

Parents Need More: clearer questions and parent-chosen next steps

Historical review of parent concern-to-question preparation. The current editorial-first publication model was not evaluated.

Research by Education Angel Group. Last substantive review: September 19, 2026.

Education Angel Group is developing Parents Need More and has an interest in the proposed product. This review does not establish its effectiveness.

Historical research scope. This September 19, 2026 report examines the earlier Parents Need More guidance proposition. The current entities are editorial-first publications: Education Needs More is the editorial umbrella within Education Angel Group, and the individual Need More publications sit beneath it. This report does not evaluate the newer editorial model. The findings, proposed mechanisms and prior tagline below belong to the earlier research scope, not a claim about current product effectiveness or availability.

Prepared by Education Angel Group (EAG), with AI-assisted research and drafting. Research date: September 19, 2026. EAG is developing Parents Need More and has an interest in its success. This report examines the proposed service and relevant evidence; it is not an independent evaluation, professional advice or a record of family outcomes.

1. Proposition, audience and what remains proposed

In the earlier proposal, Parents Need More was intended to help a parent or guardian move from an unclear school-life concern to a focused question, useful context and a practical next step they choose. The immediate purpose is preparation: understanding what to ask, what is uncertain, and which person or process owns the decision. It is not a substitute for a teacher, school administrator, qualified professional or the parent's own judgment.

The audience includes a parent preparing for a conversation, a guardian seeking context before deciding whether to ask for help, and a caregiver who wants to understand available options without creating an account or sharing a private story. These jobs can involve ordinary uncertainty rather than a crisis. A parent may want to understand an unfamiliar school message, prioritize questions before a meeting, or distinguish a question about classroom work from one about a school-wide process.

EAG's canonical definition excludes diagnosis, legal or medical conclusions, automated complaints and automatic school contact. Reading and offline preparation need no account. A shared Runstr identity, where a later approved service needs one, would not by itself establish a guardian relationship or access to student records. Parents Need More also remains dependent on the accepted Teachers Need More proof contract for activation. These are scope decisions, not evidence that a service is implemented or effective. EAG definition, A0

Overview. Research makes clear information and usable next steps plausible ingredients of support. It does not establish that this particular concern-to-question service improves learning, resolves family concerns or reduces inequality. Existing official guides and nonprofit preparation resources already address parts of the job. Parents Need More would need to help a parent prepare more usefully, with reasonable effort and less unnecessary disclosure, than those alternatives. An informed choice to pause or use a different route can be a successful result.

2. Questions and the outcomes that must stay separate

This report asks five questions:

1. What can a preparation service reasonably change before a school conversation takes place?
2. What do communication and navigation studies establish, and where does transfer to this service fail?
3. What preparation resources already exist?
4. How can language, access, privacy and parent agency shape the proposed mechanism?
5. What evidence would justify expanding, changing or stopping the service?

A prepared question, a completed conversation, a changed school decision, attendance and academic achievement are different outcomes. Improvement at one stage does not prove improvement at the next. Even a clearer conversation cannot guarantee that a requested service is available, that a school agrees with a parent or that an external barrier disappears.

The distinction matters when describing parent agency. A parent can understand the options and still decline a meeting, choose another source or decide that more information is needed. If success means only taking the action preferred by the product, the service could mistake compliance for informed choice. EAG's proposed definition of success therefore includes the ability to revise, refuse and leave without penalty.

The unit of evidence also matters. A school-delivered text intervention tests a particular communication arrangement, often using records and school staff. A student-facing admissions intervention tests choices within a particular system. Neither directly tests private parent preparation on an independent editorial site. This report uses these studies to identify plausible mechanisms and cautions, while leaving the product's own effects unclaimed.

3. Need and context: concern, information and the ability to act

The need is not simply more parenting content. A parent can have abundant information and still face a practical uncertainty: which issue matters now, what question would clarify it, and who can answer. EAG's proposition is strongest when it helps organize that transition. It is weaker if it merely generates a longer explanation or another list of resources.

Consider a hypothetical parent who sees incomplete assignments but does not know whether the difficulty concerns instructions, workload, access to materials or something else. A useful preparation tool could help distinguish observations from explanations and select a question for the teacher. It should not label the child, infer a diagnosis, assign blame or require a detailed history. The scenario illustrates a possible job, not an interview finding or a demonstrated use case.

