School decisions in context: evidence, resources and community communication

A focused synthesis of educational research use, local resource constraints, evidence interpretation and two-way school-community communication, with direct existing resources and stated limits.

Research by Education Angel Group.
Education Angel Group is developing Schools 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

- Schools Need More: institutional questions, strategic options and accountable next steps

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

Prepared by Education Angel Group. Synthesis date: October 12, 2026. This focused review examines how people understand institutional decisions, use educational research and communicate across a school community. It brings together research-use studies, a historical account of resource decisions and practical institutional guides. It is not a school diagnosis or an evaluation of a publication.

1. The questions behind a school announcement

An announcement states a decision. Understanding it requires more: what prompted the decision, which resources made it possible, what alternatives were considered and whose experience informed it. A plan can be well explained yet remain difficult to carry out. An account from another school can be informative without supplying an approach that fits locally.

This review asks five related questions:

1. How do school and district leaders obtain and use research in their work?
2. What can a reported institutional experience reveal about resources and local constraints?

3. How can readers interpret numbers and comparisons without losing their population, period or meaning?
4. Whose perspectives are represented, and what makes communication more than a one-way notice?
5. When is an original guide, professional discussion or local conversation sufficient?

These questions concern evidence and understanding before they concern any particular publication. They do not assume a shortage of information. Existing books, professional networks, institutional processes and public guides already serve parts of this work. Nor does finding a relevant source establish that a reader interpreted it correctly or that a decision improved.

The synthesis distinguishes a reported finding, guidance about a process and an interpretation of their relevance. A survey can describe what respondents said they used. A guide can explain what its authors recommend. A selected district account can illuminate constraints. None of those forms alone establishes a causal result for another institution.

2. Research use is broader than choosing a program

Penuel and colleagues examined how school and district leaders accessed, perceived and used research. Their 2017 article reports a survey of 733 school and central-office respondents in instructional K-8 roles, targeted from the 1,000 largest U.S. districts. Respondents described research use for explanations and professional learning as well as program selection. Professional associations and peers were important routes to research, and opportunities to discuss research were associated with reported use. Penuel et al., N1, pp. 5-14

This makes research use a social question as well as an access question. A leader may encounter a finding through a colleague or professional organization and consider it in an existing discussion. The association does not prove that creating more discussion causes better decisions. The study is cross-sectional self-report; the authors did not observe actual research-use processes or their quality. Its selected large-district instructional roles also limit transfer to small or rural districts and other community readers.

Publication and fieldwork dates need separate treatment. The related technical report, published in April 2016 and updated July 5, 2016, describes recruitment beginning in September 2015 and reaching its target by mid-December 2015. Printed page 19 nevertheless assigns an October 2016 date to one recruitment wave. That conflict remains unresolved. The 2017 article date is not a clean statement of the survey period. The technical report's research-interpretation items also distinguish access from inference: responses to those items concern survey participants, not every school reader or the readers of this report. Related technical report, N1t, printed pp. 19, 38-41 and 45

Farrell, Penuel and Davidson later analyzed resources named as useful in the same survey. Their 2022 article is a secondary analysis, not an independent replication or 2022 fieldwork. It examines what respondents counted as research and the kinds of leadership work for which they found it useful. Books were prominent,

alongside frameworks and practical guidance. The finding complicates a blanket assumption that busy leaders principally want short articles. Farrell et al., N2, pp. 4-12

The count of resources and the count of people differ. The article's body reports 359 codeable respondents naming 262 unique sources; its abstract instead reports 368 respondents. That discrepancy remains unresolved. In the body, 57% of codeable respondents named books, while books constituted 44% of unique sources. These are two descriptions with different denominators, not competing estimates of the same quantity.

Reported usefulness is also narrower than demonstrated quality. The study did not evaluate the depth or quality of research use, and a source mention does not measure reading time, implementation or effectiveness. Familiarity or agreement with a source cannot settle whether its claim fits the local question. Taken together, the studies support attention to the purpose and social setting of research use, while leaving actual use quality and decision effects uncertain. They do not establish an optimal article length, demand for another publication or a preferred channel for all institutional readers.

