



# The State of Entrepreneurship in K-12 Education

## Go Small or Go Home: Innovation in Schooling

By Matt Candler  
4.0 Schools

**RESEARCH PAPER: JUNE 24, 2015**

Papers for this conference are available online at [www.aei.org/feature/education-entrepreneurship-papers/](http://www.aei.org/feature/education-entrepreneurship-papers/)



AMERICAN ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE

**Draft:** Do not cite without permission from the author.

Back in 2008, Rick Hess asked me to write a chapter for his second book on entrepreneurship in education. After a few chapters written by actual experts, so his pitch went, it might be good to have a chapter by someone with a smaller vocabulary - “a guy on the ground.”

Much of that 2008 chapter was about the portfolio approach to charter school support and the creation model we’d developed at the New York City Charter Center that was then introduced in post-Katrina New Orleans at New Schools for New Orleans. My colleagues there have taken that work further than I ever could and I hope you read about it, especially how they’re getting traditionally risk-averse charter operators to play a more active role in engaging the low end of the school portfolio. But that’s another chapter.

This chapter is about what’s happened at another organization. In 2010, I created a new non-profit called 4.0 Schools - a place where curious, gutsy people can test better ways of doing school. Some of the people in our community create new tools for parents, teachers and students. Others create what we call Tiny Schools – small pilots of bold new school designs.

This chapter’s also about what I’m learning about myself. Let’s start there.

## **A REFORMER WITH A REFORMED-FIXED MINDSET**

For the first fifteen years of my career, I had a stubborn “kids’ lives are at stake” mindset that championed certainty and perfection. I’ve since realized that what kids need more from me is what Stanford psychologist Carol Dweck calls a growth mindset - one that champions curiosity over certainty and iteration over perfection.<sup>1</sup>

**Draft:** Do not cite without permission from the author.

Back in the day, my self-righteous call to other reformers was to avoid settling for “sucking less” than our predecessors. I saw the world like this: “someone has broken school; it is our job to fix it.” If we were in the business of fixing schools that the establishment had broken, we’d better get it right. There was pressure, high stakes and no room for mess ups. That’s what Dweck calls a fixed mindset—where anything new might risk your identity as someone who’s successful, so the world stays fixed and growth and new ideas are mostly a downside.<sup>2</sup>

There were two things wrong with this.

1. My arrogance.
2. My definition of the problem.

The wrong way to fix our schools is to assign blame. The school model we have is like a 360 year-old hiker who’s been given more and more rocks to carry over time. Starting in 1647, the idea of compulsory schooling’s grown increasingly complex. Schools, especially public schools, have been asked to do more and more for more and more. And that’s a beautiful thing. But it’s a complicated thing. There are many things about the way we currently do school that are now obsolete. It turns out that there is no “bad guy” to fight. Therefore, any problem framed in those combative terms isn’t really a good problem to work on.

A better problem to work on is one more in my control: how, I (and other reformers) try new things.

This may seem like a small thing, but I think it makes all the difference in how we execute our reform. As positions have hardened and dialog has calcified between

**Draft:** Do not cite without permission from the author.

reformers and others over the last decade, too few people have invested any real effort into achieving a mix between doing what works and doing what might work better.

Reformers need to admit that we've invested too little in trying new ideas, choosing instead to tell people we "know what works," so please get out of our way. These are phrases that I hear often, sometimes from reform leaders who serve many kids, and sometimes from funders who support those reformers.

Sometimes people who've resisted reformers have gone too far, too, defending the status quo at all costs, even when it's pretty obvious – especially when you ask families and kids - that parts of the status quo have outlived their utility and better solutions deserve to be explored.

## **A MIX OF SCALING WHAT WORKS AND TRYING NEW THINGS**

Hear me clearly. I'm not preaching some Silicon Valley style disruption for disruption's sake. Yes I use that word. And others like "iteration," "lean development," and "design thinking." But I write to you as a teacher, as a principal, as a district office employee, and as a parent. Our system is due some upgrades, specifically the kind that solve problems for those at the core of the system – teachers, families and children. I don't really want to work on solving problems for people at the top. That's noble, but if I am forced to pick – and we're all forced to pick – I'd rather spend time on problems that teachers, parents and students face and worry about scaling them later versus relying on trickle down as the best way to maximize impact.

I'm not preaching blow it all up; I'm preaching what I preached in 2008 - portfolio. This includes a mix of investments in scaling what we've found to work along

**Draft:** Do not cite without permission from the author.

with deliberate, disciplined exploration of the things that we don't have yet but can scale later once they show us a better way. This mix of investments and exploration is what we've been working on at 4.0 for the last five years.

Here are my three big take-aways thus far – things that make up a robust approach to finding the next wave of breakthrough ideas in schooling:

1. *Be user-centric.*

Entrepreneurs and leaders of large systems need to focus on the problems facing their users - students and families - instead of the problems facing the people who serve them.