The service should avoid treating parents as a uniform group whose main problem is insufficient motivation. Time, language, confidence in a school interaction, ability to reach the appropriate person and practical constraints can differ. This report has not measured their prevalence among potential users. The design question is whether the proposed path remains usable when a parent cannot devote much time, does not want to type personal details or needs a different language or format.

Language access is a concrete source-backed concern. The federal January 2015 parent fact sheet says schools should communicate with limited-English-proficient parents in a language they understand and use appropriate, competent interpretation or translation. It says a child's English proficiency does not establish the parent's proficiency, and schools should not rely on children, friends or untrained staff to interpret. The current OCR overview, last reviewed September 23, 2025, still links the fact sheet and describes meaningful parent communication. This is official guidance context, not an individualized legal determination. Education and Justice departments, S3, OCR, S3b

EAG's proposed response is to make the need for language support part of preparation, rather than assume an English-language page settles it. A parent might need help identifying how to ask the school for support in the conversation itself. A translated interface alone would not prove accurate understanding of a local policy or competent interpretation of a meeting. Those are separate capabilities and responsibilities.

A second constraint is opportunity. Information can clarify a route without making that route feasible. An accurate explanation of a meeting process does not create time off work, transportation or school staff availability. This report therefore treats practical feasibility as something to investigate with users, not a benefit implied by publishing a guide.

4. Existing alternatives and the case for a narrower contribution

Parents already have sources that prepare questions without a new account, narrative submission or automated adviser. The relevant baseline is what a parent could use today, including direct contact with their school's verified process.

The Department of Education's 2024 *Let's Talk Back to School* guide offers questions about communication, language support, learning and school support roles. Its *Let's Talk Everyday Attendance* guide includes questions about attendance policy, contacts, transport and other practical barriers. They are short, public preparation materials, not trials of guide effectiveness. Historical attendance statistics in the latter are not used here as current prevalence. Department of Education, S4, S4b

Understood's parent-teacher conference worksheet, copyright 2017, offers a printable structure for observations, questions and discussion. The original three-page artifact demonstrates an existing preparation format. Its name and plan fields are not permission for Parents Need More to collect those details, and this review establishes neither effectiveness nor accessibility conformance. Understood, S5

The Right Question Institute describes a school-family approach to generating questions and participating in decisions, with facilitator resources and demonstrations. Some resources require registration. This is a direct conceptual alternative, but its first-party descriptions are not independent causal evidence. Videos were listed, not watched, and restricted downloads were not reviewed. Right Question Institute, S6

Figure 1

Preparation resources already exist

Official question guides | S4/S4b

Prepare communication and attendance questions

Public, short guides; local answers still come from the school. No guide-effect trial established.

Understood worksheet | S5

Organize observations and meeting questions

Printable resource, copyright 2017. Effectiveness, conformance and reproduction rights not established here.

Right Question Institute | S6

Generate questions and participate in decisions

Provider-described strategy and facilitator resources. Some registration required; no independent effect verified.

Source-described alternatives compared by EAG. The proposed service must demonstrate added value, not just another question list.

Preparation resources already exist

Source-described alternatives compared by EAG. The proposed service must demonstrate added value, not just another question list.

- S4

- S4b
- S5
- S6

These equivalents accompany the reader figures. Source IDs refer to the report references. A0 identifies EAG's product definition reviewed for the original report, not an external study or proof of availability. Other source IDs resolve to this report's reference and access record.

Figure 1. Preparation resources already exist

Source-described alternatives compared by EAG. The proposed service must demonstrate added value, not just another question list.

Official question guides | S4/S4b: Prepare communication and attendance questions. Public, short guides; local answers still come from the school. No guide-effect trial established.

Understood worksheet | S5: Organize observations and meeting questions. Printable resource, copyright 2017. Effectiveness, conformance and reproduction rights not established here.

Right Question Institute | S6: Generate questions and participate in decisions. Provider-described strategy and facilitator resources. Some registration required; no independent effect verified.

Sources: S4, S4b, S5, S6.

Figure 1. Comparison of source-described resources, not an effectiveness ranking. Rights to adapt or reproduce materials have not been granted by this review. Text and data alternative

These alternatives set a demanding but practical test. Parents Need More should not earn its place merely by putting question prompts on a website. Its potential contribution is helping someone identify which kind of preparation they need and reach an appropriate source with a manageable question. A parent who already has a meeting date and a suitable worksheet may not need it at all.

