



THE EDTECH COLLECTIVE

December 16, 2025

Dear Mr. Olshock,

Instructure developed a four-level Research Certification based on multiple regulatory frameworks, including those from the Australian Education Research Organization (2021); Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (2020); Clearinghouse for Labor and Evaluation Research (2022); Every Student Succeeds Act (2015); Institute of Education Sciences, What Works Clearinghouse (2022); and the U.S. Department of Education (2023). This initiative addresses the need for transparency and simplicity regarding research rigor and study significance in education markets.

The What Works Clearinghouse (WWC), version 5.0, standards offer the most comprehensive approach to validating the quality of impact studies, drawing upon the expertise of numerous research institutions and organizations. Researchers can be independently certified in these standards by completing an exam. Our team includes [multiple WWC-certified reviewers](#) in the Group Design standards, and we adhere to these standards when validating studies for the highest levels of impact (i.e., causal) evidence: Strong Impact (★★★★) and Moderate Impact (★★★). Subsequent levels, Early Evidence (★★) and Foundational Evidence (★), are based on multiple previously referenced frameworks, representing correlational evidence from user research studies and a strong literature review foundation.

This letter and accompanying documents validate that Peerceptiv **meets “Foundational Evidence” (★) Research Certification requirements**. Specifically, the report includes a well-defined, research-based logic model, and another study is planned or underway.

To determine Peerceptiv’s evidence rating, researchers used a Research Certification Rubric that evaluates five factors derived from the previously mentioned frameworks: sample, methodology, baseline equivalence, implementation and findings, and theoretical rationale. Two trained reviewers independently applied the rubric to the report—with at least one certified reviewer in WWC standards—and there was excellent agreement between raters (Cohen’s Kappa = 1.00).

The Research Certification on Peerceptiv is not static and can change as new evidence becomes available. Buyers should also consider study population and context in their purchasing decisions.

Sincerely,

Mary Styers, Ph.D.
Director of Research





THE EDTECH COLLECTIVE

Summary of Research Certification Results for Peerceptiv

The following document summarizes Instructure researchers' review of Peerceptiv and provides additional information about the review team.

Review Procedure

Instructure's research team worked with the Peerceptiv team to develop and review a logic model and literature review for Peerceptiv.

To determine the intervention's evidence rating, researchers used a Research Certification Rubric with five factors derived from multiple regulatory frameworks, including those from the Australian Education Research Organization (2021); Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (2020); Clearinghouse for Labor and Evaluation Research (2022); Every Student Succeeds Act (2015); Institute of Education Sciences, What Works Clearinghouse (2022); and the U.S. Department of Education (2023). : sample, methodology, baseline equivalence, implementation and findings, and theoretical rationale. Two trained reviewers independently applied the rubric to the logic model and there was excellent agreement between raters (Cohen's Kappa = 1.00).

Study Research Certification

Researchers determined the following level of evidence for Peerceptiv Foundational Evidence Study report: **Foundational Evidence** ★

This report met 2 of 2 indicators related to *Foundational Evidence* (★). All reviewers agreed that the report included a well-defined, research-based logic model, and another study is planned or underway.

About the Review Team

Instructure researchers have extensive experience in education research and preK–16 program evaluation. Our interdisciplinary team includes innovative researchers with diverse and advanced educational attainment (i.e., master's degrees and doctorates) in Developmental Psychology, Educational Psychology, Psychometrics and Measurement, Educational Technology, Educational Research and Evaluation, Educational Research Methods, Mathematics Education, Teacher Education, and Learning Sciences.



We are certified in the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) 5.0 Group Design Standards and have extensive experience designing curriculum studies to meet WWC, Department of Labor, and international evidence standards. As examples, we have collectively conducted more than 290 preK–12 and postsecondary curriculum research studies and evaluations for providers and more than 3,000 rapid-cycle evaluations (RCEs) for districts, including randomized control trials (RCTs), quasi-experimental designs (QEDs), and non-experimental studies (e.g., correlational design, pilot studies) across an array of content areas (e.g., science, math, literacy, early childhood, and career and technical education).

We have experience working directly with a range of small and large edtech providers, school districts and institutions on educational research and evaluations. Our team is able to meet and exceed our clients' expectations due to our expertise in conducting quantitative and qualitative analyses (e.g., multilevel modeling, structural equation modeling, binary logistic regression, analytic induction) and in creating user-friendly reports and infographics for non-technical audiences.

RESEARCH CERTIFICATION RUBRIC

Instructure.

Document/Product Name:

Date Reviewed:

Instructions: Read each statement below. Check the box(es) if the statement is satisfied by the document being reviewed. Boxes for each evidence rating (columns) will automatically check if the statement applies to multiple levels. After all statements have been reviewed, the appropriate level of evidence is determined by examining which Research certification has all checkboxes in its column checked. The reviewer will record the appropriate level of evidence in the final row, "Research Certification Rating."		CERTIFICATION RUBRIC FACTORS			
		★ Foundational Evidence	★★ Early Evidence	★★★ Moderate Impact	★★★★ Strong Impact
SAMPLE	The study contains at least 350 participants in the analysis.				
	There are at least two sites in the analysis.				
	The study specifies the setting, population, and/or subgroups of interest being served.				
	The study has acceptable levels of participant attrition.				
METHODOLOGY	The study included a control or comparison group.				
	The study randomly assigned participants to treatment and comparison groups.				
	The outcome measure is standardized OR demonstrates face validity, reliability, and avoids overalignment with the intervention.				
	The authors use an analytic approach that is appropriate for the data.				
	The variables of interest are clearly defined.				
	The study includes statistical controls for prior learning or similar metrics.				
	The study uses a pre-post, correlational, and/or qualitative design and makes impact claims.				
BASELINE EQUIVALENCE	The study meets baseline equivalence on prior learning or similar metrics.				
IMPLEMENTATION & FINDINGS	The authors clearly document implementation (e.g., average dosage received).				
	For quantitative studies, there are statistically significant, positive effects of the intervention on outcomes (p < .05).				
	For qualitative studies, there are participant-reported, positive impacts of the intervention on outcomes.				
THEORETICAL RATIONALE	The authors provide a well-defined, research-based logic model, documenting how the intervention should improve relevant outcomes.				
	There is another evaluation study examining the intervention currently planned or underway.				
RESEARCH CERTIFICATION RATING					

Notes: Multiple studies or a meta-analysis can cumulatively meet the large sample or multi-site requirement, as long as each study meets the other requirements associated with the specific certification rating. The evidence is not overridden with statistically significant and negative (i.e., unfavorable) findings. Studies that do not meet Strong or Moderate Impact requirements but include statistical controls can meet Early evidence requirements. Regression Discontinuity Designs can meet Strong or Moderate Impact requirements and are evaluated using a separate Research rubric. The Research certification is specific to the study context, including year, participant demographics, and setting. Research certifications are not static and can change as new evidence becomes available.