2. *Be curious.*

Kids don't need to see us modeling "I know what works, just let me show you." They know the world's changing faster than their school is. What they need to hear us modeling is "Wow, this is hard. I don't know what the future will hold; but I am excited about it. Let's be curious and explore it in a thoughtful way."

3. *Start messy and then focus on the frequency of your edits, not the perfection of your first draft.*

In the pursuit of a better way, we must make many, many more, smaller, faster bets. This requires a bias to action, not a bias to certainty. Shipping an early version of a new idea to your user is scary. But when you get this right, your user appreciates that you've involved them in the process of finding new ways to meet their needs. And if

**Draft:** Do not cite without permission from the author.

you respond quickly to their feedback, you'll create deeper loyalty and investment than you ever could trying to read their minds.

I've grown a lot since starting 4.0. I'm working on replacing that arrogant, fixed mindset with a more curious, growth mindset. And in focusing on a different type of problem – how I do my work – I'm doing better work and learning much more than I used to. My first drafts are worse than they used to be, but the final products are better than ever.

## **A PLACE TO TRY NEW IDEAS EARLY AND OFTEN**

4.0's grown, too.

4.0 Schools exists because there are very few places to innovate in education in the United States. We are, above all else, a community - a diverse group of people who believe schools can be dramatically better, especially for kids whose families don't have the resources to exercise choice by moving to another neighborhood or paying for expensive private schools. We believe that big change in education is more likely to come from disciplined focus on acute, granular problems faced by the people who matter most in education - students, families and teachers - than from complex plans trickling down from the top.

## **What We Do**

4.0 Schools equips entrepreneurial people to create new education startup companies and schools. We start by helping these entrepreneurial people define tough problems, then we help them envision and test potential solutions. Finally, we train them to launch effective

**Draft:** Do not cite without permission from the author.

solutions as a startup or new school, within a cohort of other passionate entrepreneurs. At 4.0, we are dedicated to testing ideas early, at a small scale, and in close partnership with students, families, and teachers. We don't create a startup or new school until a leader in our community proves that someone we care about needs it and wants it. Our unique training in leading innovation in education happens in three stages:

### *Essentials*

Eight to ten times a year, we host Essentials, a multi-day experience where up to 20 leaders from the 4.0 Schools community move their ideas forward. Participants define the person they're serving, the problem they're solving, and ways to test solutions. Essentials alums walk out the door with a plan to test their ideas quickly and cheaply.

### *Individualized Coaching*

Leaders who show a willingness to test quickly and adjust to feedback from people they're serving get small-group and one-on-one coaching from highly-trained 4.0 staff throughout the year.

### *Launch*

Twice a year, we offer our Launch Program to up to 10 teams of entrepreneurial founders who've validated new solutions to important problems. They bring new startups to life based on these ideas in under 90 days. The Launch program gives leaders an environment to fine-tune solutions, figure out what type of venture makes the most sense, and build the foundation for launching a new startup or running a miniature version of a new

**Draft:** Do not cite without permission from the author.

school. The expanded 4.0 community serves as an extensive test-bed where founders can iterate rapidly during Launch as they secure their first customers. Cohorts spend one month of the program in New Orleans or New York receiving daily coaching and support to beta-test their startups and school designs. They also have access to up to \$5k of equity-free startup capital.

We're training leaders who put families, students and teachers at the center of school redesign. We're convinced that leaders who work within a community of people who give them feedback and context for their work create change that lasts longer and digs deeper than those who work in isolated silos.

We've seen the promise of this approach pay off.

#### **4.0 Stats**

- We've trained 650 people in our Essentials course on education entrepreneurship.
- We plan to launch another 20 per year through Launch, which is now more competitive than Harvard.
- Of 43 launched ventures; 32 still operate and serve 200,000 students, families, and teachers across the US.
- Our pipeline is diverse: 81 percent of recent Launch alums are 1st-time entrepreneurs; 50 percent are women; 36 percent are people of color; 26 percent are parents; 63 percent aren't traditional educators.
- 4.0 startups have raised \$7M in capital, earned \$3M, and entered prestigious downstream programs like Echoing Green, Imagine K12 and LearnLaunch.



**Draft:** Do not cite without permission from the author.

- 4.0-trained entrepreneurs have swept the podium three times at Startup Weekend EDU.

New schools like Bricolage Academy are bringing parents together across class and race lines and showing other schools what a focus on creativity and innovation can do for math and reading scores.

Tool builders like Branching Minds, an educational technology company founded by a special education teacher and a neuroscientist, are bringing teachers and parents together with software that suggests proven interventions to hard-to-diagnose student behavior in real time.

