

Teachers Need More: making a sourced classroom option feasible

Historical review of classroom-action preparation and adaptation. 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 Teachers 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 Teachers 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 Teachers Need More and has an interest in its success. This is a research rationale for a proposed service, not an independent evaluation or a report of classroom results.

1. Proposition, audience and present uncertainty

In the earlier proposal, Teachers Need More was intended to help educators describe a classroom problem, understand sourced context, compare workable options, adapt an option and choose a realistic follow-up. The earlier proposal's tagline was "Describe the classroom problem. Get something practical to try." The central product definition emphasizes teacher practice and workload. It does not establish that any proposed workflow has been implemented or shown to help.

The core audience includes classroom teachers, specialists and support educators, and new or substitute educators. These roles share a need for usable guidance but have different authority and constraints. A classroom teacher may know the curriculum and students well but lack preparation time. A specialist may need a resource to work across modalities and settings. A substitute may need clear limits and a safe fallback more urgently than a menu of creative variations. Treating all three as one generic resource consumer would miss why the same activity can be feasible for one educator and unsuitable for another.

Overview. The evidence supports treating preparation time and adaptation as central design questions. It also challenges the assumption that distributing research produces better instruction. Official practice guides and curriculum reviews already provide useful guidance. Teachers Need More therefore has a narrower proposition to prove: whether a small, context-sensitive comparison helps an educator reach a feasible action with less total burden than an existing route. No retained source demonstrates that benefit for this product.

The proposed service is not an LMS, marketplace, funding service or district-policy authority. A complete useful result must remain possible without a purchase, student upload, public post or Runstr action. EAG's definition also makes acceptance of the EduNeedsMore parent pattern a separate activation dependency. This report does not resolve that dependency or authorize a school to adopt a resource.

2. Questions that determine whether the proposition is useful

The review asks five linked questions. What constraints are documented, particularly in Arkansas? What do educators already have available? Why might a sourced recommendation fail between reading and classroom use? What would a teacher-specific guided process add? What evidence would justify continuing, simplifying or abandoning that process?

These questions require different forms of evidence. Surveys describe reported working conditions. A randomized dissemination trial tests particular ways of communicating evidence. Practice guides synthesize research and offer recommendations. Provider documentation establishes the scope of an alternative. None is interchangeable with a Teachers Need More evaluation.

The decisive uncertainty concerns the whole task. A reader can find an article quickly yet spend much longer acquiring materials, checking rights, adapting language, arranging access and preparing follow-up. Conversely, a longer conversation with a colleague may solve the real issue before any resource is selected. A comparison limited to search speed could reward the wrong design.

The unit of analysis proposed here is therefore an educator's bounded classroom task, including a decision not to proceed. Possible outcomes include using an existing routine, adapting a permitted resource, asking a school colleague for help, or deciding that an institutional constraint prevents action. These are prospective evaluation categories, not observed user behavior.

3. Need and context: time exists on a timetable and in practice

Arkansas's 2025 teacher survey, published for the 2026 adequacy study, received 4,830 responses from 32,702 invited educators, a 15% response rate. Half of respondents considered instructional-day planning time insufficient. For receipt of at least 200 weekly planning minutes, responses were 4% never, 5% rarely, 10% some weeks, 25% most weeks, 54% every week and 2% not applicable. These are voluntary self-reports, including roles beyond classroom teachers. The reported sampling margin does not eliminate nonresponse bias. They neither establish legal violations nor measure demand for a new service.

Arkansas Bureau of Legislative Research, S1

Figure 1

Receiving planning time and finding it sufficient

Arkansas survey | 2025

Weekly receipt of 200 minutes

Never 4%; rarely 5%; some weeks 10%; most weeks 25%; every week 54%; not applicable 2%.

Separate sufficiency question

Yes 50%; No 50%

Respondents assessed instructional-day planning time. This measures perceived sufficiency, not receipt frequency.

Survey scope

4,830 responses; 15% response rate

Voluntary responses from classroom teachers, media specialists and counselors. Selection bias remains possible.

Arkansas 2025 respondents, published November 2025 for the 2026 adequacy study. Separate questions; no legal-compliance or causal inference.

