



Creating a City-Based Blended Learning Network

*Prepared for the Cities for Education Entrepreneurship Trust (CEE-Trust)
by Joe Ableidinger, Public Impact*

August 2014



CEE -TRUST

The Cities for Education Entrepreneurship Trust



About CEE-Trust

CEE-Trust is a national nonprofit dedicated to helping cities ensure that every child has access to high-quality public schools. We support a growing network of foundations and nonprofits that are leading efforts to dramatically improve public education in their cities. For more about CEE-Trust, please visit www.cee-trust.org.

About Public Impact

Public Impact's mission is to dramatically improve learning outcomes for all children in the United States, with a special focus on students who are not served well. We are a team of professionals from many backgrounds, including former teachers. We are researchers, thought leaders, tool-builders, and on-the-ground consultants who work with leading education reformers. Learn more at www.publicimpact.com.

Introduction

City-based education reform organizations across the country are developing strategies to increase the number of high-quality blended learning options in their cities.¹ In a separate white paper, CEE-Trust explored the roles of city-based organizations in scaling up successful blended learning pilots.² This white paper examines the roles these organizations can play in **building networks of innovative educators who are designing and implementing high-quality blended learning**.

The impetus for this paper was a series of conversations among CEE-Trust leaders, members, and partners about the value of creating a network of educators focused on blended learning. In 2013, two CEE-Trust members—The Chicago Public Education Fund (“The Fund”) and CityBridge Foundation—pioneered innovative networks for educators aimed in part at increasing the high-quality blended learning alternatives available to students in Chicago and Washington, D.C.³ These organizations have led the charge as their cities have become national exemplars for the design and launch of programs and whole-school models that personalize learning for students.⁴ In addition to creating blended learning networks, The Fund and CityBridge are supporting partners in the Next Generation Learning Challenges (NGLC) Regional Fund for Breakthrough Schools. The NGLC fund establishes regional grant competitions that support entrepreneurial educators in developing personalized, blended, mastery-based approaches at the school level.⁵

This paper provides brief snapshots of blended learning networks created by The Fund and CityBridge. In addition, it draws on lessons their leaders have learned to generate a list of key questions useful for leaders of other city-based education reform organizations as they design their own blended learning networks (see Appendix). The Fund and CityBridge are not profiled as having chosen the “right way” to create a blended learning network, but as examples of field leaders who have thoughtfully approached the challenges of network design.

The Chicago Public Education Fund: Building an Innovative Educator Network in Chicago

The nonprofit Chicago Public Education Fund (“The Fund”) works to build a critical mass of great public schools in Chicago by investing in talented principals and enabling effective educator teams to reinvent classroom learning. Similar to a venture capital firm, The Fund raises an individual investment fund every four to five years tied to specific goals and outcomes. Investors in The Fund include a broad cross section of Chicago’s business, civic, and philanthropic leaders. Over time, The Fund has maintained a close relationship with, and acted as an independent thought partner to, Chicago Public Schools, the third-largest public school district in the country.

The Fund wrapped up “Fund 3” in 2012. This \$25 million fund, which launched in 2008, focused on elevating the performance of educators, while also investing in innovation at the school level. Previous investment funds (1 and 2) centered on building principal and teacher pipelines for Chicago Public Schools. Fund 4 will also include significant investments in innovative classroom and school models.

In 2013, The Fund took a first, major step in this new area, dedicating \$250,000 to engage entrepreneurial educators in its Innovative Educator Network.⁶ The Fund solicited nominations for prospective participants in the network from nonprofit and public partners, including Chicago Public Schools, the Office of Chicago Mayor Rahm Emanuel, and New Schools for Chicago (a CEE-Trust affiliate). From nearly 45 school applicant teams, The Fund selected 16 teams—each composed of two to four teachers and principals—as members in the pioneering cohort. The teams represent traditional district, charter, and turnaround schools.

