the Review Process:** IES should engage a standing working group of teachers, school leaders, and policymakers alongside researchers to develop realistic mechanisms for incorporating their perspectives systematically across multiple review panels.
- **Differentiate Review Tracks for Contract Deliverables:** IES should explore differentiated review tracks for contract deliverables, allowing low-risk, high-priority work (such as simple descriptive analyses or tools) to move forward quickly while reserving the most intensive review for complex or causal studies.
- **Better Leverage BPAs and IDIQ Contracting Mechanisms to Increase Efficiency and Cost Competitiveness:** IES could make better use of Blanket Purchase Agreements (BPAs) and Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contracts that pre-qualify vendors and expedite procurement. These mechanisms are designed to enable the agency to draw from a vetted pool of contractors, reducing the time needed for multiple rounds of past performance reviews and narrative write-ups and ensuring alignment with high-quality standards and scope at the task order level. Historically, IES has required bidders to repeat much of the information in task order proposals that is required in the pre-qualification proposal stage while also making the task order response window too short. This has reduced competition and created redundancy. Task order Requests for Proposal (RFP) should require little to none of the same information required in the pre-qualification stage, and response times should be at least 30 business days. For IES, BPA's and IDIQ's can increase cost competitiveness, since IDIQ vehicles often establish project-specific rate structures that are lower or more tailored than standard GSA rates.
- **Create Contract and Grant Flexibility Within IES:** To maximize the utility and timeliness of education research and evaluations, IES should explore mechanisms that provide greater flexibility in contracting and grantmaking. Other Transaction Authority (OTA), which has been used effectively in other Federal R&D agencies to accelerate innovation and enable cross-sector collaboration, could serve as a model. Providing IES with similar flexibility would allow it to respond more rapidly to emerging needs, partner with nontraditional actors, and scale effective practices more efficiently.
- **Modernize and Maintain an Accurate ED Grants and Contracts Forecast:** Publish and regularly update a comprehensive forecast of all planned grant and contract competitions, including projected opening, closing, and award dates. A reliable forecast would strengthen application quality, improve equity of access—particularly for smaller and under-resourced organizations—and demonstrate respect for the educators and



staff who plan their lives around these opportunities. Transparency and predictability in the forecast process would help ensure that the best ideas rise to the top and that Federal funds are used most effectively.

Conclusion

KA appreciates the Administration's leadership in soliciting feedback on the future of IES. We believe these recommendations, rooted in the experience of organizations working daily with States, districts, and educators, will help IES strengthen its role as the backbone of the nation's education research and development infrastructure. We look forward to continued partnership to bring this vision to life.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Rachel Dinkes". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Rachel Dinkes
President & CEO
Knowledge Alliance