Receiving planning time and finding it sufficient

Arkansas 2025 respondents, published November 2025 for the 2026 adequacy study. Separate questions; no legal-compliance or causal inference.

- S1
-

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. Receiving planning time and finding it sufficient

Arkansas 2025 respondents, published November 2025 for the 2026 adequacy study. Separate questions; no legal-compliance or causal inference.

Arkansas survey | 2025: Weekly receipt of 200 minutes. Never 4%; rarely 5%; some weeks 10%; most weeks 25%; every week 54%; not applicable 2%.

Separate sufficiency question: Yes 50%; No 50%. Respondents assessed instructional-day planning time. This measures perceived sufficiency, not receipt frequency.

Survey scope: 4,830 responses; 15% response rate. Voluntary responses from classroom teachers, media specialists and counselors. Selection bias remains possible.

Sources: S1.

Figure 1. Two separate 2025 survey questions, not a causal comparison. Percentages refer to respondents; the survey response rate was 15%. Text and data alternative.

National evidence supplies additional historical context. RAND's 2023 survey reported average school-year weekly hours of 53 for public K-12 teachers and 46 for comparison working adults. The Figure 1 analytic samples were 1,415 teachers and 524 adults. Hours were self-reported and concern the 2022-23 school year; they should not be annualized or described as 2026 working hours. Steiner, Woo and Doan, S2

The newer RAND report surveyed 829 teachers in early 2026. It reported frequent job-related stress for 55%, compared with 62% in 2025. Average out-of-pocket classroom spending of \$665 referred to the prior 2024-25 school year. These weighted survey findings concern different outcomes and recall periods. The NEA- and AFT-funded report is descriptive, not evidence that a resource service reduces stress or spending. Steiner, Levine and Doan, S3

For EAG, the implication is a question to investigate, not a savings claim: which part of a classroom task can useful organization actually remove? A resource requiring printing, cutting, account creation or new materials may consume more time than its reading length suggests. A no-cost download can still move expenditure onto an educator. The proposed service should make those tradeoffs visible before the teacher invests effort.

Institutional problems also need an institutional endpoint. Missing specialist support, unsafe staffing arrangements or conflicting school requirements cannot be solved by reframing the teacher as more resourceful. A guidance service should be able to say that no listed classroom option addresses the stated constraint. Recognizing that limit is part of useful assistance.

4. Existing alternatives and the actual gap to test

The What Works Clearinghouse's 2007 organizing-instruction guide already offers practical recommendations with differentiated evidence levels: spacing is rated moderate, retrieval quizzes that revisit content strong, and pre-questions minimal. These are ratings in that specific synthesis, not universal rankings of activities. Its implementation guidance and roadblocks make it an important direct comparator. IES/WWC, S6

The December 2024 K-5 behavior guide provides seven recommendations and separates their evidence strength. It rates establishing expectations consistent with schoolwide expectations strong and instructional choice moderate. The official page links fuller guidance and reviewed studies. This review inspected the recommendation page, not every underlying study. It is a scoped classroom resource, not authority for individualized treatment or all-age discipline. IES/WWC, S7

EdReports provides a different service. Its first-party FAQ explains that reviews assess curriculum design rather than causal classroom effectiveness, and that reviews should inform teacher-led adoption. It also notes that completed reviews are not retroactively rewritten when tools change. The provider description establishes an existing comparison resource, not proof of EdReports' impact. EdReports, S8

Figure 2

Existing routes answer different questions

WWC instruction guide | S6

What practice does research support?

Recommendation-specific evidence ratings and practical guidance. Published 2007; not a product evaluation.

WWC K-5 behavior guide | S7

Which classroom approaches merit attention?

Scoped official recommendations and evidence ratings. Full guide not appraised in this authoring pass.

EdReports | S8

How are curriculum materials designed?

First-party review scope concerns design, not causal classroom effectiveness.

Teachers Need More | A0

What fits this classroom task?

Proposed context and feasibility comparison. Added value over direct source use remains untested.

Qualitative editorial comparison of existing documented scopes and an explicitly proposed EAG task; no ranking or impact score.

