Understanding school information, family perspectives and informed questions

A source-based review of school-information understanding, family perspectives and informed questions. It distinguishes comprehension from satisfaction, local accounts from prevalence, and useful resources from unverified outcomes.

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

Current edition reviewed: 2026-10-12. Revision: public-v2.

Earlier editions

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

  Research edition reviewed: 2026-09-19. Revision: public-v1.

Prepared by Education Angel Group (EAG). Research synthesis: October 12, 2026 (UTC). This review examines how caregivers understand school information, what family accounts can establish and when a question or an existing resource helps clarify a local issue. EAG is the prospective publisher of Parents Need More and has an interest in its success; the publication connection is considered after the independent topics. This is a focused narrative review, not personal educational, medical or legal advice.

1. Understanding, relevance and action are different questions

A caregiver may want to understand an unfamiliar school term, consider an everyday routine, learn how another family experienced school life or work out what to ask at a meeting. These are related but different questions. Understanding a term does not necessarily require an appointment, and organizing a question does not establish that a school has answered it. Useful information can leave a reader better oriented without creating another task.

The central question is: **how can caregivers distinguish understandable school information from merely appealing presentation, interpret family perspectives in context and identify what still needs a local answer?** A second question follows: when does a guide, locally kept question or knowledgeable conversation fit that need better than more explanation? The evidence here cannot establish a nationwide information deficit, uniform family priorities or demand for a particular publication.

The evidence supports caution about equating an appealing explanation with an understood one. A randomized study of school-choice displays found that formats parents liked were not always those they understood most accurately. Interviews with a small Oakland sample describe general information that did not address participants' priorities. These sources answer different questions: the first measures responses to a defined display task; the second explains particular experiences with information and support. Neither determines what every family needs. P1, printed pages 3-7 and 11-18; P2, Sections 4-6

The outcomes need separate names:

Outcome	What it can establish	What it cannot establish on its own
Factual comprehension	The reader can explain a particular term, comparison or qualification correctly.	Understanding a child's individual learning needs or diagnosis.
Satisfaction and perceived usefulness	The reader likes the presentation or considers it relevant.	Accurate understanding, even when confidence is high.
Source and account understanding	The reader can distinguish a study finding, an attributed experience and an editorial suggestion.	That the account is typical or that attribution causes trust.
Optional preparation	The reader chooses and understands a question or checklist item.	A completed conversation or an appropriate school response.
School and child outcomes	A separately measured institutional response or child result.	An effect caused by reading or question preparation without a suitable evaluation.

These distinctions leave room for ordinary reading pleasure and useful context. They also prevent a reassuring tone or a completed worksheet from becoming an unsupported claim about family benefit. This outcome framework is EAG's synthesis of the different source designs, not a validated scale or a finding that any one format improves school or child outcomes.

2. Clear explanations can still be misunderstood

Glazerman, Nichols-Barrer, Valant and Burnett's *Presenting School Choice Information to Parents: An Evidence-Based Guide* reports randomized comparisons of hypothetical elementary-school displays. The study included 3,500 U.S. parents across all 50 states, with household income at most $40,000 and a child

aged 3-18. Recruitment was English-only and opt-in. The guide describes data collection in late 2016. P1, printed pages 3-7

Numbers-only displays produced better measured factual comprehension than the tested graph and icon versions, while graphs were more satisfying. Adding parent ratings increased satisfaction but slightly reduced comprehension. That comparison also added information, so it cannot cleanly establish that the social source of the ratings alone caused the reduction. More detail was not uniformly beneficial. P1, printed pages 11, 15 and 18

The guide uses Bayesian estimates and a 70 percent reporting criterion. This is its reporting rule, not a conventional universal statistical-significance threshold or a confidence level for this synthesis. Its project page gives 2017 rather than the guide's late-2016 collection period; that discrepancy remains unresolved. The technical appendix was not obtained for this review. The population, hypothetical school-choice task and language restriction limit transfer to other kinds of school information, including magazine reading. P1, methods and printed pages 26-27

Figure 1

Understanding satisfaction and local accounts

Randomized displays | P1

Comprehension and satisfaction diverged

3500 U.S. parents, English-only opt-in, hypothetical schools. Numbers-only improved factual comprehension versus tested graphs/icons; graphs were more satisfying.

