Teachers' time, classroom materials and usable evidence

Research on teachers' time, classroom materials and evidence communication, with separate limits for reading, adaptation and classroom outcomes.

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

- Teachers Need More: making a sourced classroom option feasible

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

Prepared by Education Angel Group. Research synthesis: October 12, 2026. Education Angel Group is developing Teachers Need More and has an interest in its success. This review examines research relevant to teachers' work, not an independently evaluated EAG intervention.

1. Time to prepare and time that is sufficient

A classroom idea has to fit into an educator's working day. Finding a resource, understanding its evidence, preparing materials and deciding whether it suits a class are different tasks. An explanation that makes one task easier can leave the others unresolved. Research on working conditions describes that context; it cannot establish the time required by an unspecified activity.

RAND's September 2023 report, *All Work and No Pay*, reported average weekly hours of 53 for teachers and 46 for working adults in the 2022/23 school year. Figure 1's analytic samples were 1,415 teachers and 524 working adults. These self-reported averages are historical context, not current 2026 hours, an annualized workload estimate or a baseline for using an article. The prior appraisal did not establish exact field dates. Steiner, Woo and Doan, S2

Arkansas's Teachers Survey Report asks a more specific planning question. Published November 3, 2025 for the 2026 adequacy cycle, it reports a voluntary survey conducted January 27 to February 24, 2025. There were 4,830 responses from 32,702 reached inboxes, a 15% response rate. Q11 asked about receiving 200 weekly planning minutes: 4% said never, 5% rarely, 10% some weeks, 25% most weeks, 54% every week and 2% not applicable. Q13 separately asked about sufficiency; 50% said yes and 50% no. The published distributions are not a linked comparison of individual answers. 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 January 27-February 24, 2025 respondent context, published November 3, 2025 for 2026 adequacy. Q11 receipt and Q13 sufficiency are separate distributions; voluntary response and nonresponse limit interpretation. Not legal compliance, product demand or savings.

- S1

This equivalent accompanies the planning-time figure. Source S1 refers to the Arkansas survey in the report references.

Figure 1. Receiving planning time and finding it sufficient

Arkansas respondents answered a voluntary survey conducted January 27-February 24, 2025, published November 3, 2025 for the 2026 adequacy study. The two questions describe historical respondent context, not legal compliance or a causal effect.

Q11: Weekly receipt of 200 planning minutes. Never 4%; rarely 5%; some weeks 10%; most weeks 25%; every week 54%; not applicable 2%.

Q13: Was instructional-day planning time sufficient? Yes 50%; no 50%. This measures perceived sufficiency, not receipt frequency. Q11 and Q13 are separate distributions; the published figures do not pair individuals' receipt and sufficiency answers.

Survey scope and denominator. The survey received 4,830 responses from 32,702 reached inboxes, a 15% response rate. Respondents include classroom teachers, media specialists and counselors. The source's default denominator is 4,830 unless noted.

Limits. Voluntary self-report and nonresponse bias remain; the reported sampling margin does not remove nonresponse bias. No uncertainty intervals are transcribed. This is not a causal comparison, a legal-compliance test or an estimate of spare time, product demand or saved preparation time.

Source: S1, Arkansas Bureau of Legislative Research, *Teachers Survey Report*, printed p. 1 for methods and default denominator, p. 7 for Q11 and p. 8 for Q13.

Figure 1. Historical respondent context, not a product-demand estimate. The source's default denominator is 4,830 unless noted; respondents include counselors and media specialists. Voluntary nonresponse remains a limitation. Text and data alternative.

The survey does not establish legal noncompliance or the burden of using an article. Its reported sampling margin does not remove nonresponse bias. Receiving a stated planning allocation cannot be treated as proof of spare time. Nor can national weekly hours and a state planning-time distribution be combined into an estimate of available preparation time.

2. Materials are selected, combined and supported

RAND's spring 2019 instructional-resources survey describes how materials fit into teaching. The 5,969 U.S. public K-12 teachers and 1,624 school leaders reported varied combinations and modifications of materials. Curriculum-focused professional learning and evaluative feedback were associated with reported standards-aligned practices. These cross-sectional, pre-pandemic self-reports do not establish observed fidelity or a causal benefit from professional learning. Kaufman and colleagues, S4

A complete curriculum, a supported instructional program, a guide recommendation and an editorial example are not interchangeable units of evidence. Findings about a curriculum-supported practice cannot simply be carried over to an isolated activity or a differently adapted resource. The survey describes situated material use, not the effectiveness of a magazine article or an automatic adaptation service.

