

Learning Landscapes Challenge

virtual information session transcript

Logan Cummings, Luminary Labs (00:02):

Great. Let's go ahead and get started. Welcome to the Learning Landscapes Challenge Virtual Information session. My name is Logan Cummings. My pronouns are he/him/his, and I'm an engagement manager at Luminary Labs. We're a strategy and innovation consulting firm. We've run many Open Innovation Challenges across education, health, and scientific discovery, and we're really excited to work with Siegel Family Endowment and the Walton Family Foundation to design and implement the Learning Landscapes Challenge.

(00:30):

Before we get started, we also wanted to share that the session will be recorded and made available on LearningLandscapesChallenge.com. The purpose of this session is to provide an overview of the challenge and answer any questions that you may have. We'll start by providing some background on the opportunity and on what makes the challenge unique. In the challenge details section, we'll then dive into the timeline and structure of the challenge. Finally, we'll share some more details on the submission process. And then we'll have a nice chunk of time at the end for Q&A. As you go through the presentation, please feel free to jot down any questions you might have, then you'll be able to ask them via the Q&A feature in Zoom.

(01:14):

We are so thankful to be joined today by our challenge sponsors, the Siegel Family Endowment and the Walton Family Foundation. Would love to invite them to introduce themselves now. We can start with Ali.

Ali Chin, Siegel Family Endowment (01:28):

Hello everyone. My name is Ali Chin. My pronouns are she/her/hers. I'm a Grantmaking Manager at Siegel Family Endowment

Logan Cummings, Luminary Labs (01:39):

And Josh.

Joshua Elder, Siegel Family Endowment (01:40):

Hi everyone. Joshua Elder, vice president and Head of Grantmaking at Siegel Family Endowment. Pronouns he/him/his. Really excited for everyone to be here today and looking forward to talking about the challenge more.

Logan Cummings, Luminary Labs (01:55):

Thanks, Josh. And Jamie.

Jamie Jutila, The Walton Family Foundation (01:57):

Hi everyone. Oh, thanks Logan. Hi everyone. Jamie Jutila Senior Program Officer with the Walton Family Foundation. My pronouns are she/her/hers, and I'm really excited to talk about the challenge today as well.

Logan Cummings, Luminary Labs (02:11):

Cool. Thanks so much, Jamie. We're also joined by some members of the Luminary Labs team that you'll see popping up in different roles and capacities. So let's get started. So you may be familiar with our call to action, but for those who aren't, the Learning Landscapes Challenge invites changemakers to propose infrastructure solutions that deliver and connect digital, in-school, and community-based learning experiences. So we know that there are a lot of big concepts and assumptions baked into this brief statement. A lot of this session will be about really unpacking what these terms mean in the context of this challenge.

(02:48):

So to start, I'd love to invite Jamie to say a few words about why The Walton Family Foundation saw an opportunity for this challenge and why now is the time for action.

Jamie Jutila, The Walton Family Foundation (02:59):

Yeah, thanks Logan. So the Walton Family Foundation and our education team has been investing in innovative learning experiences and learning models for several years now. We're really excited to see some of the ways that educators and parents and families and communities are coming together to design learning models that are really focused on accelerating learning loss as well as connecting students to the types of experiences that they may not have in their traditional school day. So things like work-based learning and other skill acquisition courses or classes or programs that students are finding are things that are really engaging and developing their passion to learn.

(03:48):

So as we've been developing a lot of the learnings that we've seen across the board from these models and these programs, one of the things that we've noted is that at present, despite a lot of innovation happening, there's not the same type of structures and infrastructure and tools that can support learners to access these models across the many different contexts that learners need them, whether they're in an urban setting or rural setting. We think that to reach greater scale, one of the things we're going to have to innovate on is not just the learning model itself, but also bring innovative solutions to the forefront that can really help students access innovative experiences.

(04:40):

So when we talk about structures and tools for students, that might mean things like transportation. We know that transportation is a major barrier for students in accessing non-traditional learning experiences. But it also might mean things like reimagining the current physical space of a school or reimagining where and when learning can happen, which means communities are going to have to pay close attention to how they're designing their existing and new school buildings, and in building in the right types of digital resources and supports for students.

(05:18):

So the opportunity we see with this challenge is a couple things. One, we are just really excited to see what innovative solutions are out there. So this is a way for us to help elevate and hopefully give a little bit of support to some of the things that are already happening, but be able to better understand what are the things that communities are really grappling with, and where are some of the most promising examples of how schools and communities are coming together to redesign how we better support learners.

(05:51):

The second thing is we think that through a challenge like this with some additional technical assistance and support, we really want to help the teams that are applying to really think about how are they integrating across the different contexts of digital, in-person, and community? How are they designing for future-ready school environments? How are they thinking about what this is going to look like, not tomorrow, but how are they thinking about the 20, 30 years down the road?