Ratings and detail | P1

More appealing is not always more understood

Parent ratings raised satisfaction and slightly lowered comprehension; added information complicates attribution. More detail not uniformly beneficial; Bayesian reporting rule 70 percent.

Oakland interviews | P2

General information could miss local priorities

14 interviews: 10 parents, 4 advocates, September 2020-March 2021. Selected accounts valued trusted local knowledge; not prevalence, causal benefit or EAG interviews.

Observed findings retain different designs and outcomes. No magazine effect, numerical forecast or pooled benefit is shown.

Understanding satisfaction and local accounts

Observed findings retain different designs and outcomes. No magazine effect, numerical forecast or pooled benefit is shown.

- P1. Presenting School Choice Information to Parents: An Evidence-Based Guide
- P2. Not Another School Resource Map: Meeting Underserved Families' Information Needs Requires Trusting Relationships and Personalized Care

---

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

Figure 1. Understanding satisfaction and local accounts

Observed findings retain different designs and outcomes. No magazine effect, numerical forecast or pooled benefit is shown.

Question: What did these sources actually measure or report?

Evidence type: Observed findings from different source designs; no magazine effect is established.

Randomized displays | P1: Comprehension and satisfaction diverged. 3500 U.S. parents, English-only opt-in, hypothetical schools. Numbers-only improved factual comprehension versus tested graphs/icons; graphs were more satisfying.

Ratings and detail | P1: More appealing is not always more understood. Parent ratings raised satisfaction and slightly lowered comprehension; added information complicates attribution. More detail not uniformly beneficial; Bayesian reporting rule 70 percent.

Oakland interviews | P2: General information could miss local priorities. 14 interviews: 10 parents, 4 advocates, September 2020-March 2021. Selected accounts valued trusted local knowledge; not prevalence, causal benefit or EAG interviews.

Uncertainty: P1 guide late-2016 collection wording conflicts with project 2017; appendix unavailable. P2 small selected sample. Neither source tests magazine reading.

Transformation: Qualitative summaries of inspected findings and accounts; no unverified effect estimates or percentages.

Sources and access limits

P1. Presenting School Choice Information to Parents: An Evidence-Based Guide

Printed pp. 3-7 methods, p. 11 format, p. 15 ratings, p. 18 information amount, pp. 26-27 limitations

Not a magazine study; hypothetical task, selected income range and English-only recruitment. Graph satisfaction differs from factual comprehension. Parent-ratings comparison also adds information. Technical appendix not obtained. No exact estimates or optimal layout/length inferred.

Additional public references: P1 reference 1; P1 reference 2.

P2. Not Another School Resource Map: Meeting Underserved Families' Information Needs Requires Trusting Relationships and Personalized Care

Sections 4.2.1-4.2.3 and Tables 1-2 recruitment/sample; 4.3 analysis; 5.1-5.2 findings; 6 discussion/limits

Small selected sample; reported experiences do not estimate prevalence or a magazine effect. Does not authorize EAG personalized support. Manuscript placeholder DOI excluded.

Additional public references: P2 reference 1.

Figure 1. Different evidence answers different questions. Findings are qualitative summaries, not pooled benefits, article scores or a forecast. Text and data alternative

The reasonable inference is to check what a reader actually takes away, not to choose a format solely because it looks approachable. It is not a blanket instruction to remove visuals or an evidence-based length rule. An illustration might explain a sequence that numbers cannot; a labeled table might make a comparison easier to inspect. The study does not establish which format is best for an unfamiliar school message, an assessment explanation or a family account.

Assessment interpretation makes this distinction concrete. North Carolina DPI's assessment guide explains assessment types and treats a score alongside other information. Its state-specific test and policy language is historical guidance, not current Arkansas policy. P4, pages 2 and 4 In a hypothetical explanation, a reader might like a reassuring paragraph yet leave believing that one score tells the whole story of a child's progress. Clarifying what an assessment measures, what it leaves out and what depends on the school's interpretation addresses that possible misunderstanding; it does not interpret the individual child's result.