The Fund describes the network as “a professional learning community for educators committed to dramatically improving student outcomes by reinventing the structure and practice of classroom instruction through the use of time, technology, and talent.”⁷ Heather Y. Anichini, president and CEO of The Fund, says of the network: “We invest directly in high-performing educators and ask them to think about what kinds of innovations are going to make the difference in their classrooms and schools, to implement those innovations, and then to test and see what happens over time, making adjustments to ensure that they get not incremental gains but transformational gains for their students.”⁸

Network teams participated in the six-week Summer Design Program to confront specific instructional and engagement challenges they identified at their schools. Over the six weeks, teams honed their understanding of the challenges and engaged in a design and rapid iteration process to develop solutions. Teams were exposed to innovative educational approaches through workshops and intensive meetings with regional and national education experts and design consultants. At the program’s final session, each team presented its plan to overcome challenges and improve student outcomes to a panel of educators, stakeholders, and education technology experts. Based on the quality of their plans, five teams received investments of up to \$10,000 to seed their projects, as well as additional personalized coaching and support from The Fund and other experts during the 2013–14 school year. The 11 other teams received smaller investments to further develop their ideas.⁹

Several of the summer 2013 winning teams included blended learning in their proposals. For example, Spencer Elementary Technology Academy designed a first- and second-grade blended learning literacy curriculum. According to their plan, students will be grouped by ability rather than age, and will learn through small groups, one-on-one time with teachers, peer-to-peer engagement, and online activities. “The Summer Design Program gave us a unique opportunity to collaborate amongst colleagues that are trying to integrate innovative programs within their schools,” Spencer Principal Shawn Jackson says. “It also gave us an opportunity to work in our group. We all bring something unique to the process, and the students come with so many varied needs, not only academically but also socially. This program gave us the opportunity to really synthesize what was going on in our building and to try to develop some way of solving the problem together.”¹⁰

Educators at Cesar E. Chavez Multicultural Academic Center used the Summer Design Program to create more time for individualized learning, using after-school programming and technology to add a blended-learning supplement to the regular school day. They have continued building on their initial innovation to propose the creation of a competency-based instructional model across the whole school. They will use multiple assessments to better measure student comprehension and progress to plan instruction and help students take more responsibility for their own learning.

The Fund created the Summer Design Program in partnership with 2Revolutions, which describes itself as “an education design lab that designs and launches Future of Learning models and catalyzes the conditions within which they can thrive,”¹¹ as well as the Chicago Public Schools Office of Innovation and New Schools for Chicago. The Fund will study the impacts of the summer program and network teams’ innovations, looking mainly at student outcomes but also at peer effects, student and educator engagement, and educator satisfaction. The best programs and ideas will be shared across schools to improve student learning outcomes citywide.

Looking ahead, The Fund will continue expanding the network and creating opportunities for members to convene throughout the year to share what works and address common challenges. The network is a central component of The Fund’s effort to give Chicago teachers and principals opportunities to design, plan, and implement innovative practices and models in schools at increasing depth and scale.¹² The Fund has improved the Summer Design Program based on what it learned in the first year and is holding it again in 2014 with up to 40 schools, each participating in one of three specialized tracks: personalized learning, STEM, and the eighth to ninth-grade transition. “It is a simple idea,” Heather Anichini wrote in February 2014. “Our most talented educators, those who work with students every day, are identifying how to best use emerging technology to transform teaching and learning.”¹³

CityBridge Foundation and NewSchools Venture Fund: Launching an Education Innovation Fellowship in Washington, D.C.

CityBridge Foundation, a family foundation started by David and Katherine Bradley in 1994, works to build a citywide system of high-performing schools in Washington, D.C. CityBridge’s education focus began with investments in early childhood education, broadening in 2007 to K–12 education reform. Margaret Angell, program director for CityBridge’s Education Innovation Portfolio, likens the foundation’s strategy to venture philanthropy: “CityBridge researches best practices in education across the country and then does whatever it takes to bring those practices to Washington.”¹⁴

In partnership with NewSchools Venture Fund, CityBridge launched the Education Innovation Fellowship in 2013 with a \$1 million, three-year grant from Microsoft.¹⁵ CityBridge selected 12 fellows to participate in the inaugural fellowship cohort—six from district schools and six from charter schools—from a total of 63 applicants. The selection process was rigorous, including three essay questions, a nomination from their school principal, a second nomination, and an interview evening that included two individual interviews and a group interview. All of the fellows, who teach various grades and subjects, had at least two years of teaching experience and earned strong endorsements from their principals. Fellows were selected on the basis of demonstrated evidence of strong student achievement gains and track records of leadership and innovation. During the fellowship, the fellows maintained their regular teaching workloads.