(06:19):

And finally, we want to really look for solutions that we think have the greatest potential for transformation and impact. And so this is not going to be able to provide large investment dollars, and so we're really going to be looking for those proposals that we think are best suited, or maybe they already are thinking about ways of leveraging both state and federal investments to ensure that infrastructure is able to become a sustainable piece of a community.

Logan Cummings, Luminary Labs (06:53):

Thanks so much, Jamie. I'd love to bring in Josh and Ali as well to provide some framing on how they see this challenge as unique and a little bit about how we're defining infrastructure.

Joshua Elder, Siegel Family Endowment (07:03):

Yeah, thanks Logan. And completely agree with what Jamie just laid out. And I think for us at Siegel Family Endowment, why we are really excited about this opportunity is that we've been thinking a lot over the last few years around the role of infrastructure. And I can imagine some of you might be

wondering why are we putting such a big emphasis on infrastructure? But for us back in 2020 on the heels of the current administration and all the work and funding around infrastructure, we started thinking about an opportunity to really reimagine and reframe the way that we look at infrastructure.

(07:42):

We are based in New York City. So oftentimes when you think about infrastructure in a New York City context, the first thing we go to is thinking about physical infrastructure and thinking about the subway or bridges. And we said, what if we actually took this time to really reimagine what if we didn't take this isolated view of the individual components of infrastructure? So physical, digital, and social, which Ali will talk a little bit more about, but actually look at it in terms of the intersection.

(08:09):

So we created this multi-dimensional framework and put out a white paper in 2020. And then in 2022 took it a step further to say, what if we actually applied this multi-dimensional infrastructure view to the role of schools? And so we released a white paper around schools as community infrastructure that really guided some of our thought processes to really figuring out the role that infrastructure could play in building a future-ready state of education. And so I'll turn it over to Ali to talk a little bit more about what we're hoping to see and why this multi-dimensional approach here.

Ali Chin, Siegel Family Endowment (08:45):

Thanks Josh. And so building on what Josh discussed, so previous investment has been funneled toward more traditional forms of infrastructure. And by investing in multidimensional approaches, we can really break down silos across sectors and meet students' holistic needs. So in this challenge specifically when thinking about the infrastructure needed for future-ready learning environments, it's less about the individual types of infrastructure you see here, but more about the connective tissues that really bring them together in order to integrate and expand learning across digital, in-school, and community contexts as Jamie and Josh touched on before.

(09:21):

And so the scope of multidimensional infrastructure is broad. So on this slide we've included some examples within physical, digital, and social infrastructure that entrants can consider. But we also want to note that this is not an exhaustive list. This is just a sample and it's also not required for entrants to incorporate all three dimensions of infrastructure in their solutions. More information too, including additional examples of infrastructure opportunities can be found on the resources page of the website. I'll pass it back to Logan to go more into detail about the challenge,

Logan Cummings, Luminary Labs (09:58):

So with that framing in mind, we'll dig a bit into the challenge incentives and what makes a challenge unique. So obviously we know that the prize pool is one obvious incentive for participation, but in a survey that we conducted of entrants from our past Open Innovation Challenges, we actually found that the non-monetary incentives were seen as even more valuable and transformative for their work. That's not to say that the prize funds aren't important. Prize funds are intended to be catalytic, supporting entrants to further develop solutions, but also as Jamie alluded to, really accessing greater and more sustainable funding sources.

(10:32):

The technical support and mentorship in phases two and three will really be tailored based off of the submissions that we receive and the specific needs identified to further flesh out, refine, and test solutions and support linkages to partners and potential funding sources. And then finally, the challenge offers access to like-minded changemakers and partners and due to the challenge's visibility, the potential to connect with a national network outside of the challenge community.

(11:00):

So many of you are probably more familiar with traditional grants. While there are some similarities, challenges are generally less prescriptive in terms of how they're achieving a certain outcome and how they can be used to incentivize earlier stage concept generation. You'll notice that the way that we've scoped parts of the challenge is quite broad, and this is by design. We want to see a diverse set of ideas and entrants, really sourcing broad ideas from those closest to the work before narrowing in subsequent phases.

(11:31):

So challenges are also unique in their flexibility regarding the prize funding. While a grant generally funds specific activities, outputs and outcomes, a prize is an incentive for participation. There are no reporting requirements or specific restrictions on how and when the funding can be used. So I'll now pass it over to my Luminary Labs colleague Ellie to run through the structure of the challenge.

Ellie Kiernan, Luminary Labs (11:56):

Great, thanks Logan. Let's dive into the challenge in more detail. So the Learning Landscapes challenge is a multi-phase competition spanning from February, 2024 to June, 2025. Each phase builds on the next, so with submission requirements increasing as the challenge progresses. We'll get into that in a bit. But we're currently in phase one, which started in February and runs through June, 2024. In phase one, entrants will submit concepts for their innovative infrastructure solutions.