An appropriate comprehension question is whether the reader can explain why a score is only part of the picture. Asking whether the explanation felt helpful measures something else. Neither answer authorizes a conclusion about the reader's child. General context and an individual interpretation need not be collapsed into one answer.

3. Family perspectives reveal context, not prevalence

Robertson, Nguyen and Salehi's author manuscript, *Not Another School Resource Map*, describes fourteen Oakland interviews: ten parents and four parent advocates. Interviews occurred from September 2020 through March 2021 in English or Spanish, with an interpreter. Participants described general information that did not fit their priorities and valued trusted people with local knowledge. P2, Sections 4.2-4.3 and 5.1-5.2

This complicates the assumption that more general information is always the answer. Another well-written list can still miss the issue a family is trying to understand. Sometimes an informed conversation is the more useful next source. The sample is small and selected, including families who needed and obtained support. It does not establish how common these experiences are, how all families judge resources or whether a publication should offer personalized support. P2, Tables 1-2 and Section 6

A family account can show what an experience meant to that participant. It should not be presented as evidence that most families experience the same thing. A hypothetical account of a difficult morning routine might illuminate a tradeoff between work schedules and school timing. It would not estimate the prevalence of that difficulty or establish the effect of a suggested routine. No such EAG interview was conducted for this report.

For source judgment, it matters who is speaking, which setting is described and what kind of statement is being made. A parent's account, an advocate's interpretation and a randomized study finding are not interchangeable. Accurate attribution lets the reader inspect that distinction; this review contains no measured finding that naming a participant causes greater trust. Nor does a real quotation make a proposed solution effective.

Selection matters even when every quotation is accurate. A set of willing participants can leave out families who lack time, dislike publicity, need another language or disagree with the story's framing. The answer is not to invent balancing quotations or claim representativeness from a small collection. Editors can state whose perspectives were included, retain disagreement that changes the interpretation, and identify the limits of the reporting. A vivid account should not overwhelm the actual evidence about the topic.

Local context also changes which answer is relevant. A report about one school process may reveal a useful question without establishing that the same process operates elsewhere. A contrast between two accounts can expose disagreement without resolving it. The careful conclusion is sometimes that a general source explains part of an issue while current local knowledge is still missing. The Oakland accounts do not justify turning that gap into a diagnosis of every household or a universal service model.

4. Source judgment includes language, dates and missing information

An explanation needs to distinguish a source's finding from the interpretation added around it. For a study, relevant details include who participated, where and when, what task or experience was examined and what the design cannot establish. For an official guide, the issuing jurisdiction and edition date matter. For a provider resource, its described purpose is not independent evidence of effectiveness. These are source-appraisal distinctions used in this synthesis, not a tested checklist for families.

The difference matters in practice. P1's display experiment cannot establish that a reassuring explanation of an unfamiliar notice is understood. P2's interviews cannot establish the prevalence of families' information needs. P4's state guide cannot supply current policy for a different jurisdiction. A source may be useful while leaving precisely the question a reader needs answered unresolved. Naming that limit is more informative than presenting all linked material as equally authoritative.

Language and format are substantive questions. W3C's informative G153 technique recommends ordinary wording, focused paragraphs and explicit logical relationships to make text easier to read. It is standards-based guidance, not an observed family effect, a universal 25-word sentence cap or proof of WCAG conformance. A familiar school term may still need a definition; shortening a sentence must not erase a qualification. P3, Description and Tests

A translation needs to preserve distinctions between observation and inference, possibility and requirement, and public explanation and local policy. A language menu alone does not establish that. Print, audio and accessible text may serve different readers, but their usability remains to be checked in the actual material.

The English-only display study cannot establish equal usefulness across languages or formats.

Source links can make an explanation inspectable, but a long reference list is not itself an explanation. A reader should be able to identify the central claim and qualification without reconstructing the argument from several documents. For example, saying a test score is one source of information differs materially from saying a score is unimportant. A shorter sentence that loses this distinction is not an improvement in understanding.