Existing routes answer different questions

Qualitative editorial comparison of existing documented scopes and an explicitly proposed EAG task; no ranking or impact score.

- S6
- S7
- S8
- A0. EAG product definition

Figure 2. Existing routes answer different questions

Qualitative editorial comparison of existing documented scopes and an explicitly proposed EAG task; no ranking or impact score.

WWC instruction guide | S6: What practice does research support? Recommendation-specific evidence ratings and practical guidance. Published 2007; not a product evaluation.

WWC K-5 behavior guide | S7: Which classroom approaches merit attention? Scoped official recommendations and evidence ratings. Full guide not appraised in this authoring pass.

EdReports | S8: How are curriculum materials designed? First-party review scope concerns design, not causal classroom effectiveness.

Teachers Need More | A0: What fits this classroom task? Proposed context and feasibility comparison. Added value over direct source use remains untested.

Sources: S6, S7, S8, A0.

Figure 2. Comparison of documented official and first-party resource scopes with EAG's proposed task. This is a qualitative editorial comparison, not a ranking or efficacy score. Text and data alternative.

Local curriculum materials and professional collaboration are additional comparators to include in any field evaluation. Their availability and quality were not audited here. Their advantage may be local knowledge: which lesson has already been taught, which materials are available, and which practice fits school expectations. A general website would have to request or infer that context, introducing both effort and error.

The plausible gap is not absence of educational information. It is the work between a particular classroom concern and an option that fits. Teachers Need More might help by presenting preparation, source scope, rights, materials and adaptation limits together. That remains a hypothesis. If the existing guide answers the question directly, the best product behavior may simply be a clear route to that guide. Rewriting it into another article is not automatically added value.

Nor should the service collapse all judgments into “recommended.” Evidence of effect, design quality, accessibility, permission to adapt, curriculum fit and practical feasibility answer different questions. An option can be well supported but infeasible this week; feasible but weakly supported; or promising but unavailable for redistribution. Preserving these distinctions gives an educator grounds to disagree with a suggestion.

5. Evidence, counterevidence and limits of transfer

The 2019 American Instructional Resources Survey, published by RAND in 2020, documented varied combinations and modifications of curricula. Its completed samples included 5,969 teachers and 1,624 leaders. Reported curriculum-related feedback and professional learning were associated with standards-aligned practices; use of aligned materials alone was not. The study was cross-sectional and self-reported. Its pre-pandemic findings do not establish current prevalence, causal learning effects or the superiority of any adaptation service. Kaufman and colleagues, S4

Stronger counterevidence comes from the Literacy Octopus trial. This school-randomized study involved 823 English primary schools and tested nine evidence-communication interventions against a control group. It found no evidence of improved Key Stage 2 English attainment in the main or later follow-up. The research-use outcome also showed no detected improvement, but low survey response and measurement reliability limited that result. The interventions began in 2015; the report appeared in 2017 with a 2019 addendum. These particular dissemination approaches do not represent every possible form of guidance. Lord and colleagues, S5

The two studies ask different questions, but together caution against a simple materials-to-outcomes story. The observational study cannot prove that adding coaching causes improvement. The trial cannot prove all editorial support fails. Neither licenses EAG to describe its own adaptation layer as the missing ingredient that will make evidence work.

A productive response is to narrow the claim. A prototype can test whether teachers understand an option's conditions and can identify an acceptable next step. A separate study would be needed to determine whether they use it as intended. A further question is whether classroom outcomes improve. Favorable responses at an earlier stage should not be carried forward as if the later stage had been tested.

The official guides also establish a positive but limited basis for content selection: there are recommendations with an explicit evidence trail that can be examined in context. The source's exact recommendation, age range, outcome and evidence rating should survive summarization. An editor's adaptation should be labeled separately. Removing a component for convenience may change the intervention enough that its original findings no longer transfer.

The review found no product-specific evidence for reduced search time, lower preparation burden, preserved instructional fidelity, improved attainment or better teacher well-being. It also found no local comparative user study of the proposed workflow. These gaps are not reasons to invent a larger evidence narrative. They define what a small next investigation should measure.