The fellowship helps educators in Washington develop as blended learning teacher-leaders through a cohort-based experience running January through December. Fellows meet in monthly, full-day sessions that include conversations with thought leaders and practitioners, design workshops, book discussions, education technology demonstrations, and leadership development. Fellows also visit exemplary blended learning schools in Washington, D.C., and across the country, including a weeklong trip to California. During the fellowship year, all fellows design, launch, and manage blended learning pilots in their classrooms and schools. Although the fellowship is designed for individual teachers rather than teams, each fellow’s school leader attends several fellowship sessions and is involved in pilot planning.

The program has three distinct phases. In the first four months (January through April), fellows visit to leading blended learning programs, learn from thought leaders in the field, and begin to develop their ideas for pilot programs through workshops on design and entrepreneurship. From May through August, fellows engage in a facilitated design process, during which they design their blended learning models and begin to prototype these models in lower-stakes summer school environments. This phase of the program emphasizes ongoing reflection, collaborative small-group work, peer feedback, and speakers and workshops that support pilot development and implementation. Fellows document and communicate the successes and challenges of their pilot design and implementation to other fellows, their school communities, and educators citywide. In the final four months of the fellowship (September through December), fellows’ needs and interests guide the content and format of fellowship meetings as they improve on and expand their blended learning pilots to their classrooms and schools in the fall.

Each fellow receives a \$5,000 stipend for participation in the program and a “personal innovation fund” of \$2,500 to be used, for example, for technology purchases, site visits to leading blended learning schools, personalized coaching, or schoolwide professional development opportunities.

Fellows pilot the use of tools or instructional practices to personalize student learning in their classrooms or schools. For example, in summer 2013, eighth-grade science teacher Rabiah Harris implemented a hybrid blended learning model with flexible groups based on performance on end-of-class quizzes. As concepts shifted in difficulty for Harris' students, the flexible groups shifted as well. A student might have worked with Harris in a small group of five students one day, and learned independently using digital tools the next day.¹⁶ Algebra teacher Kyle Morean piloted a model in which students rotated among three 30-minute stations in two classrooms, led by two teachers. In one station, students experienced a small-group, five- to eight-minute lecture with guided notes and student-led, teacher-coached practice problems. In the second station, students worked on algebra problems in groups of three or four students, overseen by a teacher who served as their coach and tutor. This same teacher also oversaw the third station, at which students worked online, independently and at their own pace, using Khan Academy. Morean saw this model empower students to explore new ways of learning and develop confidence in their math abilities.¹⁷

As fellows like Harris and Morean innovate at their schools, CityBridge expects the program to generate proof points of blended learning in practice; catalyze activity across the city, with the fellows serving as ambassadors for the implementation of effective blended learning models; and establish Washington as a hub for education innovation.¹⁸ "Our mission at CityBridge is to build a system of transformational schools so that every D.C. student has access to a high-quality school. Developing a pipeline of educators who are willing to innovate and lead their colleagues through a change process is a first step toward this larger goal," says Mieka Wick, CityBridge's executive director. "We could not be more proud of the impact of all of our fellows to date, both on their schools and on the city as a whole."¹⁹

The first fellowship cohort concluded in December 2013. Earlier that month, teachers and education leaders came together at the first Education Innovation Summit, which was an opportunity to recognize and celebrate the first cohort's accomplishments and showcase their innovations. Four fellows presented an overview of blended learning and made the case for increased innovation in the city's district and charter schools. Fellows also led sessions for educators on topics ranging from "design thinking" to creating digital content.²⁰