The product should preserve this possibility in its structure. Direct links should be visible when they answer the job. An existing school channel should remain an acceptable destination. A parent should not have to disclose a concern, subscribe or complete a sequence just to discover a public guide. EAG's interest in related services should not turn an ordinary question into a compulsory portfolio handoff.

5. Evidence and counterevidence: information can help, but outcomes differ

Figure 2

Information studies measure different outcomes

Attendance trial | 2017-18 | S1

Chronic absence reduced 2.4-3.6 percentage points

Four adaptive strategies; expected no-study-messaging rate 20.5%. Range across strategies, not confidence bounds.

Same attendance trial | S1

No detected reading or mathematics gains

Grades 3-5 after one year. Does not prove an exact zero effect or evaluate this preparation service.

School-choice experiment | 2015-16 | S2

Matched-school attribute, not student attainment

Graduation-rate effect: basic list +1.664 pp (SE 0.571); pooled +0.742 pp (SE 0.488), nonsignificant. Some groups benefited more.

Different mechanisms, populations and outcomes. Neither study evaluates Parents Need More; no pooled effect or product forecast.

Information studies measure different outcomes

Different mechanisms, populations and outcomes. Neither study evaluates Parents Need More; no pooled effect or product forecast.

- S1
- S2

Figure 2. Information studies measure different outcomes

Different mechanisms, populations and outcomes. Neither study evaluates Parents Need More; no pooled effect or product forecast.

Attendance trial | 2017-18 | S1: Chronic absence reduced 2.4-3.6 percentage points. Four adaptive strategies; expected no-study-messaging rate 20.5%. Range across strategies, not confidence bounds.

Same attendance trial | S1: No detected reading or mathematics gains. Grades 3-5 after one year. Does not prove an exact zero effect or evaluate this preparation service.

School-choice experiment | 2015-16 | S2: Matched-school attribute, not student attainment. Graduation-rate effect: basic list +1.664 pp (SE 0.571); pooled +0.742 pp (SE 0.488), nonsignificant. Some groups benefited more.

Sources: S1, S2.

Figure 2. Observed findings from two different interventions. The attendance range spans four strategies and is not a confidence interval. The choice estimates describe matched schools, not student attainment. No combined effect or Parents Need More forecast is calculated. Text and data alternative

Heppen, Kurki and Brown's September 2020 evaluation tested adaptive attendance texts during 2017-18 in 108 elementary schools across four large urban districts. It enrolled 26,843 K-5 students and analyzed 23,133. All four adaptive versions reduced chronic absence by 2.4-3.6 percentage points relative to an expected 20.5% rate without study messaging. Reading and mathematics gains were not detected for grades 3-5 after one year. The smaller achievement sample could not rule out all modest effects. The intervention combined school-record notifications, reminders and, for selected families, additional support.

Heppen and colleagues, S1, printed pages 3-9 and endnote 23

This is stronger evidence for a particular attendance communication strategy than for generic advice. EAG should not collapse its results into "parent information improves achievement." Nor should the trial's framing choices be treated as permission to frighten or shame users. The proposed editorial service has a different relationship with the family and lacks the trial's school-owned data and operational arrangement.

Corcoran and colleagues' January 2022 working-paper revision examines a 2015-16 experiment in 165 New York City middle schools, largely serving high-poverty communities. Customized school information affected choices and matches. In Table 5, the basic-list treatment increased the graduation-rate attribute of the matched school by 1.664 percentage points, with standard error 0.571; the pooled estimate was 0.742, standard error 0.488, and was not statistically significant. This is an attribute of the school matched to, not the student's own graduation outcome. Some comparatively advantaged students benefited more; the intervention was not necessarily inequality-reducing.

Corcoran and colleagues, S2, methods, subgroup results and Table 5

The school-choice study cautions against assuming that simplifying information equalizes the ability to act on it. If some options remain harder for particular users to access, better information may leave those constraints intact. Its student-focused setting and admissions system also differ from a parent's ordinary school conversation. Graduation rates cannot serve as a complete measure of family fit, school quality or the value of a proposed next step.

Taken together, the evidence supports a question worth testing: can preparation improve a specific decision or interaction? It does not establish a general causal chain from readable content to agency, better school responsiveness and student success. Those later claims would need direct measures and a study capable of separating the service's contribution from other influences.

6. Proposed mechanism: concern to question, with the parent in control

Figure 3

The parent chooses the next step

Conceptual only. Every link is proposed.