6. Proposed mechanism: a feasible action, including a safe exit

EAG's proposed mechanism begins with a concrete problem rather than a subject catalog. The educator could state the intended classroom result, what is already being tried, the preparation time actually available, materials on hand and relevant access constraints. The process should permit a partial description; uncertain context should remain visible rather than be silently completed.

Next, a small set of options would show both why an option may help and why it may not fit. A source note would distinguish a tested intervention from a guide recommendation or an editorial idea. A burden note would distinguish reading, preparation, adaptation, classroom execution and follow-up. A rights note would identify whether the educator may use, change or redistribute the resource. Unknown rights would prevent distributing an adaptation, not become a generic disclaimer beneath it.

The educator would then select, revise or decline. Selection is not permission from a district and is not evidence of actual classroom use. An optional follow-up could ask whether the stated burden was realistic and what prevented use. That question can be useful without asking for student names, classroom recordings or sensitive case histories.

Figure 3

A feasible action or a justified exit

Conceptual only. Every link is proposed.

Classroom-action hypothesis

1. Clarify purpose and constraints
↓ proposed link
2. Compare source, burden and rights
↓ proposed link
3. Adapt within permission
↓ proposed link
4. Choose action and optional follow-up

Unknown: comprehension, feasibility, use and instructional benefit.

No-fit route

1. Recognize unavailable time, access or materials
↓ proposed link
2. Decline or use an existing school route

Ending without a download can be useful; that benefit needs observation.

Authority boundary

1. Identify an institutional or permission question
↓ proposed link
2. Return to the responsible school role

The service does not grant policy, funding or publication permission.

EAG conceptual pathway only. Every link is proposed, and no classroom effect has been measured.

A feasible action or a justified exit

EAG conceptual pathway only. Every link is proposed, and no classroom effect has been measured.

- A0. EAG product definition
-

Figure 3. A feasible action or a justified exit

EAG conceptual pathway only. Every link is proposed, and no classroom effect has been measured.

Classroom-action hypothesis. Clarify purpose and constraints → Compare source, burden and rights → Adapt within permission → Choose action and optional follow-up. Unknown: comprehension, feasibility, use and instructional benefit.

No-fit route. Recognize unavailable time, access or materials → Decline or use an existing school route. Ending without a download can be useful; that benefit needs observation.

Authority boundary. Identify an institutional or permission question → Return to the responsible school role. The service does not grant policy, funding or publication permission.

Sources: AO.

Figure 3. EAG conceptual pathway, not an evaluated causal model. A missing fit, unclear permission or institutional issue can end the classroom-resource path. Text and data alternative.

A useful hypothesis is that earlier rejection saves later effort. If a teacher learns immediately that an option depends on materials they do not have, the result may be better than a download followed by abandonment. This is an evaluation proposal, not a measured saving. It argues for observing why people reject suggestions instead of treating every exit as product failure.

The service would also need to avoid making clarification itself burdensome. Asking a long series of questions may recreate the work it promises to remove. Context should be requested only when it could change an option or its conditions. A teacher who can already identify the needed official resource should retain a direct route to it.

7. Design concepts worth comparing

Three concepts follow from the proposed job, and none is presented as an approved interface. The simplest is a sourced action sheet: one classroom purpose, assumptions, steps, preparation, materials, access alternatives and original source. It would suit a well-defined need and offer the least interaction overhead. Its weakness is limited support when the educator has not yet identified the real problem.

A second concept is a short guided comparison. It would ask only the context needed to distinguish a few options and then put their tradeoffs together. It might help an educator who knows the difficulty but not the appropriate response. Its weakness is that a structured prompt can sound more certain than its evidence warrants, especially when the teacher's context does not fit predefined choices.

A third concept is an adaptation worksheet alongside the original source. It would record the intended change, its reason, the source component affected, rights and remaining uncertainty. It might help a specialist or experienced educator preserve the distinction between an original method and a local variation. Its weakness is extra documentation burden and the risk that completing a worksheet looks like formal approval.