Based on lessons learned in the first year, CityBridge made several important changes to the fellowship. With the cohort increasing from 12 to 20 fellows in year two, CityBridge created small learning teams of four fellows to enhance the cohort experience and support the development of deep relationships. It expanded the number of site visits from 10 to 16, seeing that school visits were the most powerful way to get educators excited about the possibilities of blended learning. CityBridge also expanded its design workshops to systematically work through the design process, basing the program curriculum on the design thinking process at the Stanford University Institute of Design ("d.school").²¹

In January 2014, the second cohort of the CityBridge-NewSchools Education Innovation Fellowship began with 20 fellows, again a mix of district and charter school teachers. Margaret Angell says unlike most professional development, which conveys information to teachers, CityBridge tells fellows, "There is awesome stuff going on out there that you can learn from, but only you know your kids. So the design is up to you."²² The fellowship has earned national attention because, in the new and rapidly evolving area of blended learning, it is not training teachers on what to do, but rather encouraging a mindset of innovation and improvement.²³

The first cohort enhanced CityBridge staff members' confidence in their roles as facilitators and in teachers as innovators and designers, which will help them support future fellows. "When we welcomed the first cohort of Education Innovation Fellows," Angell writes, "we believed that teachers could be engines of innovation. We now know that with the right resources and opportunities to test new approaches, teachers can very quickly become the sparks that light the fire of change in our schools."²⁴

Appendix: Creating a City-Based Blended Learning Network: Key Questions

Multiple objectives led The Fund and CityBridge to consider building networks of innovative educators to develop and implement high-quality blended learning. They wanted to *connect implementers* to share best practices and lessons learned. They also sought to *support educators with innovative ideas or entrepreneurial aspirations*, to help them bring their ideas to reality and to act on deeply held passions and visions of improving education through blended learning. If that succeeds, these organizations believe they can *increase the pool of innovative educators* by exposing great teachers and leaders to the transformative potential of blended learning and helping them develop game-changing ideas.

Building blended learning networks can address shortcomings in traditional school models, classroom structures, and teaching practices. Through networks, educators can work together to create solutions to education's most vexing problems, consider and critique one another's ideas, and build connections that will help them confront challenges as they design, implement, and grow blended programs.

For city-based organizations, deciding to create a network of educators focused on blended learning is an important step, but only a first step. These organizations confront a set of key questions that will shape the purposes, character, and activities of their networks. This section lays out 20 of those key questions, in these five categories:

- 1. Desired outcomes.** What will the network ideally do or create?
- 2. Recruitment, screening, and selection.** Who should be in the network?
- 3. Training and support.** What will the network provide to its members?
- 4. External partners.** Which outside experts should be involved, and in what ways?
- 5. The pioneering cohort.** How should the network get started?

Desired outcomes

Most organizers of blended learning networks will start with a set of orienting questions around what the network intends to accomplish: the type of opportunity the network aims to provide, or the kind of change it is meant to incite. A blended learning network may lead to a set of outcomes for students, teachers, and schools. Or it may lead to the creation of policy changes and support structures that influence implementation of blended learning across the city. Network organizers might begin with one or both ends in mind.

The following questions frame the desired outcomes for the network creator and its city:

- **Key Question 1:** What are you attempting to introduce to the city that does not already exist, and what impact do you hope to achieve?
- **Key Question 2:** What are the metrics by which you and others will judge your success in creating a strong blended learning network?

A related set of threshold questions pertains to the role of education technology in the development and implementation of high-quality blended learning models. Some cities are growing as education technology “hives” or “hot spots,” in part through the efforts of city-based organizations and a variety of nonprofit and for-profit funders attempting to seed education technology activity.²⁵ But it is an open question how, if at all, that activity translates into more high-quality blended models actually being implemented in a city's schools. As a result, organizers of blended learning networks might ask additional questions about the role of education technology in their efforts:

- **Key Question 3:** Of what value to the city's schools, teachers, and students is having a vibrant education technology ecosystem *in your city*? What is lost by looking to existing, external hot spots (e.g., Silicon Valley, New York City) for education technology tools, and focusing solely on site-level implementation and related policies?
- **Key Question 4:** Do you want to develop or network *creators* or *users* of education technology (or both)? Will your network aim to *connect* creators with users, and if so, how?
- **Key Question 5:** What are the metrics by which your success in creating a strong education technology ecosystem will be judged?