We've founded other organizations focused on early-stage investments in education, but we don't have nearly enough people doing this type of work. And while we generally invest much earlier in the process than others, what really separates 4.0 from other ed-tech accelerators or school incubators is the expectations we have of the leaders we train, beyond the startup or school they create at 4.0. We expect these leaders to continue to drive systemic reform as the architects and founders of sustainable startup communities that can thrive in their hometown.

For us, the unit of change in education isn't the superhero superintendent, or the charter management operator, or the mayor who takes control. Nor is it the entrepreneur. Nor is it the disruptive ed-tech startup.

It is the local startup community - a network of gutsy, curious people working 24/7 to create an environment where local leaders make the future of school radically

**Draft:** Do not cite without permission from the author.

better for their own children regardless of how much policy work and traditional structural reform is underway.

The leaders of the schools and startups we're helping are the most important ingredient in these local startup communities. When each community in our nation has their own stunning example of the future of school and enough momentum to sustain their own local innovation, regardless of the policy environment or elected leadership around them, 4.0's work will be done.

To make that vision a reality, we're creating a national network of local startup communities led by the entrepreneurs and school founders we're training right now. Over time, this network of curious, gutsy people will transform how we do school, and how we approach school reform. Last year, 4.0 Schools' events and programming drew more than 1,750 people together to imagine and test ideas for the future of school.

Entrepreneurial individuals rely on Essentials and our early-stage coaching to turn their ideas into actionable pilots like:

*Aaron Frumin's Uncommon Construction, New Orleans, LA.*

New Orleans youth lack the exposure, experience, resources and soft skills that are necessary to successfully pursue the career of their choice. Aaron is piloting unCommon Construction, an initiative that builds houses with currently enrolled high school students, and uses the profits to provide these apprentices with expanded academic or career opportunities. They're currently planning for this summer's "Tiny House Institute," where they'll test their program and process by building and selling a tiny (but complete!) house on a trailer with a small cohort of apprentices.

**Draft:** Do not cite without permission from the author.

*Clara Baron-Hyppolite's Bridge the Gap, New Orleans, LA.*

College mentoring programs exist in low-income communities, but very few provide support to high-achieving students attempting to prepare for and apply to the country's most competitive universities. Clara believes students can match into better universities through more personalized advising, mentoring, and academic enrichment opportunities early in their high school careers. Her project, Bridge the Gap, is now testing information sessions and workshops to educate students and families about steps they can take to prepare for the admissions process.

*Anke Stohlmann's Li'l Stories, New York, NY.*

Anke is exploring how to teach elementary students 21st century skills —soft skills like creativity, creative thinking, communication, and collaboration—with a play-based approach. She's testing a visual storytelling framework that teaches abstract thinking and collaboration through visual, oral, and written storytelling, working with 1st–3rd graders in schools and museums.

*Vivy Chao's Yang Camp, Los Angeles, CA.*

Vivy is focused on equipping students with the skills they need to succeed beyond high school. She is testing how students respond to hands-on, experiential learning of entrepreneurship and is getting feedback through piloting in schools, General Assembly, the homeschooling community, and a maker studio.

**Draft:** Do not cite without permission from the author.

Not all of our pilot tests work and neither do all of our startups. But we don't hear the people involved say they were reckless experiments. By starting small and including parents, teachers and students in the process instead of working in isolation and then delivering a fully formed solution ready to scale with an attitude of "trust us, this works," the leaders we work with start off asking for help, admitting they don't have a perfect solution yet, and asking for support and feedback. If they adapt when people give them good feedback, not only do they get better faster than they would have if working alone, but they build trust and buy-in, too!

This posture – of curiosity and openness to feedback – is what makes these leaders so effective in finding new ways to do school.

## **THE TINY SCHOOLS PROJECT**

Since the word schools is half of our name, I guess it makes sense to talk about that part of our work, too.

Over the last twenty years, I've been involved in more than 100 school startups. Until about four years ago, I stuck with a pretty consistent approach to get a new school up and running:

*Step one:* Find effective classroom teachers and give them a chance to have more impact as the founder of a new school.

*Step two:* Have teachers spend 6–12 months incubating in one or two quality schools in order to understand the culture and shadow a proven school leader.

**Draft:** Do not cite without permission from the author.

*Step three:* Help teachers write a charter application detailing a school as close to the one they'd worked in as possible. Authorizers are mostly concerned with approving schools based on models that have been proven effective, so convincing them they are making a safe bet was key.

*Step four:* Cross fingers on the authorizer approving the 200–400 page paper-based application on a school that I never actually tested with any of the people who were going to run it.