The first comparison should include an existing-resource route alongside these concepts. The purpose is to find the lightest useful support, not to prove that the most interactive concept deserves development. A plain source link plus one explanatory paragraph may outperform a guided workflow for some tasks.

An illustrative task could involve planning a brief review of already-taught material with existing classroom materials. The prototype should identify the relevant source recommendation and ask what local change is proposed. It should not fabricate a lesson's effectiveness, promise a preparation duration, or reproduce a third-party worksheet without permission. Any timing label would need observation with the actual action and actual intended educators before being described as verified.

8. Risks, equity and the full burden of use

Total burden is broader than minutes on the page. An educator may need to obtain materials, revise language, prepare accessible formats, coordinate with another adult, learn an unfamiliar routine, manage a changed classroom interaction and decide how to follow up. These components form a proposed accounting model. Their size and distribution have not been measured for Teachers Need More.

Figure 4

Account for work beyond reading

Before use

Search, check and prepare

Observe clarification, source checking, materials, rights and accessible preparation.

During use

Adapt and manage

Observe the educator effort required to make the action work in context.

After use

Reflect, revise or stop

Observe follow-up and maintenance rather than counting a download as completion.

EAG conceptual workload account for future observation. No component durations or projected savings are supplied.

Account for work beyond reading

EAG conceptual workload account for future observation. No component durations or projected savings are supplied.

- A0. EAG product definition

Figure 4. Account for work beyond reading

EAG conceptual workload account for future observation. No component durations or projected savings are supplied.

Before use: Search, check and prepare. Observe clarification, source checking, materials, rights and accessible preparation.

During use: Adapt and manage. Observe the educator effort required to make the action work in context.

After use: Reflect, revise or stop. Observe follow-up and maintenance rather than counting a download as completion.

Sources: A0.

Figure 4. EAG conceptual checklist for future observation. No component durations or savings are estimated. Text and data alternative.

Equity review should ask who can actually use the suggested action with resources already available. Repeatedly offering activities that require personal purchases would make financial capacity a condition of participation. A no-purchase path should be a complete alternative with a realistic purpose, not an inferior-looking consolation. Institutional acquisition belongs to the responsible school process; the service should not imply that reimbursement follows.

Accessibility also needs task-level scrutiny. An alternative response format may change what an activity measures. A printable version may solve connectivity problems while introducing printing expense or unusable formatting. A specialist's review may be necessary for a particular adaptation. The report proposes attention to these tensions, not a claim that one universal format resolves them.

Privacy risk begins at problem description. Teachers can describe a classroom concern without identifying a student, but an open text field could invite sensitive details. The proposed core path does not require such details. Research tasks can use fictional classroom scenarios and explicitly exclude real identifiers. An account, shared identity or school affiliation should not be treated as permission to publish a classroom problem.

There is also an editorial maintenance burden. A resource can become unavailable, change terms, acquire a correction or cease to fit a linked recommendation. The product should retain a way to withdraw or correct it and tell a returning reader what changed. Large-scale resource accumulation would make this work harder before the basic usefulness of the service had been established.

9. Evaluation and criteria for changing course

A proportionate next evaluation would compare realistic classroom tasks using existing resources with the proposed formats. Participants should include the different educator roles the product claims to serve. Order effects, prior topic familiarity and whether a resource is already known should be recorded. A small qualitative study can reveal breakdowns; it cannot establish population-wide time savings.

Record the entire task through a feasible next-step decision. Observe time spent clarifying, finding, checking and preparing the option, alongside unresolved work. Ask participants to explain the source's scope, the adaptation they intend and any permission or institutional question. Record whether the researcher had to rescue the task. A confident answer reached through a source misunderstanding should not count as a success.

Evaluation question	Proposed evidence	Reason to revise or stop
Does guidance fit the classroom task?	Educator explains why the option fits and what remains uncertain	Suggested action ignores a stated constraint
Is effort genuinely manageable?	Observed task time plus preparation and follow-up still required	A shorter search shifts more work downstream
Is the source understood?	Educator distinguishes original finding from proposed adaptation	Guidance creates unwarranted confidence
Can people decline safely?	No-fit and institutional routes remain understandable	Participants feel pushed into unsuitable action
Does it add value over existing resources?	Same-task comparison with current routes	Direct guidance or a colleague is consistently more useful

Before an evaluation, EAG and participating educators should agree what improvement would matter and what harm or burden is unacceptable. This report does not invent thresholds without baseline observations. Favorable usability evidence could justify refining the chosen format; it would not establish attainment gains or authorize expansion into student data collection.