Confidence, warmth and apparent clarity do not settle accuracy. A proposed understanding check would ask a reader to explain the central claim and its qualification in their own words, while separately asking whether the material felt helpful. It could also ask which statements describe an individual account rather than a general finding. Such a comparison would require a separately approved study, recruitment and privacy decisions; none was conducted here. A small exploratory study would not establish population-wide benefit or equity.

Uncertainty also includes unavailable evidence. An appendix that was not obtained cannot silently become a verified methods record. A failed link does not establish that guidance was withdrawn. An older edition can explain the history of a topic while requiring a current local source for action. Source maintenance is part of keeping an explanation usable, but no correction-time or maintenance-workload result was measured in this review.

5. Informed questions do not require another assignment

The appropriate resource depends on the question. A school-specific deadline may be answered by the current official school notice. An assessment term may be explained in a short official guide. Someone who already understands the issue but wants to organize a meeting may prefer a worksheet or blank local note. These are reasoned examples of resource fit, not an effectiveness ranking. More reading or preparation is not automatically the better choice.

North Carolina DPI's five-page *Family Guide to Assessment*, dated August 2022 in the PDF, combines explanation with questions. Its final page offers questions to support discussion. The official landing page lists August 16, 2022, while its download row carries September 13, 2023; this review retains the PDF edition. A family elsewhere needs current guidance for its own jurisdiction before relying on local test names or policy details. The guide's existence is not proof that readers understand it. P4, pages 1-5

Understood's three-page parent-teacher conference worksheet, copyright 2017, organizes observations and questions, including prioritization for limited meeting time and plan-specific prompts. It supplies an existing preparation format. It does not establish worksheet efficacy, accessibility certification or rights to adapt its wording or artwork. Its personal fields do not justify collecting those details through EAG. A reader may choose a locally kept note instead. P5, pages 1-3

The Right Question Institute's *Schools + Families* page describes question-formulation and decision-participation resources and shows registration for resource access. The public page was inspected; linked videos and member materials were not. Its first-party descriptions are a comparator, not independent evidence of better conversations. P6, resource and download listings

A direct knowledgeable school conversation is another possible alternative when the question depends on a particular classroom or current local process. No contact, response time or quality of that route was verified here. General explanation can identify what remains to be checked, but cannot manufacture a contact or treat a missing answer as school refusal. The Oakland accounts give a reason to consider relevant local knowledge without guaranteeing its availability or success. P2, Sections 5-6

Consider a hypothetical example of unfinished classroom work. The observation does not determine its explanation. A question about what instructions were given, or what the teacher has noticed, leaves room for information a general source cannot supply. The caregiver might use either question, rewrite it or ask something else. This example is not a family case, diagnosis or individualized recommendation, and it does not imply that a completed sheet is necessary to be heard.

Question preparation has its own limits. Choosing a question is different from understanding it; copying wording is different from using it to clarify a concern; asking it is different from receiving an adequate response. A worksheet can organize an already desired conversation without creating a duty to arrange one. For an everyday-routine story, a reader may simply consider a perspective or disagree with a suggestion. The evidence establishes no optimal question count or mandatory preparation format.

Total effort includes reading, checking a source, selecting questions, printing and finding a relevant school route. To examine the contribution of preparation, a separately approved comparison could allow an explanation alone, the same explanation with optional questions and a topic-fit existing guide or local note. It would need to distinguish accurate understanding, satisfaction, chosen preparation and total effort. Declining a worksheet or deciding no conversation is needed can be consistent with useful information. School responsiveness and child outcomes require different measures and cannot be inferred from question completion.

6. Limited applicability to Parents Need More

Parents Need More is a planned free parent-and-caregiver publication within Education Needs More, Education Angel Group's editorial umbrella. EAG was founded and is operated solely by Zachary Obasiolu; a proposed publication does not establish a staffed newsroom or finished archive. Its approved direction covers sourced school-life explanations, routines and genuine permissioned family perspectives. EAG's public description identifies the product context, not evidence of effectiveness. [Publisher authority, A0]

The topics in this review suggest explaining a defined question accurately, keeping source limits beside the claim and distinguishing a family account from prevalence. Selected articles may have optional authored question sheets or checklists, prepared locally. An article remains a complete use without a companion,

meeting, account or private message; ordinary reading does not require a child's records. Optional saved actions have separate Runstr identity and product permissions, and protected kits retain their separate access rules. The publication is not a case-intake or personalized educational, medical or legal advice service.