Preparation hypothesis

1. Name a concern without a diagnosis
↓ proposed link
2. Read relevant context and its limits
↓ proposed link
3. Prioritize a question in the parent's words
↓ proposed link
4. Verify the school role and decide whether to ask

Unknown: usefulness, total effort and added value over existing guides.

A legitimate pause

1. Concern does not fit or route is unclear
↓ proposed link
2. Verify through an official source, revise or leave

No automatic contact, story transfer, professional conclusion or guardian authorization.

EAG conceptual mechanism. Preparation does not guarantee a conversation, school response or student outcome.

The parent chooses the next step

EAG conceptual mechanism. Preparation does not guarantee a conversation, school response or student outcome.

- A0. EAG product definition
-

Figure 3. The parent chooses the next step

EAG conceptual mechanism. Preparation does not guarantee a conversation, school response or student outcome.

Preparation hypothesis. Name a concern without a diagnosis → Read relevant context and its limits → Prioritize a question in the parent's words → Verify the school role and decide whether to ask. Unknown: usefulness, total effort and added value over existing guides.

A legitimate pause. Concern does not fit or route is unclear → Verify through an official source, revise or leave. No automatic contact, story transfer, professional conclusion or guardian authorization.

Sources: AO.

Figure 3. EAG conceptual mechanism, not an evaluated causal chain. No question list automatically sends a message, transfers a family story or establishes guardian authority. Text and data alternative

The proposed mechanism has four stages. First, a parent recognizes a school-life concern without being assigned a diagnostic label. Second, an explanation distinguishes what a public source can clarify from facts only the school or an appropriate professional can assess. Third, the parent chooses a short set of questions. Fourth, the parent verifies the relevant route and decides whether to ask, revise, seek other help or stop.

The product hypothesis is that this sequence reduces confusion enough to make preparation more useful without requiring a private family narrative. It is not a claim that all concerns can be resolved through a school conversation. The important intermediate result is the parent's ability to describe a question in their own words, understand its limits and choose a proportionate next step.

For example, a hypothetical parent preparing to discuss incomplete work might separate three questions: what instructions the student received, what the teacher has observed and what practical support is already available. The guide would help the parent prioritize what they want to understand, not supply a diagnosis or a predetermined demand. The parent may decide that the first question is enough for the initial conversation.

A route must be verified at the level needed for action. A national article can explain the difference between a teacher, school office or specialist role, but it cannot invent the correct contact or local process. If that information is missing, the output should help the parent verify it through an official school source. An unavailable destination should not cause automatic referral to EAG or imply that the school has refused help.

A completed question list is only preparation. The school may ask for clarification, identify a different process or provide information that changes the parent's understanding. A useful tool should allow revision without making the original output appear authoritative. This is one reason the proposed mechanism should preserve the parent's wording and avoid presenting a generated letter as expert judgment.

7. Design concepts for a bounded first test

A first candidate is a concern explainer paired with a short preparation guide. It would answer one defined job, use a dated source and clearly distinguish a general explanation from a local decision. It should give a parent something usable even if they do not continue to another page. This is a research concept, not an approved interface or implementation.

A second candidate is a question-prioritization tool. Rather than collecting a life story, it could demonstrate how to turn an observation into a question and invite the parent to choose what matters most. It should support an ordinary paper or offline preparation route. More output is not necessarily better: a parent may benefit from one well-chosen question more than a full page of suggested talking points.

A third candidate is a role-and-route explanation. It would show what a role can typically help clarify, identify where local verification is needed and offer a return path if the route is wrong or unavailable. It must distinguish examples from verified current school information. The first trial should not assume a searchable directory of every school or a mechanism for contacting staff.

The most informative first slice would join these ideas around one ordinary, non-sensitive concern, such as preparing to ask about classroom work. A direct comparison with an official question sheet would reveal whether the additional structure helps. Starting with many concern categories would make it difficult to distinguish a useful method from repetitive content.

Parent language should shape the questions. A tool that replaces a person's words with formal institutional language can make the output harder to use and can exaggerate its authority. Testing should examine whether parents can say the question naturally and recognize it as their own. It should also ask whether the proposed sequence feels helpful or like another required task before the school will listen.

No account, private note storage, translation provider, messaging flow or professional-help directory is selected by this report. Those choices would introduce separate behavior, evidence and privacy requirements. The preparation proposition can be examined before taking them on.