Practical explanations can identify the materials assumed, what an educator must select or make, what support the studied approach included, and which changes have not been evaluated. A specialist may need to examine a response format; a substitute may need consistency with an existing routine; a classroom teacher may already have an adequate curriculum resource. These are possible considerations, not measured preferences in an EAG reader sample. Staffing, accommodation and procurement constraints remain institutional questions rather than problems a teacher must solve through greater resourcefulness.

3. A free resource can still have material costs

RAND's June 2026 report used a weighted January-February 2026 survey of 829 U.S. public K-12 teachers. Its reported average out-of-pocket classroom spending of $665 concerned the 2024/25 school year, not spending during 2026. This self-reported, NEA- and AFT-funded evidence supplies cost context, with recall limitations. It does not show that a free resource saves money or relieves stress. Steiner, Levine and Doan, S3

Price and practical cost are different questions. A free download may assume printing, consumable materials, accessible formats or an unfamiliar routine. Those requirements should be inspectable before classroom use. The evidence does not supply durations or savings for these tasks, so a preparation checklist should not turn into an invented time estimate.

A simpler version might use materials already available, or existing curriculum may answer the task without another download. Neither possibility establishes adequate provision at any school. The spending average is not a catalog of universal shortages or a reason to shift institutional costs onto individual teachers.

4. Communicating evidence is not the same as changing instruction

The Literacy Octopus trial tested ways of communicating education research, not merely the underlying literacy practices. It involved 823 English primary schools and nine intervention arms against a control. Delivery began in spring 2015 and continued into 2015/16; the report assessed attainment across 2014/15, 2015/16 and 2016/17 cohorts. Some arms offered a research magazine, summaries, searchable evidence, visual guides, booklets and classroom posters, with events or support in some interventions. Lord and colleagues, S5

The evaluation detected no improvement in Key Stage 2 English attainment. Its research-use outcomes also offered no detected improvement, but low response and reliability problems limit that conclusion. The January 2019 addendum revised the score-completeness criteria and retained the null attainment conclusion. Teacher time was not measured as a cost. The study cannot tell us that distributing those materials saved or wasted a particular number of hours.

Attractive presentation and access to evidence do not by themselves establish changes in instruction or attainment. Adding a planning card does not resolve the trial's null result. Equally, failure to detect attainment improvement is not proof that all magazines are futile, that all tested approaches are equivalent, or that readers found nothing interesting. The findings concern the tested communications, populations, implementation and outcomes, not every purpose that reading can serve.

This is important counterevidence for a claim that explaining research is enough to improve teaching. Whether a reader understood a source, found an explanation relevant or gained a useful perspective remains a separate question, requiring its own measure rather than borrowing an attainment result from another intervention.

5. Understandable uncertainty may not feel reassuring

Lortie-Forgues, Sio and Inglis examined teachers' responses to numerical uncertainty in hypothetical Key Stage 2 mathematics interventions. The complete author manuscript describes two online studies with 495 and 500 teachers, mainly in England. Study 1 measured perceived understandability and found no change when uncertainty was communicated. Study 2 did not include that measure. Across the studies, numerical uncertainty lowered perceived effectiveness and trust. Lortie-Forgues, Sio and Inglis, N1 author manuscript

These results concern judgments about vignettes. They do not demonstrate objective comprehension, implementation or classroom outcomes. Participants volunteered; Study 1 had 16% post-randomization attrition, and Study 2 did not record non-completers. Exact field dates were not established in the accessed material. The author manuscript is not guaranteed identical to the final publisher version, which was unavailable in the retrieval used for this review. Linked study materials were not inspected.

Greater transparency should not be promised to increase trust. It may reduce confidence in an effect, and that can be an appropriate response. Nor should a writer conceal uncertainty to protect an activity's appeal. Readers need to identify what was studied, how uncertain the result is and what remains unknown in their setting.

One clear explanation can do more work than a string of caution labels: identify the age group and subject, name the outcome, distinguish a trial from a survey, and locate the qualification beside its claim. A practical example should be distinguishable from the original finding. These are editorial judgments, not a writing recipe validated by the vignette experiments.