Real family reporting requires accurate quotations and agreed use. An interview agreement does not cover every photograph, recording or promotional reuse; identifiable minor material needs the applicable permissions and assent. Reading, interview participation and paid membership remain independent choices. These are publisher obligations, not evidence that attribution improves trust or that a companion improves school conversations. Source, translation, rights and correction work remains the sole operator's responsibility, with actual capacity and qualified review still to be established.

The reasonable connection is therefore limited: the publication can pursue these topics, but the sources do not demonstrate demand, reader benefit or improved school or child outcomes. A short existing guide or direct conversation may meet the need with less work. No new reader study, reporting commitment or service is authorized by this synthesis.

7. Review methods, limits and references

This is a focused narrative review, not a systematic review or a new empirical study. It brings together a randomized information-display study, qualitative family-information accounts, informative accessibility guidance and concrete existing resources. The October 11, 2026 source review inspected the originals identified below; this synthesis reuses that appraisal rather than claiming a new retrieval. Additional original-source checks covered P1's sample, collection-period wording and Bayesian reporting criterion in ERIC, and P2's methods, recruitment and limitations. Qualitative summaries are retained without importing unverified effect estimates.

The earlier report centered a concern-to-question service and different school-led interventions. That historical edition is preserved separately; attendance-texting and admissions-allocation estimates do not measure the effects of general school-life reading or question preparation and are not carried into this synthesis. Previously cited federal question guides and language-access materials could not be reopened in the October 11 source run. Failed access does not establish removal or withdrawal. This review makes no new legal determination from those records.

No Parents Need More trial, EAG parent interview, Arkansas reader sample, translation evaluation, local school-route verification or observation of school response was obtained. The review does not establish reader demand, publication cadence, staffing capacity, rights to reproduce provider resources or comprehensive correction/retraction clearance. The proposed examples and evaluation are identified as such. All retained evidence remains indirect to the publication.

The conclusion is bounded by the sources: liking a presentation is not the same as understanding it; selected accounts can reveal context without estimating prevalence; and a general resource cannot establish a current local answer. The fit of explanation, existing guidance and question preparation depends on the

question and the effort involved. These distinctions give a basis for careful explanation and further inquiry, not a proven intervention or a requirement that every caregiver take another step.

References

Source and scope
A0. Education Angel Group. Current Parents Need More publishing definition and EAG ownership: planned free publication within Education Needs More, with optional local companions and independent reading/reporting/paid-participation choices. Public product context; EAG context. Publisher authority, not effectiveness evidence; public links are context rather than a fresh availability verification.
P1. Glazerman, S., Nichols-Barrer, I., Valant, J., and Burnett, A. *Presenting School Choice Information to Parents: An Evidence-Based Guide*, October 2018, NCEE 2019-4003. Original ERIC PDF; IES project description. Printed pages 3-7, 11, 15, 18 and 26-27. Collection-date discrepancy and unavailable technical appendix retained.
P2. Robertson, Nguyen and Salehi. *Not Another School Resource Map: Meeting Underserved Families' Information Needs Requires Trusting Relationships and Personalized Care.* Author manuscript v2, March 31, 2022; version record. Sections 4.2-4.3, 5-6 and Tables 1-2. Selected Oakland interview accounts, not representative or causal evidence.
P3. W3C WAI. G153: Making the text easier to read, updated July 15, 2025. About this Technique, Description and Tests. Informative technique, not a family-benefit study or accessibility certification.
P4. North Carolina DPI. *Family Guide to Assessment*, August 2022 PDF edition, five pages. Original PDF; official landing page. Historical state-specific explanation and questions, not current policy elsewhere or tested efficacy.
P5. Understood. *Parent-teacher conference worksheet*, copyright 2017, three pages. Original worksheet. Existing preparation format; efficacy, conformance and adaptation rights not established.
P6. Right Question Institute. Schools + Families, public first-party page inspected October 11, 2026. Resources and registration listings only; linked videos and member materials not inspected.