3. Resources and feasibility belong in the explanation

GAO's review of initial COVID relief spending illustrates why knowing what a district chose is different from knowing what another district could do. It combines national spending data for school years 2020-21 and 2021-22 with accounts from 17 selected districts across six states. Those accounts were gathered during the June 2023-September 2024 audit. The report was published September 23, 2024 and publicly released October 23, 2024. GAO, N5, printed pp. 2-4

Officials in ten selected districts described difficulties finding staff, contractors or vendors; officials in ten described heavy vendor solicitation. The report also discusses stakeholder participation and difficulties explaining why an approach used elsewhere was not feasible or aligned locally. Those are attributed historical accounts, not estimates of current national prevalence or interviews conducted for this review. They identify conditions worth asking about, not a diagnosis of every school's capacity. GAO, N5, printed pp. 18-19

Continuation requires another distinction. Fourteen selected districts intended to sustain at least one funded activity. An intention is not evidence that continuation occurred. The account can describe planned sustain, scale or sunset choices, but cannot establish the later availability of resources or whether the plan worked. GAO, N5, printed pp. 23-25 and Table 3, p. 27

The useful comparison is therefore between conditions, not just labels. What staff work was required? Which responsibilities and resources were available? Was an activity proposed, started or sustained? What evidence supports a reported result, and what remains unknown? A public account that answers those questions may be easier to assess than one that presents the decision as a portable success formula. This is a synthesis of the reporting problem, not a tested effect of adding context.

The Department of Education's evidence-use guidance offers a direct institutional resource for this deeper appraisal. Its revised September 2023 guidance asks educational organizations to consider relevant populations and settings, resources, staff skills, costs, alternatives and stakeholder feedback when making investment and implementation decisions. These considerations connect evidence relevance with organizational capacity. The document is non-regulatory process guidance, not a comparative trial or permission to spend, procure or implement a particular option. Department of Education, N6, printed pp. 4-8

Reading an account does not confer authority to act for an institution. A reader can understand a decision, identify a contextual difference or ask a question without representing a school. Actual policy choices, access to school records and institutional commitments remain separate matters for the responsible institution.

4. A number needs its question, population and period

An accurate percentage can still support a misleading comparison. A share of responding staff, a district estimate and a share of named resources count different things. Before comparing them, a reader needs to know who or what was counted, the relevant period, the definition of the measure and whether the comparison uses the same basis.

The National Forum on Education Statistics' 2016 data-visualization guide recommends retaining sources, definitions, formulas and collection dates, choosing appropriate scales and comparing measures that are genuinely comparable. Its annual-versus-cohort dropout example shows why similar labels can conceal different periods and populations. The guidance concerns communication of education data, not an experiment demonstrating comprehension gains. Forum guide, N3, printed pp. 16-25 and 32

The book figures in Farrell and colleagues' analysis provide a concrete reading exercise. “57% of codeable respondents named books” describes people; “44% of unique resources were books” describes distinct resources. Multiple people can name the same resource, and a person can name more than one type. Neither percentage answers how long people read or whether they would choose a short article next. The unresolved abstract/body respondent discrepancy further limits precise sample-dependent claims. Farrell et al., N2, pp. 4-9

The same discipline applies to the GAO account. Its national spending analysis and selected-district experiences do not share a denominator. Ten of 17 selected districts describing a difficulty cannot become a percentage of all U.S. districts. An audit period is not the same as the school years covered by spending data, and a report's release date does not make its observations current.

A readable explanation should keep this context near a material number. A chart cannot carry an uncertain source detail more precisely than the source supports. If a discrepancy is not necessary to the question, qualitative synthesis may be more useful than a precise-looking graphic. Essential definitions should remain available in ordinary reading rather than only on hover.

The Forum guide is normative guidance. Forum publications do not undergo the same formal review as NCES statistical products and do not necessarily express Department policy. Its historical accessibility examples are not current legal or interface-compliance authority. The report uses its principles to explain comparisons; it does not claim that its own presentation has been tested or copy the guide's artwork.

5. Whose account, and where does a response go?

A decision can look different from the roles around it. A leader can explain the intention, a staff member can describe preparing or carrying out the work, and a family member can describe receiving the information. One person's account does not represent everyone in that role. Where their experiences differ, the disagreement is part of the context rather than something a summary should automatically smooth away.

A useful reading distinction is between an attributed account, independently supportable context and interpretation. Who described the experience, when and with what firsthand knowledge? Which statements can be supported by a public document or other source? Which explanation belongs to the participant or the author? These distinctions help bound the account, but do not themselves create a causal comparison.