Some blended learning networks might aim to introduce school leaders and teachers to blended models and education technology content alternatives for implementation in their schools and classrooms. Others might aim to connect educators with programmers to develop and roll out new education technology tools. Both objectives address perceived shortcomings in available alternatives for students and educators, but they come at them from different angles. Organizers of blended learning networks will want to be clear about what they are attempting to achieve and how they will measure the success of their efforts.

Recruitment, screening, and selection

Whom should the network attract? How should it choose among those prospective members? These are some of the most foundational decisions to make when creating a city-based blended learning network. One of the most central questions is:

- **Key Question 6:** Will you bring together *innovators* or *innovative ideas*?

One approach to recruiting, screening, and selecting members would be to find the most ambitious, forward-thinking *individuals* and work with them to create and implement new ideas, even if these individuals do not come to the network with preconceived approaches to blended learning. Another would be to screen *ideas* instead of, or in addition to, the people proposing them, only admitting those to the network whose ideas show strong promise.

While there may be some overlap between those interested in networks of innovators and networks of innovative ideas, the answer to this question will determine, to a large extent, the character of the cohort, as well as the goals and activities of the network (discussed below). Networks of innovators will build programming toward the creation and refinement of new ideas. Networks of those with existing, innovative ideas will function more like existing incubators and accelerators,²⁶ helping to refine ideas and move them toward becoming reality. A network of innovators will ideally grow to become a network of innovative ideas, but there may be dramatic differences in where participants in each type of network start out, and what value the network itself can add.

Beyond this central choice, the following questions illustrate the range of alternatives network founders face in recruitment, screening, and selection:

- **Key Question 7:** Do potential participants self-select into the applicant pool, or is the pool pre-selected by network organizers or created through a nomination process?
- **Key Question 8:** What criteria should you use to vet prospective network participants? What questions should you ask as part of the application or selection process?
- **Key Question 9:** If you are planning to create a network of *innovators*, should you focus on individuals or teams?
- **Key Question 10:** If you are planning to create a network of proponents of *innovative ideas*, what stage of development should you target?
- **Key Question 11:** Should the network focus on blended learning at the whole-school level, at the classroom level, or both?

- **Key Question 12:** Should the network be limited to particular grades and/or subjects?
- **Key Question 13:** Should the network be limited to certain neighborhoods or other limited geographies within the city?
- **Key Question 14:** Should the network be limited to school leaders and/or teachers, or should it also be open to innovators or designers of innovative ideas who are not educators?

Answers to these questions will shape the applicant pool and determine the character of the network generated through the screening and selection processes. The answers will be determined in part by the individual city-based organization's objectives; the size and character of the city's education market, including the number and type of existing blended models and the readiness of school leaders and teachers to engage with blended learning; and the size and strength of the potential applicant pool.

Training and support

Any organizer of a city-based blended learning network will need to devote considerable energy to working out the details of what network participants will do, with what supports, and on what timetable. While there are many components and approaches to this, all boil down to one essential, overarching key question:

- **Key Question 15:** What types of training and support should the network provide?

Answers to this question will follow from answers to the key questions above. A network of teams of innovative educators focused on middle-school math in a city with strong readiness to design and implement new blended models, for example, will need very different training and support than a network of individual non-educators with innovative ideas for new technologies in a city with few existing blended models and little readiness to connect new technologies with classroom-level practice.

A related question focuses on how network members work with the training and supports provided:

- **Key Question 16:** Should network activities be loose, creating an environment for thoughtful people to interact, or prescriptive, leading participants along a well-defined path?

Once again, answers to this question will be determined by the answers to earlier questions, and by the character of the network and its participants. For example, a network might offer participants a menu of options, but let participants choose among them or chart their own course. This network could simply identify a community of high-potential blended learning leaders and provide them with a loose networking structure, with training and support offered upon request. Its value might come through contacts among network members on specific topics, even though such contacts might be infrequent or limited. The cohort as a whole might attend few common events or have few shared experiences and little common training and support.