(12:29):

Then phase two will take place from June to October, 2024. Teams will participate in a 14-week virtual accelerator and then be invited to submit detailed proposals of their solutions. And then finally, phase three, that will take place from October, 2024 to June, 2025 and teams will participate in a six-month incubator and then be invited to submit prototypes and implementation plans. I'll go into more detail on each of these phases over the next few slides. So just hold tight if you have more questions on that.

(13:03):

Let's get into the prizes. So the total prize pool is \$2.2 million, which will be distributed across three phases. At the end of phase one, up to 40 winners will receive at least \$5,000 each. At the end of phase two, up to five winners will receive at least \$200,000 each. And then at the end of phase three, up to two grand prize winners will receive [inaudible 00:13:27] each.

(13:31):

So getting into the details of each of the phases. So we are in phase one now. During this phase, we are inviting eligible entrants to submit concepts for innovative infrastructure solutions. Submissions close at 7:59 P.M. Eastern time on May 14th. As a part of their concept submissions, entrants will be expected to broadly articulate the unmet learning need, their infrastructure solution to solve it, the intended learning experience, the evidence base, and a plan for partnerships. Judges will review all eligible submissions and assign scores based on the phase one evaluation criteria. In June, up to 40 phase one winners will be announced and invited to participate in the phase two virtual accelerator.

(14:24):

So judges will use the phase one evaluation criteria to evaluate each submission. Each criterion is worth 20 points for up to a total of 100 points. So right now I'll paraphrase the criteria, but I encourage you to read the criteria carefully on the challenge website to get the full detail. And my colleague should be sharing a link to the criteria in the chat if you want to take a closer look.

(14:49):

So ingenuity of the infrastructure solution speaks to how the submission innovatively uses multidimensional infrastructure to meet the needs of their target student population.

(15:00):

Scale of learning need speaks to the extent to which the submission explores and articulates the specific learning need of the target students and community and how that need will evolve over time and be generalizable in other contexts.

(15:16):

Impact speaks to the extent that a submission articulates a theory of change backed by learning science and metrics, and then maps towards students' future success.

(15:26):

Community engagement speaks to how the submission demonstrates authentic local presence and trust in the target community.

(15:33):

And finally, feasibility of implementation really speaks to the extent that the submission articulates a near-term delivery plan, inclusive of pathways to partnerships, resources, and capacity.

(15:49):

Okay, phase two overview. In phase two teams will participate in a virtual accelerator, which will include webinars, mentor office hours, and partnership development assistance. At the end of the accelerator, phase two teams will submit a detailed proposal describing their refined solutions, how they have validated any early assumptions, and information about additional partnerships. Phase two submissions will be due in September 2024, but we'll be sharing more details about the submission process and deadline during phase two. Judges will review all eligible submissions and assign scores based on the phase two evaluation criteria. And in October, up to five phase two winners will be announced and invited to participate in the phase three incubator.

(16:39):

Okay, so you might notice the titles of phase two evaluation criteria are the same as phase one, and that is by design. The descriptions, however, in phase two reflect higher expectations in line with the level of fidelity. So let me give you two examples. In phase one, the community engagement criterion is used to evaluate the level of local presence and knowledge entrants demonstrate in their submissions. Whereas in phase two, community engagement criterion is used to evaluate the extent to which the entrant has established and committed partnerships. So it goes from local knowledge and presence to establishment of partnerships.

(17:19):

Another example, the impact criterion evolves from expecting a theory of change in phase one to a logic model in phase two. You'll see that same leveling up in expectations between phase two and three descriptions as well. The phase two criteria are also available on the challenge website, but please note that these criteria are preliminary and will be finalized prior to the beginning of the phase.

(17:49):

Phase three consists of an incubator which will kick off with an in-person boot camp. Teams will then receive tailored technical support to help them develop their solutions. And at the end of phase three, teams will submit prototypes and implementation plans. The team will then participate in a live demo day where they will present their solutions and have a final Q&A in front of judges. Up to two grand prize winners will be selected to receive \$500,000 each. Similar to phase two, phase three criteria titles are the same, but the descriptions will reflect a higher expectation in line with fidelity. Again, these criteria are preliminary and will be finalized prior to the beginning of the phase.

(18:38):

Let's talk through how to participate in the challenge. So we received quite a few questions about eligibility via the Eventbrite RSVP, so hopefully this clears up a lot of those questions.

(18:54):

Eligible entrants must designate a single individual or entity as the lead and that lead must have a primary place of operations in the U.S. Leads are however welcome to partner with international organizations if they wish. All entrants must be 18 of years of age or older to participate. An entrant can be current or past recipients of grant or other non-contractual funding from Siegel Family Endowment, the Walton Family Foundation, Education Reimagined and/or Luminary Labs. And finally, by the end of phase two, entrant teams must be led by a nonprofit organization with a 501(c)(3) status. As a reminder, phase two submissions aren't due until September, so teams have several months to form these partnerships if required. And we will also be providing support to help teams connect with potential partners during phase two. That's a key part of that programming.