Absence also matters. If a family perspective was not obtained, a leader's description of family response cannot silently stand in for it. This synthesis collected no school interviews, participant quotations or original school cases. It does not fill that gap with invented speakers, composite experiences or an implied community consensus.

REL Pacific's communication toolkit addresses a related issue: providing information is not the whole school-family communication task. Part 3 supplies resources for reflection and planning around trusting relationships, cross-cultural communication and two-way exchange. Its communication-strategy tools consider how information is shared, while the two-way communication section concerns opportunities to listen and respond. The toolkit was developed in a REL Pacific context with broader source examples; it is based on research and expert opinion, not a trial of its tools. REL Pacific, N4, printed pp. 2-7, 12-22 and Appendix A

A notice may answer what will happen and when while leaving a question about access, language or participation unanswered. A response path gives that question somewhere to go. Listening, considering local context and answering concerns take work beyond arranging the message clearly. The toolkit's activities require preparation and discussion; a summary or notice cannot inherit a trust or engagement effect from the guidance.

The original toolkit is from September 2016. A 2025 timestamp in the current official route is not a new study date. Its scope and age should remain visible when readers use it as a planning resource. No people-rating exercise from the toolkit is reproduced here, and neither its availability nor its title proves that a particular school has established trusting relationships.

6. Choose the resource that fits the question

The sources do not imply that every question needs another article. Different tasks can be served directly by an existing guide, a deeper resource or a conversation with the people who know the local arrangements.

Question	Existing route worth considering	What it does not establish
How do we plan a two-way school-family exchange?	REL Pacific Part 3 communication-strategy tools and two-way communication sections, printed pp. 12-22.	A tested trust gain, local language provision or a school's actual response capacity.
How should we explain an education statistic?	The Forum data-visualization guide, including its summary on printed p. 32.	Current compliance or measured comprehension of this explanation.
How should an institution appraise an investment or implementation choice?	The Department's evidence-use guidance, printed pp. 4-8, alongside the institution's responsible process.	Local approval, funding eligibility or a decision on the institution's behalf.
How does this evidence relate to our work?	A relevant book or an existing peer/professional discussion, routes reflected in the research-use survey.	That a familiar source is reliable or the discussion produces a better decision.
What are this school's arrangements or unanswered concerns?	An existing local discussion with the responsible staff or community contact.	That this review verified a contact, response time or authority for a particular school.

This task-to-resource comparison is an interpretation of the sources' roles, not an effectiveness ranking or required sequence. A short source extract may be enough. A book may provide depth that a summary cannot. For a local question, asking the responsible person can be more relevant than reading a general account. This review did not audit any school's contact routes.

Effort belongs in the comparison. Finding a source, checking it, preparing a meeting, translating information, adapting a message and responding to questions all take work. A shorter reading time can shift work to another role rather than remove it. The retained studies and guides do not quantify time savings for these alternatives or for an EAG resource.

Understanding a complete account and stopping there is a valid result. Neither downloading a companion nor following an organizational link establishes comprehension. More confidence is not necessarily greater accuracy. Questions about usefulness should examine whether readers can distinguish observation from interpretation, identify missing context and explain what a statistic measures. These are appraisal questions, not observed scores or an approved research trial.

7. Relevance to Schools Need More

Schools Need More is a planned free school-community publication within Education Needs More, Education Angel Group's editorial umbrella. Its current focus is sourced institutional features, everyday work, staff and community perspectives, and optional practical resources. The questions in this review are relevant to that editorial focus, but the publication is not the subject of the retained studies. Education Angel Group is the parent organization; Zachary Obasiolu is its sole founder and operator. EAG is developing the publication and has an interest in its success. Publication context, A0

A selected communication example is a clearly fictional project-showcase notice. It can show purpose, date and location fields, confirmed access information and a responsible contact without supplying an actual event or inventing arrangements. An optional one-page brief can organize the issue, options, decision owner and missing evidence for the school's own review. Neither is mandatory for reading or a grant, policy, strategy-approval or private case service. A reader may use the existing school template, ask a local question or use no companion. No attendance, workload, trust or school-outcome benefit is established.

Actual reporting would need real attribution and appropriate permissions for the particular words, documents or media used. Participation, an interview and publicity remain separate choices; coverage does not imply institutional endorsement or Runstr adoption. Permission to read a source differs from permission to reuse its artwork or a school's records. Ordinary reading requires no institutional authority, while representing a school or publishing its records does. The intended publication and its correction route do not supply that authority, and no real school reporting or rights clearance was performed for this synthesis.