In contrast, many networks will offer participants a preset curriculum of trainings or specific supports; control the pace and type of engagement with blended learning through the network; and hold many full-network events to facilitate collaboration and build cohort and network identity and affinity. Such networks will place a higher premium on the benefits of full-network engagement and collaboration, and the value of specific trainings and supports for all participants. In some cases, certain participation thresholds might be set as a condition of continuing network participation and the privilege of receiving network benefits, whereas the looser structure described above would make some or most network activities optional.

External partners

Few city-based organizations will have sufficient internal capacity and expertise to rely on in-house staff members to execute all trainings and provide all desired supports for the blended learning network. Therefore, most networks will look to external partners for at least some of their programming. Some of the factors that network organizers will consider in choosing partners are obvious: partner qualifications and relevant expertise, availability, and budget. But before considering criteria for selecting external partners, network organizers will need to answer even more fundamental questions about their goals for involving external experts in the network:

- **Key Question 17:** What are the best roles for external experts to play in supporting the network?

External experts might play a wide variety of roles to support network participants. They could serve as workshop presenters or facilitators; instructors or faculty in extended courses or engagements; motivators or sources of inspiration, as speakers or facilitators of group discussion; sounding boards or advisors for network organizers or participants; providers of assistance in publicizing network activity or the benefits of network membership; evaluators of applications or judges of participants' prototypes or ideas; or mentors.

For some roles, network organizers might prefer local experts who understand city-specific issues, events, or stakeholders. For others, they might prefer national experts with a wider breadth of experience. Organizers might purposefully select experienced *implementers* of blended models to provide some training and support, while for others they might turn to *advisors* who have engaged with blended learning as designers, observers, researchers, and thought partners for practitioners and policymakers.

With regard to mentors, there are many ways these relationships could be structured, which leads to another key question:

- **Key Question 18:** What structure do you want to create for mentoring relationships in your blended learning network?

Networks might choose to pair experts with individuals or with groups or teams of participating educators or innovators. The partnership could be arranged or brokered by the network, or it could be facilitated but to some degree left to the preferences of the participants and experts. As with the other elements of training and support, the relationship could be tightly managed, with mentors playing prescribed roles or engaging with participants according to a prepared plan, or the network could make matches but let participants and experts dictate the terms and level of engagement.

The pioneering cohort

A city-based organization might run a blended learning network once, or it might set up structures to run cohorts through the network periodically, perhaps annually. For those that intend to operate their networks more than once, an additional set of key questions might come into play:

- **Key Question 19:** To pilot the network, should you gather the best available candidates from across a target geographic area, or work with a predefined or preselected group?

Some organizers might prefer to start by running their networks for pre-established groups, possibly by partnering with specific interested organizations, networks, or leadership programs. Doing so would allow them to bypass some of the challenging questions around recruitment, screening, selection, and even desired outcomes, and use the pilot to focus on the quality of training and support, and on establishing a strong group of external partners.

- **Key Question 20:** How much should the first cohort be about “getting it right,” versus serving as a test case for future iterations?

An organizer’s answer to this key question will affect the pacing of processes around recruitment and selection, as well as resource allocation. An organizer might be less deliberate in its decision-making processes if it decides at the outset that the first cohort will be a test case used to establish systems and “work out the kinks” for additional cohorts.

In addition, those organizers that establish their networks knowing they plan to run multiple cohorts might answer the earlier key questions with iteration in mind. For example, such a network could plan from the outset to run one cohort focused on innovators and another on innovations; or to conduct geography-specific cohorts; or one specifically for traditional district schools and another for charter schools.

Each creator of a city-based blended learning network will need to answer most or all of the questions above.

The answers to these questions will shape the character of the network—who participates and what they do, and the ultimate effects of the network over time. Experience has not yet pointed to preferred answers. Instead, the “best” answers to these questions will depend on network creators’ objectives and the readiness of potential participants and city education leaders to engage meaningfully with blended learning.