(19:55):

So we want to make sure that all entrants feel supported as they familiarize themselves with the challenge and prepare their submissions. If you haven't already, we encourage potential entrants to visit the challenge website LearningLandscapesChallenge.com, review the submissions form, and sign up for the newsletter to receive important challenge updates.

(20:15):

We have also compiled a range of resources to help potential entrants learn more about topics such as multidimensional infrastructure, equitable impact, and sustainable scaling. I know the paper that Josh mentioned earlier is linked in that resources page, so feel free to check that out as well. We also recommend you add hello@LearningLandscapesChallenge.com to your address book so key emails from us, don't go into your spam folders. Very important.

(20:46):

Okay, if you are planning to submit, you will need to first off create a Luminary Lightbox account, which you can find by going to the submit page on the challenge website. Review the rules, terms and conditions, and phase one criteria and complete and submit the phase one submission form prior to 7:59 P.M. Eastern Standard Time on May 14th. We really do encourage you to submit early to avoid any last-minute technical issues. If you do experience any issues, please take a screenshot and email the challenge team with a description of the issue and the time you encountered it.

(21:24):

I'm now going to hand it over to my colleague Logan, who will be responding to your questions.

Logan Cummings, Luminary Labs (21:31):

Thanks, Ellie. So if you have a question, please share it in the Q&A box in Zoom. We'll start by answering some of the questions that we received via the Eventbrite Registration. So thanks to those that submitted questions as part of your RSVP.

(21:45):

We do have a lot of attendees today, so we might not be able to answer everyone's questions. If we don't get to your question, please feel free to follow up via email, but we will also be publishing a written FAQ on the challenge website in the coming weeks covering everything that we're discussing today, as well as questions that we might not have gotten to.

(22:04):

Unsurprisingly, we received many questions about how we're defining infrastructure for the challenge. I can't say it better than Josh and Ali described earlier, but just as a quick reminder, we are defining infrastructure broadly through a multidimensional lens, that is as physical, digital, and social tools, structures, resources and systems needed to effectively implement and scale learning experiences.

(22:27):

As Ali mentioned, we have an illustrative list of examples of these types of infrastructure on the resources section of the website. This is also left intentionally open because we want to hear from entrants. We want to hear from you about how you define key infrastructure needed for learning. Solutions do not have to address every dimension of infrastructure. What we're looking for is solutions or submissions that reflect a thoughtful and holistic consideration of the infrastructure needed to implement your solution. The most competitive submissions will integrate multiple types of infrastructure. We would recommend reviewing the criterion on ingenuity of

infrastructure solution to see how this expectation will evolve across the phases of the challenge.

(23:08):

We also received a number of questions about what are some elements that we hope to see in strong submissions. So I'll again highlight the evaluation criteria, describe some of the elements of a strong submission, but you'll see that these criteria are fairly open and do not presuppose a particular solution or prioritize any particular types of infrastructure. But I'd actually love to bring in Josh and Jamie to say a little bit about what they're hoping to see in some of the submissions. Josh, do you want to start?

Joshua Elder, Siegel Family Endowment (23:39):

Sure. Happy to start. No, and I think as what Logan said before, I think for us, really excited to think about what opportunities present themselves and really focusing on the infrastructure, again, to the point that it doesn't need to touch on all aspects, but really thinking about an element in this point as well, that we know previous kind of efforts in education as well as funding have been very siloed. And it's one of the obstacles I think we have faced in terms of not being able to actually get the system of education to be responsive and adapt to what we know is needed for students and families to really be set up for success no matter the pathway that they choose in life.

(24:22):

And so I think this opportunity of really reframing and looking at opportunities to connect both the digital, the social, and what goes on in and out of school is really timely as we think about all the different things that we're hearing about what the future state of education looks like, the role of technology within that. And so really just encourage people to think about how they can really push. And I know people are doing this, really push and going against the grain, getting outside of the box to think about how you can partner and bring together some of the key stakeholders to really figure out the role that infrastructure plays and how it'll set up the students and families in which you serve or even the community stakeholders in which you serve.

(25:06):

But Jamie, keen to hear your thoughts as well because I know Walton has done a lot of thinking about this as well.

Jamie Jutila, The Walton Family Foundation (25:12):

Yeah, no, Josh, I completely agree. I mean we're really excited to see what people are thinking about when they're uniquely leveraging the sort of multidimensional approach.

(25:24):

The second thing I would say that we are really excited about is one, well, we want to understand what the different big areas of need and problems are that you guys are identifying. So we intentionally did not limit the types of infrastructure or define for you all what could come forward. And so if you look at what falls into the three different categories, it's really broad. But we may find that data infrastructure and interoperability is a major problem area. So we may find that transportation or other things. So we'd like to understand where are we seeing some strong alignment across communities.