8. Methods, limitations and references

This is a focused narrative synthesis, not a systematic review, school needs assessment, legal analysis or product trial. Sources were selected to examine institutional research use, local feasibility, interpretation of education data, communication and direct alternatives. The 2017 survey and the 2022 named-resource analysis share a cohort and cannot be counted as two independent samples.

Original source text was inspected on October 11, 2026. Focused October 12 rechecks examined population and limitations in the 2017 AERA article, resource counts and use-quality limits in the 2022 article, and recruitment chronology in the related technical report. The other sources were not retrieved again on October 12. Original NCES PDF access was intermittent; the Forum guide was accessed through the government ERIC mirror. Access describes available text and inspected sections, not visual approval or reuse rights. No comprehensive correction or retraction search was performed.

The technical report's inconsistent recruitment-wave year and the named-resource article's abstract/body respondent counts remain unresolved. Guidance recommendations and historical district accounts retain their different evidential roles. No pooled effect, current prevalence estimate, demand estimate, optimal format or predicted institutional benefit was calculated. No reader trial, local school case or school endorsement was collected.

Earlier facilities estimates, grant categories, historical Arkansas authorization mechanics and School Improvement Grants findings are not central evidence for these questions. Their exclusion is a relevance decision, not a correction of their historical limits. This review neither establishes a positive effect nor a null effect for an untested publication.

References

- **N1. Penuel and colleagues.** *How School and District Leaders Access, Perceive, and Use Research*, AERA Open, April 19, 2017. Methods pp. 5-7; findings pp. 8-12; discussion/limits pp. 13-14. Selected large-district instructional K-8 roles; cross-sectional self-report. Original article.
- **N1t. William R. Penuel; Derek C. Briggs; Kristen L. Davidson; Corinne Herlihy; David Sherer; Heather C. Hill; Caitlin C. Farrell; Anna-Ruth Allen.** *Findings from a National Study on Research Use Among School and District Leaders*. Technical Report No. 1, National Center for Research in Policy and Practice. April 2016, updated July 5, 2016. Printed p. 19 recruitment chronology; pp. 38-41 and 45 interpretation items and limits. Recruitment-wave year conflicts with surrounding chronology. Original report via ERIC.
- **N2. Farrell, Penuel and Davidson.** *"What Counts" as Research? Comparing Policy Guidelines to the Evidence Education Leaders Report as Useful*, AERA Open 8, 2022. Methods/limits pp. 4-6; findings pp. 6-9; interpretation pp. 10-12. Same survey; abstract/body count unresolved; different respondent/resource denominators. Original article.
- **N3. National Forum on Education Statistics.** *Forum Guide to Data Visualization: A Resource for Education Agencies*, October 2016, NFES 2017-016. Printed ii, 16-25, 32 and 38-39. Normative guidance, not a comprehension trial or current compliance authority. Original guide via ERIC; official catalog.
- **N4. Garcia and colleagues, REL Pacific.** *Toolkit of Resources for Engaging Families and the Community as Partners in Education: Part 3: Building trusting relationships with families and the community through effective communication*, September 2016, REL 2016-152. Printed pp. 2-7, 12-22 and Appendix A. Research/expert-opinion toolkit, not an evaluated intervention. Original toolkit via ERIC; official resource.
- **N5. GAO.** *K-12 Education: School Districts Reported Spending Initial COVID Relief Funds on Meeting Students' Needs and Continuing School Operations*, GAO-24-106913. Published September 23, 2024; publicly released October 23, 2024. Printed pp. 2-4, 18-19, 23-25 and Table 3, p. 27. Historical national spending analysis and separate selected-district accounts; intention is not observed continuation. Original report; first-party date record.
- **N6. U.S. Department of Education.** *Non-Regulatory Guidance: Using Evidence to Strengthen Education Investments*, revised September 28, 2023. Printed pp. 4-8. Institutional-process guidance, not an investment approval or publication evaluation. Original guidance.
- **A0. Education Angel Group.** Current Schools Need More definition: free institutional publication with optional authored resources. Publisher authority for Section 7 only, not independent research evidence. Publication context.

Readers can contact EAG with the section, disputed statement and supporting source. A correction should identify the affected claim and update its explanation and references together. Schools Need More provides publication context, not independent support for the research findings.