A later classroom study would need a defined intervention, comparator, consent and school approvals, appropriate measures and enough follow-up to distinguish novelty from continuing use. That is a separate research decision. It should not be quietly attached to an editorial prototype.

If the guided comparison adds effort, reduce the questions or retain the action sheet alone. If local context dominates selection, strengthen the handoff to existing school support. If most needs are institutional, reconsider the audience or task rather than publish more activities. If no format adds practical value, the evidence should support stopping this product path.

10. Methods, limitations, references and corrections

This focused review was assembled on September 19, 2026 from the current EAG product definition, official education sources, original research reports and first-party alternatives. It is not a systematic review, exhaustive market audit or meta-analysis. Sources were selected to address educator workload, resource adaptation, dissemination, and existing practical guidance. Search leads were checked against original sources. No search snippet supplies a numerical finding.

Original PDFs were retrieved for the Arkansas survey, three RAND reports and Literacy Octopus. Official recommendation pages were inspected for the two WWC guides. This authoring pass did not independently appraise every study behind those guides or read the complete 2024 behavior guide. The EdReports page was treated as provider documentation. Publication dates, measured periods and product hypotheses remain separate throughout.

The review contains no interviews, classroom observations, user dataset or independent product evaluation. Arkansas respondents are not a representative local user sample simply because they work in the state. National surveys do not measure the exact task EAG proposes to support. English primary-school dissemination findings require caution when considering U.S. settings and different formats. Historical evidence remains relevant to mechanism questions without becoming a statement of current prevalence.

Correction checks were limited to the retrieved original pages and documents. The Literacy Octopus addendum was retained; absence of another visible notice is not proof that no correction exists. Resource licenses, accessibility and current local permission must be checked for any actual item selected later. This report is not professional, legal or policy advice.

Correction history: September 19, 2026, first research-report revision. EAG is responsible for interpretation and corrections. Readers can identify the section, disputed statement and supporting source when contacting EAG; no dedicated public correction channel is established by this report.

References

All sources were retrieved September 19, 2026.

- **S1.** Arkansas Bureau of Legislative Research. Teachers Survey Report. November 3, 2025; 2025 survey in the 2026 adequacy cycle. Printed pp. 1, 7-8.
- **S2.** Elizabeth D. Steiner, Ashley Woo and Sy Doan. All Work and No Pay. September 12, 2023. Hours, Figure 1 and methodological limitations.
- **S3.** Elizabeth D. Steiner, Phoebe Rose Levine and Sy Doan. Teacher Well-Being, Pay, and Intentions to Leave in 2026. June 8, 2026. Overview, Figures 1 and 10, methods.

- **S4.** Julia H. Kaufman and colleagues.
How Instructional Materials Are Used and Supported in U.S. K-12 Classrooms. August 31, 2020; spring 2019 survey. Findings, methods, limitations and discussion.
- **S5.** Pippa Lord and colleagues. Evidence-based literacy support: the Literacy Octopus trial. December 2017; January 2019 addendum. Executive summary, conclusion and addendum.
- **S6.** Harold Pashler and colleagues, IES/WWC.
Organizing Instruction and Study to Improve Student Learning. September 2007. Official recommendation inventory.
- **S7.** IES/WWC. Teacher-Delivered Behavioral Interventions in Grades K-5. December 2024. Official recommendation inventory and evidence ratings.
- **S8.** EdReports. 5 Key FAQs About Curriculum Reviews. March 18, 2025. Review scope and tool-version questions.

Product-definition source: EAG, *Teachers Need More product definition*, current central definition reviewed September 19, 2026. This establishes intended scope, not implementation, adoption or effectiveness.

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. Teachers Need More provides the public entity context, not an external citation for EAG's product claims.