(26:17):

The second thing I would say from a Walton perspective is we have seen a lot of small scale pilots that are underway or that communities have been moving for a while. And I think for a challenge like this, we are really excited to see some ideas and proposals that are thinking about moving towards larger impact, like how do we take an idea or a solution and think about how we leverage that not just in one classroom or one school, but how do we leverage a solution that might be able to be done district-wide, or community-wide, or even statewide? So think about how we get to more systemic transformational change more quickly and how we really leverage what could be a statewide infrastructure play because that will allow more students to be reached more quickly, and especially students that might not be in a traditional urban area, those who may not have access to the traditional forms of infrastructure if they're in communities that are more rural, or just happen not to be where there's large public districts.

Logan Cummings, Luminary Labs (27:38):

Thanks so much, Jamie and Josh. So we also had a number of questions regarding who's eligible to participate in the challenge. Ellie provided an overview of this earlier and the full eligibility details are in the challenge rules terms and conditions. But wanted to underline a few specific answers to some questions that were asked.

(28:00):

So as Ellie mentioned, only U.S.-based organizations are eligible as lead entrants and the solution should be planned for implementation in the U.S. However, you're welcome to partner with international organizations if you wish to do so.

(28:13):

Past or current grantees of sponsor organizations are eligible to apply. However, employees or contractors of these organizations are not eligible. Schools and school districts are eligible to apply in phase one. However, like other entrants, they will need to be either a 501(c)(3) nonprofit or partner with a 501(c)(3) to be eligible for phases two and three. And entrants can apply as individuals, as groups of individuals, as organizations, or as coalitions of

organizations. Partnerships between multiple organizations is encouraged, particularly in phases two and three, though not explicitly required.

(28:53):

We also receive several questions as to how mature or advanced concepts should be or should not be in order to be considered. Solutions should be well-thought-out, but they can be quite early stage as phases two and three will provide technical support to refine and further develop the solutions. More mature or previously developed solutions are still eligible to apply; however, we want to ensure that solutions stand to benefit from participation in the challenge, meaning that they should not be fully developed or already implemented at scale.

(29:25):

We received some other questions regarding whether specific interventions or areas of focus were in scope. Unfortunately, we can't weigh in on each of these; however, if your solution is focused on K-12 public education in the U.S., focuses on the development of education infrastructure, and is ultimately aimed at improving learning outcomes, we'd encourage you to apply. We'd encourage you to review the submission form and criteria to determine whether your solution would be a good fit for the challenge.

(29:54):

Another set of questions focused on the types of learners targeted by solutions. So solutions do not need to cover the full range of K-12 education. You are welcome to focus on specific grades, age ranges, or subpopulations. Higher education is not in scope as the main focus for implementation; however, you are welcome to include linkages or partnerships with higher education institutions as part of your solution.

(30:20):

Organizations working on a national scale are welcome to submit concepts, but need to identify specific communities for implementation, whether geographic or otherwise. Solutions can also focus on out-of-system or out-of-school time; however, they should be ultimately focused on learning outcomes. And while evidence generation can be included in a concept, solutions should include implementation of infrastructure for the improvement of learning outcomes and not be purely research-based.

(30:53):

So I know we had a lot of questions both in the Eventbrite as well as in the Q&A now around the desired scale of solutions. So we had a lot of questions around how we're defining scale and whether a certain level of scale is required. A specific definition or level of scale is not required. It will be dependent on your solution and theory of change. You'll be asked to define your anticipated scale of impact as part of the application. You should aim

for a meaningful and ambitious level of scale suited to your specific solution and community.

(31:24):

And Josh, I know Siegel has done a lot of work around defining scale for smaller organizations, so would welcome any thoughts that you have to add here.

Joshua Elder, Siegel Family Endowment (31:34):

Yeah, no, absolutely. I think for us, the journey to scale and impact has been really interesting given the fact that we are strong believers that there isn't a cookie cutter approach to scale. We recently just did a panel with some of our grantees at SXSW EDU and talked about the different variations of scale deep, scale wide, scale up, scale down, and really understanding for us what drives that is the context and not forcing organizations to scale to a certain degree.

(32:07):

I think within that, being very mindful and understanding the pathway to scale and the impact that organizations want to have and the role that the data plays to help guide that. And so that's something that I know and Walton as well, is just been being very mindful and understanding what's the impact that the organization is trying to have? How do you make sure there are aligned data and metrics that can kind of support what that pathway looks like? And so I think for us, really interested to see as organizations are thinking about deepening their impact or widening their impact, what does that look like and how we can help really define that and shape that around the landscape?

Logan Cummings, Luminary Labs (32:49):

Josh. So then another area that we've had both a lot of questions in advance, and I know it's also popping up in the Q&A, is around kind of the particularities of a challenge versus a grant and any of the requirements of funding.