8. Equity, privacy and burdens the service could create

Information without access. The choice experiment shows why an average benefit cannot stand in for equal opportunity. For this product, a readable question may still be unusable if the parent cannot reach the school role or obtain an accessible conversation. Evaluation should ask where the proposed route fails, including failures outside the page itself.

Language and format. Offering a language menu does not prove comprehension. Parent review should assess whether wording preserves meaning, uncertainty and the distinction between a suggestion and a requirement. Some users may prefer a printed note, text, audio or another accessible form. The report does not assume one format fits everyone or that any untested implementation meets accessibility standards.

Disclosure pressure. A conversational interface can make personal detail feel expected. The service should be able to explain a public preparation method without requiring names, student records, diagnoses, disciplinary histories or private messages. An example worksheet's fields do not justify collecting those data on a new platform. The safest useful first test is one that can proceed with non-identifying scenarios.

Fear and blame. A worried parent may be vulnerable to alarming wording and confident explanations. The site should not use urgency to lengthen engagement or imply that a parent who declines to continue is failing their child. Nor should calm language dismiss a serious concern. Where a topic falls outside ordinary preparation, a current qualified or school route must govern; this report does not create an emergency or professional-advice workflow.

Misrepresented authority. School decisions, guardian access and professional judgments have different owners. A polished output should not imply legal expertise, school endorsement or permission to view a student's records. The parent should understand what remains a question even after using the guide.

Work shifted to families. A service can appear to help while asking parents to research more, document more and negotiate more. Total effort includes reading, checking sources, finding the route and using the output. A questionnaire that improves the provider's understanding while exhausting the parent may be a poor fit for this proposition. School responsiveness also matters; lack of a response should not automatically be attributed to poor parent preparation.

Portfolio incentives. EAG benefits if people find its services useful. The product should nevertheless allow a complete result with an official guide, a school route or no onward action. Referral counts and account creation would be weak indicators of the promised benefit and could reward unnecessary contact.

9. Evaluation, disconfirmation and decisions to change direction

Figure 4

Test preparation without rewarding pressure

Question and source understanding

Can the parent explain what they want to ask?

Check observation versus inference, source limits and natural wording.
Generated text volume is not success.

Route and agency

Does the parent know who decides and retain choice?

Correct verification or pause can count as success. Confidence with a wrong role is a warning.

Effort and access

Does it add value over an existing guide?

Compare total burden across languages and formats. Revise or stop if it duplicates work or pressures disclosure.

Proposed evaluation dimensions, not measured scores. Study approval, recruitment and privacy decisions remain separate.

Test preparation without rewarding pressure

Proposed evaluation dimensions, not measured scores. Study approval, recruitment and privacy decisions remain separate.

- A0. EAG product definition
-

Figure 4. Test preparation without rewarding pressure

Proposed evaluation dimensions, not measured scores. Study approval, recruitment and privacy decisions remain separate.

Question and source understanding: Can the parent explain what they want to ask? Check observation versus inference, source limits and natural wording. Generated text volume is not success.

Route and agency: Does the parent know who decides and retain choice? Correct verification or pause can count as success. Confidence with a wrong role is a warning.

Effort and access: Does it add value over an existing guide? Compare total burden across languages and formats. Revise or stop if it duplicates work or pressures disclosure.

Sources: AO.

Figure 4. Proposed evaluation dimensions and change decisions. No scores, thresholds or results have been observed. Text and data alternative

The first evaluation should compare usable preparation, not attempt to claim student outcomes from a short interaction. No product trial or parent interviews were conducted for this report. Future research would need separate approval, appropriate recruitment and privacy practices.

Begin with non-identifying scenarios and parents or guardians who use different languages, formats and school communication arrangements. Include people with limited time and those who do not want an account. Compare the proposed path with an appropriate existing guide rather than no information. Task order should be varied where practical, because completing one preparation exercise can make the next easier.

Before looking at results, specify what a useful output includes: a focused question, an accurate distinction between observation and inference, a plausible role whose local route still needs verification where applicable, and a next step the parent knowingly chooses. Reviewers should examine whether the parent can explain those elements, not merely whether the tool generated them.

Confidence should be assessed alongside accuracy. A parent who feels more confident but believes the wrong person controls the decision has not necessarily been helped. Include situations with insufficient information so that a correct pause or verification step can count as success. Avoid rewarding escalation or greater disclosure as signs of engagement.