Acknowledgements

This white paper was authored by Joe Ableidinger, a senior consultant with Public Impact. CEE-Trust and Public Impact would like to thank Ben Kutyllo, director, Program Investments, and Patrick Haugh, former managing director, at the Chicago Public Education Fund; and Margaret Angell, program director, Education Innovation Portfolio, and Abbey Goldstein, education director, Education Innovation Fellowship, with the CityBridge Foundation, for sharing strategies and insights from the creation of their field-leading, city-based blended learning networks. Except as noted, network profiles were developed through conversations with staff at The Fund and CityBridge, and from the organizations’ websites.

Endnotes

1. Blended learning is “a formal education program in which a student learns at least in part through online delivery of content and instruction with some element of student control over time, place, path, and/or pace, and at least in part at a supervised brick-and-mortar location away from home.” Staker, H., & Horn, M. B. (2012). *Classifying K–12 blended learning*. San Mateo, CA: Clayton Christensen Institute for Disruptive Innovation. Retrieved from: <http://www.christenseninstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/Classifying-K-12-blended-learning.pdf>. This also has a detailed taxonomy of blended learning models.
2. Locke, G., & Ableidinger, J. (Public Impact). (2013). *Scaling a successful pilot to expand blended learning options city-wide*. Indianapolis, IN: The Cities for Education Entrepreneurship Trust. Retrieved from: http://cee-trust.org/upload/news/0513130443_Strategies%20for%20Scaling%20a%20Blended%20Learning%20Pilot.pdf
3. The networks do not focus solely on blended learning. However, most network members are innovating in the areas of technology, talent, and time, so a substantial number of their innovations fall within the definition of “blended learning.” See Staker & Horn (2012).
4. CEE-Trust refers to members of its network as “harbormasters” for education reform. These organizations coordinate the activities of multiple actors to create more vibrant ecosystems for education. They aggregate funding from multiple sources to invest in portfolios of reform initiatives and support the growth of high-quality schools.
5. Next Generation Learning Challenges. (2013, September 9). Next Generation Learning Challenges aims to catalyze ed innovation with urban incubator partnerships [Press Release]. Retrieved from <http://nextgenlearning.org/press-release/nglc-aims-catalyze-ed-innovation-urban-incubator-partnerships>
6. As The Fund designed this network, two members of The Fund’s management team—Ben Kutyllo and Patrick Haugh—engaged in several strategy discussions with CEE-Trust and one of its consulting partners, Public Impact. Ben Kutyllo, director, Program Investments, leads The Fund’s innovation work, and previously managed The Fund’s “Effective Teachers” portfolio. Patrick Haugh was the managing director at The Fund before becoming the president of Teaching Trust in March 2014.
7. The Chicago Public Education Fund. (2013, August 6). Top Chicago educators to present innovations to earn up to \$10,000 [Press Release]. Retrieved from <http://thefundchicago.org/top-chicago-educators-present-innovations-earn-10000/>
8. The Chicago Public Education Fund. (2013, October 29). Watch educators in action at The Fund’s Summer Design Program [video]. Retrieved from <http://thefundchicago.org/watch-educators-action-funds-summer-design-program/>
9. Reed, R. (2013, August 20). Schools win cash to implement innovative ideas. Catalyst Chicago. Retrieved from <https://www.catalyst-chicago.org/notebook/2013/08/20/32206/schools-win-cash-implement-innovative-ideas>; The Chicago Public Education Fund. (2013, August 20). The Chicago Public Education Fund selects top Summer Design Program teams [Press Release]. Retrieved from <http://thefundchicago.org/chicago-public-education-fund-selects-top-summer-design-program-teams/>
10. The Chicago Public Education Fund (2013, October 29). Watch Educators in Action at The Fund’s Summer Design Program [video]. Retrieved from <http://thefundchicago.org/watch-educators-action-funds-summer-design-program/>
11. Please see <http://www.2revolutions.net> for more information about 2Revolutions.
12. In spring 2014, The Fund will launch the Discover Series—multiple short events and workshops that expose educators to innovative classroom practices, resources, and technologies, and introduce new problem-solving and design skills to help address school-level challenges. Also, in collaboration with local partners including LEAP Innovations and national partners including NGLC and The Broad Foundation, The Fund will support principals and teacher teams demonstrating the highest level of readiness in designing and implementing whole-school personalized learning models.