(33:05):

So as a prize, again, there are no restrictions on how the money can be spent and no formal follow-up financial reporting. So grant considerations such as indirect cost rates aren't applicable. The budget estimates that you're providing in the submission are for information only. This is not intended to be an accounting for how you will specifically plan to spend prize funding.

(33:27):

So we articulated a little bit about how a challenge is different from a grant, but we also received some questions around how this challenge in particular is unique and different from other education challenges. I would point mostly to, number one, the specific focus on infrastructure as a gap that we had identified. Number two, to the openness in the early stage, an openness to early stage solutions and really focusing on a broad group of entrants. And

then finally, the multi-stage or the multi-phase design is really intended to support the further development and prototyping of solutions, which is a bit unique from other challenges that might be a one-phase sourcing mechanism or competition.

(34:11):

So we had some other questions around the submission format. So as Ellie noted, the submission format is through what we call the Luminary Lightbox platform that's integrated into the challenge website. So the submission format is a series of short answer questions embedded in that platform accessible on the website. Submissions will only be accepted via this form, so please do not draft separate proposal documents. And note as you're drafting that there are word limits for each question that cannot be exceeded. And part of the intention of setting up the submission in this way is to really level the playing field for organizations.

(34:49):

By standardizing submissions in this format, we're not privileging organizations with greater grant writing capability or capacity. Altogether the text required for phase-one submissions is only the equivalent of about six to seven pages. But I would recommend reviewing the submission form as early as possible. I would also note that in addition to answering all of the questions, we do ask for three brief statements of community support. So please do review the submission form and all the requirements as early as possible to make sure that you have the lead time needed to gather that information.

(35:24):

So we received the number of questions as well about the criteria judging process and timeline. So as noted, you can find the criteria for each phase and the full timeline on the challenge website. In terms of judging for phase one, judging will consist of an evaluation of your submission by three separate members of a judging panel. The judging panel will consist of a diverse group of experts including educators and education sector thought leaders, technology and ed tech specialists, and practitioners across infrastructure and community design. Based on the evaluations from the judging panel, Siegel Family Endowment and Walton Family Foundation will make the final winner determination.

(36:04):

In phases two and three, there will be more opportunity for interaction with the judges. In phase two, we anticipate having a Q&A as part of the judging process. And in phase three there will be a demo day for presentations and live Q&A with the judges. So more information on the selection of judges for phase one will be provided prior to the closure of phase one submissions.

(36:27):

There were a number of questions regarding how to connect with potential partners both during and after phase one. So during phase one, we really encourage you to begin considering partnerships that you will need to refine and implement your solution. You should have a good sense of what these partnerships might be, whether or not you have already secured them for your phase one application. We encourage you to broadcast your interest and begin reaching out to potential partners in your network and in your community. But there's no formal platform through the challenge to matchmake or facilitate these conversations.

(37:00):

However, during phase two, there will be more active support for partnership both between phase one winners and with other external organizations. Phase one winners will form a cohort community with an opportunity to learn from one another and form potential partnerships. And as mentioned, the phase two accelerator will provide technical support for identifying potential partnerships and forming equitable partnerships.

(37:26):

Finally, we received several questions from organizations that were interested in supporting the challenge but didn't necessarily see themselves as an entrant. So wanted to highlight a few opportunities to get involved. First, you can share the challenge with your networking partners. We have a communications toolkit with sample language that you can share. Just let us know and we'll provide that with you. We'll also be reaching out to recruit members for the judging panel. And then finally, we'll be looking for additional organizations to provide technical support, in phases two and three especially. So you can reach out to partnerships at LearningLandscapesChallenge.com if you're interested in any of these opportunities or discussing further.

(38:08):

So looking to some of the questions that we are also receiving now with the chat. So we had one question, whether solutions have to be infrastructure-based or if they can be policy solutions. So ultimately there does need to be a focus on infrastructure in the solutions. They can include policy considerations, but they should not be purely policy solutions. For example, if you're thinking of a solution that incorporates out-of-school time, policy considerations or policy constraints on seat-time regulations might be of interest and you might note that and incorporate that into your solution. However, if a solution is just aimed at policy change, that would not ultimately be seen as competitive according to the criteria.

(39:00):

So we had another question around the anticipated time commitment required to participate in the accelerator and the expected value that we expect it to bring to participants. So again, we'll share a lot more information on the phase two accelerator. Part of the intention is that it will really be tailored based off of what we're seeing in phase one, but ultimately it will be self-paced and intended to support the development of your solutions. So there will be a number of informational webinars on different topics to help you develop your solution, whether it's in identifying metrics and refining your measurement plan, or finding the right partnerships for your solution. So there'll be a mix of different technical areas with webinars, with mentor office hours to provide specific time and advice. And then you'll also have time to refine your submission before phase two solutions.

(40:01):

So we had a question around who will be evaluating proposals at each stage. So as mentioned, it'll be a multidisciplinary group of judges. We'll announce those prior to the end of the phase. We encourage you to sign up for the newsletter to be notified when this is announced. In phases two and three, we expect it to be a smaller subset of that judging panel, but made up of a similar multidisciplinary and diverse group.