Measure total preparation effort, ability to locate the original source, understanding of source limits and whether the parent recognizes the output as their own. Examine outcomes by relevant access and language circumstances, while acknowledging that small exploratory samples cannot establish population-wide equity. Ask what participants would otherwise have used and whether the product duplicated that work.

A later study could examine whether prepared questions are used and whether parents consider the conversation more useful. That would still differ from demonstrating school responsiveness, a changed institutional decision or academic improvement. Any collection involving a real family interaction would need a carefully bounded purpose and appropriate consent; it should not become a reason to collect complete family histories.

Continue if the proposed guide adds usable value with acceptable effort and preserves informed choice. Revise if people can complete it but cannot explain the question or owner, if language changes distort meaning, or if users feel pressured to disclose. Narrow or stop if an existing sheet performs equally well with less work, if correct routing depends on information the service cannot verify, or if the tool repeatedly creates false professional certainty. The ability to choose a simpler existing alternative is a meaningful test of the proposition.

10. Methods, limitations, references and corrections

This report is a focused review completed September 19, 2026. It is not a systematic review, an exhaustive inventory of parent resources or individualized legal, medical or educational advice. The EAG product definition determined scope. External sources were selected for a specific mechanism, counterevidence or an existing preparation alternative.

The author reopened the original attendance report, author-hosted school-choice paper, official language-access materials, two official question guides, the original Understood worksheet and the Right Question Institute page. The empirical sources were read with attention to design, sample, measured period and outcome. Both studies are historical and concern interventions different from Parents Need More. The school-choice source is the January 10, 2022 revision of the 165-school experiment, not a separate 473-school study surfaced during discovery.

Numerical findings are reproduced as published. The attendance range is a range across intervention versions, not uncertainty bounds. School-choice standard errors are retained with the two selected estimates, and nonsignificance is not treated as proof of an exact zero effect. No effects were pooled or converted into a forecast for this product. Conceptual figures identify proposed links and evaluation questions rather than outcomes.

No Arkansas-specific parent research, local school-process verification, product evaluation, caregiver-burden estimate or observation of school responsiveness was obtained. First-party resource descriptions establish availability and described form, not efficacy, accessibility certification or permission to reproduce. Videos and restricted provider downloads were not reviewed. No comprehensive correction or retraction registry search was conducted, and no visible notice in the retained sources is not proof that none exists.

Corrections should identify the statement, source version and locator affected. Changes to dates, sample definitions, effects or outcome labels must be carried into the associated figure and data alternative. A broken or stale route should be marked as such rather than replaced with an invented contact. The report's provisional conclusion is that a small comparative preparation test is more informative than expanding content or promising family outcomes before the core job is demonstrated.

Retained references

Source and reference
A0. Education Angel Group, Parents Need More product definition, reviewed September 19, 2026 for this report. Defines intended scope, not implementation or effectiveness.
S1. Heppen, J. B., Kurki, A., and Brown, S. <i>Can Texting Parents Improve Attendance in Elementary School? A Test of an Adaptive Messaging Strategy</i> , September 2020, NCEE 2020-006. Full evaluation.
S2. Corcoran, S., Jennings, J., Cohodes, S., and Sattin-Bajaj, C. <i>Leveling the Playing Field for High School Choice</i> , January 10, 2022 working-paper revision; 2015-16 experiment. Author-hosted full paper.
S3. U.S. Departments of Education and Justice. <i>Information for Limited English Proficient Parents and Guardians</i> , January 2015. Fact sheet. S3b. OCR. <i>Equal Education Opportunities for English Learners</i> , last reviewed September 23, 2025. Current overview.
S4/S4b. Department of Education. <i>Let's Talk Back to School</i> and <i>Let's Talk Everyday Attendance</i> , 2024 editions. Back-to-school questions; attendance questions.
S5. Understood. <i>Parent-teacher conference worksheet</i> , copyright 2017. Original worksheet.
S6. Right Question Institute. <i>Schools + Families</i> , undated page retrieved September 19, 2026. Provider resources.

Figure text and data alternatives

Complete semantic alternatives accompany each figure in this reader and its text download. Source IDs refer to the references in this report. A0 identifies EAG's product definition reviewed for the original report, not an external study or proof of availability. Other source IDs resolve to this report's reference and access record.

Corrections and entity context

Readers identifying an error can contact EAG with the section, disputed statement and supporting source. Parents Need More provides the public entity context, not an external citation for EAG's product claims.