Endnotes, con't.

13. Anichini, H. (2014, February 14). Commentary: From the ground up, Chicago embraces technology. Education Nation, NBC News. Retrieved from <http://www.nbcnews.com/feature/education-nation/commentary-ground-chicago-embraces-technology-n32871>
14. Lautzenheiser, D. K., & Hochleitner, T. (2014). Blended learning in DC Public Schools: How one district is reinventing its classrooms. Washington, DC: The American Enterprise Institute. Retrieved from <http://www.aei.org/papers/education/k-12/blended-learning-in-dc-public-schools-how-one-district-is-reinventing-its-classrooms/>
15. Brown, E. (2013, May 16). Microsoft donates \$1 million to help expand 'blended learning' in D.C. schools. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/microsoft-donates-1-million-to-help-expand-blended-learning-in-dc/2013/05/16/f14f7f76-be58-11e2-97d4-a479289a31f9_story.html
16. Harris, R. (2013, October 17). Getting students what they need: Blended learning supports a science classroom [blog post]. Retrieved from <http://www.blendmylearning.com/2013/10/17/getting-students-what-they-need-blended-learning-supports-a-science-classroom/>
17. Morean, K. (2013, September 6). Not the algebra they were expecting: An exploration of the blended algebra workshop [blog post]. Retrieved from <http://www.blendmylearning.com/2013/09/06/not-the-algebra-they-were-expecting/>
18. Lautzenheiser, D. K., & Hochleitner, T. (2014). Blended learning in DC Public Schools: How one district is reinventing its classrooms. Washington, DC: The American Enterprise Institute. Retrieved from <http://www.aei.org/papers/education/k-12/blended-learning-in-dc-public-schools-how-one-district-is-reinventing-its-classrooms/>
19. Also see Vanderkam, L. (2013, spring). Blending, upending: Is blended learning the disruptive innovation of K–12 reform? *Philanthropy*. Retrieved from http://www.philanthropyroundtable.org/topic/k_12_education/blending_upending
20. Angell, M. (2014, January 7). Promising practices in blended learning and innovation in school design [blog post]. Retrieved from <http://www.blendmylearning.com/2014/01/07/promising-practices-in-blended-learning-and-innovation-in-school-design/>
21. See Stanford d.school website: <http://dschool.stanford.edu/>
22. Vander Ark, T. (2013, October 22). CityBridge is changing the school landscape in DC [blog post]. Retrieved from http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/on_innovation/2013/10/citybridge_is_changing_the_school_landscape_in_dc_1.html
23. Ibid.
24. Angell, M. (2014, January 7). Promising practices in blended learning and innovation in school design [blog post]. Retrieved from <http://www.blendmylearning.com/2014/01/07/promising-practices-in-blended-learning-and-innovation-in-school-design/>
25. See Tom Vander Ark's "Smart Cities" series on the Vander Ark on Innovation blog at Education Week, http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/on_innovation/smart-cities/. This series profiles dozens of American cities, and education innovations occurring in each, identifying some cities as education technology "hives" or "hot spots."
26. See a description of these types of entities and where they fit into markets for education technology and blended learning in Ableidinger, J. (Public Impact). (2013). Interventions and catalysts in markets for education technology: Roles of city-based funders. Indianapolis, IN: The Cities for Education Entrepreneurship Trust. Retrieved from: http://cee-trust.org/upload/news/0514130900_Interventions%20and%20Catalysts%20in%20Markets%20for%20Education%20Technology.pdf



CEE - TRUST

The Cities for Education Entrepreneurship Trust

www.cee-trust.org



CEE - TRUST

The Cities for Education Entrepreneurship Trust

www.cee-trust.org