(40:40):

Right, just looking through some other questions coming in. Again, please feel free to submit if you haven't already. We're sorting through ones that we've already spoken to.

Jamie Jutila, The Walton Family Foundation (41:12):

Logan, did you want Josh or I to address the question about applying to Walton directly versus this challenge?

Logan Cummings, Luminary Labs (41:21):

Yes, happy to have you come in on that.

Jamie Jutila, The Walton Family Foundation (41:23):

Yeah, so Josh or Ali, you guys can speak. I think we have a lot of organizations that either receive funding through different types of intermediaries or challenges or projects that Walton supports. And so if you are applying to a challenge like this and you know you receive support from either Walton or Siegel, it's always helpful to note that. But please know that this does not preclude you from applying to a different challenge that we might fund. Or if you're in conversations with Walton about receiving funding directly, we would want to understand the differences between the projects, but it wouldn't mean you couldn't apply to multiple places for funding. And Josh, is that the same for Siegel?

Joshua Elder, Siegel Family Endowment (42:18):

Yeah, no, I completely agree. And the fact that we actually don't have an application process. So a lot of our kind of grants are based off of the conversations and kind of active sourcing that our team does. So I definitely think I would encourage people if you are in talks with us or recently met with us or even current grantees, as we have check-ins or start to think about grant conversations, just let us know and then we can follow up. But completely agree, it doesn't preclude you from the opportunity there.

Logan Cummings, Luminary Labs (42:50):

Thanks both. I got another question around whether funding is available for the expansion or augmentation of existing programming. So as mentioned briefly, there's no requirement of a specific level of, it doesn't have to be a brand new idea or a fully implemented model. The main guiding principle here is that there does need to be an infrastructure need identified and there should be a potential benefit from participation in the challenge. So if you are looking to expand programming that's already being implemented, there should be a consideration of what is the infrastructure needed to do that expansion and that should fit. You should evaluate that need according to the criteria.

(43:45):

Another question whether innovations need to be classroom learning-based, if there is room for models outside of that. So the innovations do not need to be focused on classroom learning. They can focus on out-of-school time or out-of-system learning; however, they should clearly link to learning outcomes in your theory of change. I think that should also answer the question around whether they can pertain to afterschool programming or educational programming in general. The answer is yes.

(44:27):

There's a question whether this is only for tech-based schools or online learning. No. All eligible schools are invited to enter. So while digital infrastructure is one kind of arm of the challenge, that does not mean that we are only looking for tech-based or tech-enabled solutions.

(44:52):

Had another question, clarifying whether or not the openness around prize funding is specific to phase one or to phases two and three as well. That is across the board. So the prize, the definition of the prize, will remain the same across phases one, two and three.

(45:18):

So we had one question referring to the conversation at SXSW EDU sharing that talent could be considered infrastructure. Can you talk about how you see talent-related projects connecting to this challenge? Josh or Jamie, do you want to come in on that, given that I think those were your comments?

Jamie Jutila, The Walton Family Foundation (45:43):
If talent qualifies as infrastructure. Is that the question?

Logan Cummings, Luminary Labs (45:47):
Yeah, I think the specific-

Jamie Jutila, The Walton Family Foundation (45:48):
I'm not seeing the question.

Logan Cummings, Luminary Labs (45:50):
Yeah, I think the specific question or I think the specific comment that was made is around talent development being considered as part of infrastructure. So as part of thinking about work-based learning or as part of thinking about career and technical education, preparing educators and providing the tools and resources for them can be considered infrastructure.

Jamie Jutila, The Walton Family Foundation (46:15):

Josh, do you guys have a perspective on that? I feel like this one is really maybe right on the cusp of whether or not. I think it could be part of a infrastructure solution for providing work-based learning or CTE programming. But Josh, I'm curious about Siegel's perspective on talent and teacher training.

Joshua Elder, Siegel Family Endowment (46:41):
Yeah, no, completely agree and I think I remember us talking about that and I think it was related to how so much of what we are thinking about and brainstorming will rely on the actual human capital and human talent to execute this, in particular on the CTE side. And so I think what would be critical is to understand as we're thinking about going back to the beginning, how does it link to the other components of infrastructure? I think certainly acknowledging that it is critical to the implementation and the sustainability of it, but it would be interesting to just understand how it is interrelated to other components there.

Logan Cummings, Luminary Labs (47:29):
We have some questions around how we're thinking about scalability and sustainability within the timeframe of the challenge. So the one thing that I do want to differentiate is how we're thinking about it within the challenge. Generally by the end of phase three, what we're looking for is proof points and demonstration of potential.