6. Direct guidance answers particular questions

The 2007 What Works Clearinghouse guide on organizing instruction offers direct recommendations and implementation steps. Its historical evidence ratings differ by recommendation: spacing is moderate, pre-questions minimal, and quizzing that revisits taught content strong. The guide addresses content learning across varying K-12 and postsecondary populations. Those ratings are not universal rankings of every classroom activity. The complete 63-page guide was accessed, but its underlying studies were not all separately appraised. Pashler and colleagues, S6

The December 2024 K-5 behavior guidance answers a narrower classroom question. Its recommendations include establishing expectations consistent with schoolwide expectations, rated strong, and instructional choice, rated moderate. The accessed official page and complete 26-page summary describe low-intensity practices that complement schoolwide programs. They do not authorize all-age discipline or individualized treatment. The full guide and underlying studies were not separately appraised in this review. IES/WWC, S7

EdReports answers a different question again. Its first-party FAQ describes curriculum-design review, not causal classroom effectiveness, and explains its treatment of completed reviews when review tools change. That scope can inform curriculum comparison; it does not approve an EAG article or show that a lesson will work with a particular class. EdReports, S8

If a reader needs an original guide's steps, a direct link and accurate orientation may be enough. If existing curriculum already answers the task, repackaging it may introduce unnecessary checks. If uncertainty is local, a colleague's contextual knowledge may be more relevant than another generic resource. This review did not audit local provision or establish that these routes are available in a particular school.

7. Adaptation has its own work and limits

Selecting material, checking a prompt, arranging response formats and fitting an activity into an existing routine can remain after a quick download. Finding something faster can transfer work downstream. These are categories to examine, not observed component times or quantified savings in the cited studies.

Adaptation needs separate judgments. Is the change permitted by the actual rights? Does it preserve the relevant parts of the source recommendation? Does it fit the classroom's purpose and access needs? Permission does not establish fidelity, and fidelity does not guarantee a local outcome. If an adaptation changes what students do or what an activity measures, the original evidence cannot be carried over as if nothing changed.

Rights are item-specific. Public access to a study or worksheet is not permission to modify or redistribute it. Linking a source, summarizing findings, reproducing artwork and distributing an adaptation require different checks. Unknown rights can prevent an adaptation from being offered without preventing an accurate explanation or source link. Institutional permission and accessible use remain separate; a protected resource kit cannot be silently copied into a public companion.

A companion should carry something useful, not create an obligation to complete it. Reading can end with understanding a debate, considering an idea or hearing another educator's perspective. An accurate article or interesting account need not become an assignment to count as worthwhile.

8. Understanding, interest, use and outcomes are different

An attributed educator account can explain what happened in a particular setting, which constraints mattered and what the contributor would keep or change. It is not a representative survey or evidence of a causal effect. A writer's interpretation should be distinguishable from a contributor's words, and permission for an article does not automatically cover a promotional excerpt, student image or recording. These are reporting responsibilities, not findings that the cited studies establish about reader preferences.

For readers seeking explanation, assessment can ask whether they distinguish the original finding from interpretation and describe its scope and limits. Interest and relevance can be considered separately. For classroom use, feasibility and the remaining work matter too. Perceived understandability is not objective source understanding; trust is not a substitute for accuracy.

Question	Evidence to seek	What would not answer it
Was the source understood?	Reader explains population, outcome and uncertainty, including the editorial addition	Confidence or satisfaction alone
Was the reading worthwhile?	Reader describes relevance, interest or a useful perspective	A compulsory download or later action
Was a companion worth its effort?	Comparison of checking, preparation, adaptation and remaining work	Faster resource discovery alone
Was the idea used appropriately?	A separately authorized account of actual use and changes	Planning-card completion
Did classroom outcomes change?	A defined intervention, comparator and appropriate classroom study	Positive article feedback

A useful comparison would examine a sourced explanation, that explanation with an optional companion, and an appropriate simpler route for the same task. The comparator might be an original guide, a plain source-linked resource or existing curriculum material. A colleague route belongs only where it actually exists. No sample size, time-saving threshold or attainment target is prescribed without a defined study and baseline.

An early reader investigation can identify confusing claims and impractical requirements; it cannot establish population-wide benefits. Classroom research requires its own consent, school authority and outcome design, not an intervention attached silently to a reading test. If a companion adds work without helping, a shorter alternative or its removal should remain possible. If an article is interesting but produces no classroom action, assess it as reading rather than record a failed implementation.

9. Relevance to Teachers Need More

Teachers Need More is a planned free, resourceful, collegial publication for teachers, specialists and other educators. It belongs beneath Education Needs More within Education Angel Group. Its intended contribution is sourced classroom reading, realistic preparation and material context, optional rights-cleared practical companions and genuine attributed educator perspectives when actual reporting exists. Ordinary reading requires no account, private student records, Runstr participation or classroom action.

The research supports making source scope and practical requirements inspectable, not promising saved time or better classroom outcomes. The Notice, Explain, Try planning card remains an authored proposal. Selecting material, checking prompts and arranging response formats are still work; no classroom testing or observed time saving is established for it. Direct guidance or an existing local resource may suffice without an EAG companion.

This review contains no educator interviews, classroom observations or product-specific reader study. Invented teachers, composite quotations and fictional staff biographies cannot fill that absence. Reporting participation must stay separate from membership or a commercial offer, with permission for the actual use. Topic suggestions should not invite identifiable student details or private classroom records. Source maintenance, rights checks, accessible output, corrections and withdrawal remain publisher responsibilities rather than reader homework. Availability and permission for a particular article or resource require their own verification.

10. Methods, limits and references

This is a focused narrative synthesis, not a systematic review, meta-analysis or market-demand study. It brings together working-condition surveys, material-use evidence, an education-research communication trial, teacher-specific uncertainty experiments, official guidance and first-party comparator documentation. It reuses the original source appraisal recorded in October 2026; this authoring pass does not claim renewed retrieval of those originals.

The source work accessed complete original PDFs for the Arkansas survey, the three RAND reports and Literacy Octopus, including its January 2019 addendum. It accessed the complete teacher-uncertainty author manuscript, not a verified identical publisher version. It accessed the full 2007 instruction guide and the official K-5 behavior page and summary, not every underlying study or the full behavior guide. EdReports was treated as first-party scope documentation. Source checks were bounded to the retrieved material, not an exhaustive correction or retraction search.

The populations, periods and outcomes differ. Historical national hours and Arkansas responses do not establish current demand; English dissemination and vignette studies do not establish U.S. publication effects; survey associations do not show causal instructional changes. No retrieved study measures Teachers

Need More's reader understanding, preparation burden, stress, expenditure, adaptation fidelity or attainment. Actual resource rights, accessible output, editorial responsibility and local permission still require item-specific review.

EAG is responsible for its interpretation and corrections. Readers identifying an error can contact EAG with the section, disputed statement and supporting source. Teachers Need More supplies entity context, not an external source for product effects.

References

External access recorded October 11, 2026 and reused for this synthesis. Publication dates and measured periods are listed separately.

- **S1.** Arkansas Bureau of Legislative Research. Teachers Survey Report. November 3, 2025; January 27-February 24, 2025 survey. Printed pp. 1, 7-8, Q11 and Q13.
- **S2.** Elizabeth D. Steiner, Ashley Woo and Sy Doan. All Work and No Pay. September 12, 2023; reported hours for the 2022/23 school year. Complete 28-page PDF; printed pp. 6-8, Figure 1 and hours discussion, pp. 21-22 methods. Exact field dates were not established in the prior appraisal.
- **S3.** Elizabeth D. Steiner, Phoebe Rose Levine and Sy Doan. Teacher Well-Being, Pay, and Intentions to Leave in 2026. June 8, 2026; January-February 2026 survey, spending recalled for 2024/25. PDF pp. 4, 23-24.
- **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. Printed pp. 1, 7-8, 38-39.
- **S5.** Pippa Lord and colleagues. Evidence-based literacy support: the Literacy Octopus trial. December 2017, January 2019 addendum; 2015-2017 delivery/outcome period. Printed pp. 3-10, 62 and addendum pp. 107-109, 119-120.
- **N1.** Hugues Lortie-Forgues, Ut Na Sio and Matthew Inglis. Should We Communicate the Uncertainty of Educational Effects to Teachers? Author manuscript. Complete 24-page manuscript; methods, results and limits pp. 7-10, 15-16, 18-21. The publisher record reports online August 14, 2026, DOI 10.1080/19345747.2026.2692973; final publisher text was not verified. Exact study field dates remain unresolved.
- **S6.** Harold Pashler and colleagues, IES/WWC. Organizing Instruction and Study to Improve Student Learning. September 2007. Full guide; evidence definitions pp. v-vii, recommendations 1, 5a, 5b and 7.
- **S7.** IES/WWC. Teacher-Delivered Behavioral Interventions in Grades K-5. December 2024. Official recommendation page and 26-page summary, pp. 1-3 and recommendation sections; not full-guide appraisal.

- **S8.** EdReports. 5 Key FAQs About Curriculum Reviews. March 18, 2025. Complete first-party FAQ, design/effectiveness and tool-revision questions.

Product definition. Education Angel Group's current Teachers Need More editorial scope establishes the intended publication and optional companions, not observed implementation or effects.

Figure text and data alternatives

The planning-time figure has a complete text and data alternative in this reader and its text download. Source S1 refers to the Arkansas survey in the references.