(47:47):
So we're not looking for solutions to be scaled within the confines of the challenge. What we're looking for is concepts that they have tested their

largest assumptions, they're tested elements at small scale through prototyping and have evidence that they can provide early signs of scalability and sustainability. So a lot of what phase three will focus on is doing the planning for implementation, planning for who will be the funders, what will the governance structure be, and what are the plans for long-term sustainability. We know that winning phase three is not sufficient to implement and scale most of these ideas on their own. This challenge is really focused on linking these solutions to longer-term funding and sustainability partners.

(48:43):

So we received a question. Working in multiple school districts or within a large state, does a participant need to be more single-place based? So the scope or definition of the target community is dependent on your theory of change. So we're not defining you have to work in one town, in one county. It is up to you to define the proper level of implementation. And what we do want to see is especially beginning in phase one, demonstration of authentic local presence and trust, signaled by a knowledge of local needs, barriers, community assets and partnerships needed for a solution in your community.

(49:58):

I'm looking through other questions. Is this required to focus on public schools or can be around alternatives? So as mentioned this, it does not have to be focused on public school in-system learning. It has to be focused on ultimately laddering up to learning outcomes for students.

Jamie Jutila, The Walton Family Foundation (50:25):

Logan, can I chime in on, there's a couple questions around the prize amounts, the thinking there, and just to just double down on this, public versus private. I think this was not designed to be philanthropy coming into supplant or replace where the public system should be funding infrastructure for public education, and education generally in this country. So this \$500,000 is more like a prize amount to help an existing effort that has gone through this challenge, this competition to develop their proposal in a way where they could go out and then seek the support of investment from the community, investment from the state, investment from the federal government.

(51:19):

So we don't envision and we never did envision that the appropriate role for philanthropy is to come in and play a role where traditionally the government is providing that funding. So I want to name that, because infrastructure is very expensive. And so this shouldn't be looked at as an opportunity to get funding that would fully fund your implementation of your new structures or tools or supports. You'll have to bring in additional funding for that. But the process by which we've designed it is meant to help proposals get to that phase or that stage, and some of you might be further along than others.

(52:05):

And then just to the public versus private, we recognize that in certain states there is public funding available for non-traditional solutions and we know in certain states there are not. So we don't want to preclude states or communities from applying who are maybe working in an out-of-system context but in a state that doesn't have existing public funding. But we recognize that might be more of a challenge when we start to talk about the sustainability question because that'll be a big question about how are you thinking about the ongoing sustainability of this solution since the prizes aren't designed to give you the full dollar amount for implementation.

Logan Cummings, Luminary Labs (52:53):

Thanks Jamie. And then we had another question around the focus on K-12 and transitions in this case specifically pre-K to kindergarten. I think we've also had this question in the past around the secondary education to the workforce or to higher education. I think we are open to looking at the linkages between these systems. So I think ultimately if you're looking at the linkage between pre-K to kindergarten that is still, as long as it's focused on learning outcomes for kindergartners for easing that transition, I would see that as within scope for the challenge.

(53:55):

Last questions we're sorting through. We just have a few minutes left. Again, if we don't have time for your question today, we are following up with many questions in the FAQ as well.

(54:37):

And then some other questions around a for-profit establishing a nonprofit and whether you can apply with the for-profit and nonprofit together. Again, we just stress that for phase two, the lead entrant identified on the proposal needs to be a 501(c)(3) nonprofit, whoever they partner with, whether it's a for-profit affiliated or another for-profit or other institution that is up to them, but the lead entrant does need to be a 501(c)(3).

(55:29):

Maybe one final question. Jamie and Josh, if you don't mind me putting you on the spot a little bit, I know we've had some questions around what we mean by learning outcomes. Can you say a little bit about how we expect entrants to, what types of outcomes we're open to and how we're open to defining those?

Jamie Jutila, The Walton Family Foundation (55:57):

Yeah, I'll start. I think when we say learning outcomes, what we're going to be looking for are folks that are focused on outcomes that are measurable and that indicate that there's research, there's evidence that if students are

achieving these particular outcomes, that's going to help them in their future success. So it wouldn't be like enrollment into a program. It' what's the result of that program? What has a student acquired in terms of their skills, their knowledge, their understanding of the concepts and mastery of those concepts?

(56:43):

So what is an acceptable outcome? Academic learning outcomes is absolutely in that category. But it may also be that you're really focused on industry recognized credentials, for example, or other types of, maybe it's computer science skills. So I think the most important thing is that we really want to be focused on the acquisition of knowledge and skills for learners. And it does need to be something that is measurable and something that there is an evidence base for why it matters for future success.

Logan Cummings, Luminary Labs (57:21):

Wonderful. Thanks Jamie. I'm sorry. I know we're just running over time. Thank you again everyone so much. And thank you for Jamie, Ali and Josh for joining us today. Encourage you to again visit the Challenge website LearningLandscapesChallenge.com to learn more and sign up for the Challenge Newsletter to stay engaged on the process. Thank you all so much and looking forward to continuing the conversation. Have a great day everyone.