*Step five:* Get ready to launch a school. This included things like: build a board, rent or renovate a private building or negotiate with the district for one, hire a pretty large staff (plan for growth!), start recruiting families, plan marketing, fundraise, talk to local political leaders for support, reach out to local community and convince them of the good stuff the school would bring, get insurance, get vendors, buy books, buy furniture, find busses or hire someone, plan routes, train staff, get uniforms for all the kids, plan the first few weeks down to the minute, and so on (I dug up an old checklist for startup; it had almost 400 tasks on it).

*Step six:* Go from zero to running a \$1–4M operation, serving 80–200 kids out of the gate. Overnight.

**Draft:** Do not cite without permission from the author.

I used to think chartering this way was an awesome approach. It was safer, faster, and lower-risk than the traditional district-led school improvement plan, where a savior blessed from on high would show up at a huge school and promise the moon to families, but only be equipped with control over a few variables - a school-site budget line here, a few staff changes there, a coat of paint here.

To me the chance to start anew, with a new culture and a new team, with only a few hundred kids was a huge upgrade. And sure, there's still merit in finding ways to replicate what's working in good schools and train more leaders to take those models to more families.

But my approach had a big flaw. I rarely tested school models before families and kids showed up! Sure, I thought it was pretty clever to have leaders do test runs with staff, role playing and practicing scenarios, but I rarely asked anyone to actually test a simple version of the school with actual families and students.

### **Chartering Isn't So Tiny Anymore**

The charter movement itself has shifted away from its original promise of offering a tiny way to test new models and ideas in a way that might inspire and inform bigger systems. These days, charter schooling is less about trying new things than “scaling what works.” (At least that's where the money's going.) And increasingly, the scaling what works approach is where the laws are leaning, too, with laws that favor “proven operators” over new ones. There are many chapters to write about this topic, and many better authors. And while I'm optimistic that we can rekindle the original spirit of the movement,

**Draft:** Do not cite without permission from the author.

especially if charter advocates dial back the “we know what works” bit, we’re already finding a few new ways to test new models without getting a charter school approved.

I think we can still find ways to validate and explore new schools, even though the charter movement has fallen short of its potential. It’s taken a few years, but we’re starting schools at 4.0 in a very different way that I used to.

### **A Tinier Way**

Our first cohort of school founders and startup entrepreneurs was a group of six innovative people who wanted to make school better. I got started with them the same way I’d always started; I asked them to commit a year soaking up proven concepts in existing high-quality schools.

Not long into that year, Josh Densen, a member of that first cohort, challenged my approach. He started hosting sessions in living rooms around New Orleans, asking parents what they wanted in a new school. He didn’t sell anything; he just listened. And when he crunched the numbers from his surveys, the two things that parents wanted were socioeconomic diversity and a focus on creative thinking. So we sat and sat and googled and called friends trying to find a school he could replicate that had that stuff. But we couldn’t find one.

But Josh came up with a crazy idea, informed by the big fight going on at the time between old school New Orleans restaurants and the food trucks roaming around selling new types of food. What if he tried a food-truck version of his school?

Josh bought a table and some creative thinking manipulatives he wanted to use in his school and started doing pop-up versions of his school at free music festivals at the

**Draft:** Do not cite without permission from the author.

Mahalia Jackson Center. He'd cleverly set up his table close enough to the blow up bounce house that all music festival organizers worth their salt have installed that you almost wondered if he was the guy who'd paid for it. He had no brochures - no propaganda. He'd just have a sign with the school name, a blank sign-up sheet and him standing there being friendly next to a big ground cloth with some really fun toys on it. He'd usually have his kids playing with the stuff once he got set up. Families would wander in to the festival and do a double take. Was it ok for their kids to play with this stuff? Could they do that *and* do the bounce house? And there Josh would be, smiling, ready to encourage them to let their kids try them out and when it felt safe, geek out about how he thought the building blocks might boost creative confidence.

A cool mix of families started showing up again at the pop-ups, and Josh felt it was time to test his creative confidence ideas at a deeper level, so he struck a deal with Jay Altman, the CEO of First Line Schools, to show up at Samuel Green Charter School one afternoon a week with some of the pop-up kids and have them join Green students in a test run of his design thinking class. He wasn't driving a food truck, but he might as well have been. It took Josh an extra year beyond what I hoped to start Bricolage Academy - now one of the most diverse schools in New Orleans. Much of that extra year was about Josh doing these pop-up and small-scale pilots.

Ever since watching Josh's pop-up schools, we've been trying to de-risk the process of new school creation and make it more iterative, more responsive, and more agile. We've studied everything we can find on agile development and lean startup. Four years after Josh's first pop-up school, we're formalizing this new approach to school creation we call The Tiny Schools Project.



**Draft:** Do not cite without permission from the author.

The goal of The Tiny Schools Project is to reduce the risk of creating new schools by testing promising concepts at a very small scale in intimate environments where willing families and students provide high-frequency feedback to school leaders before they build a full scale school. We will provide design guidance, real-time feedback, leadership coaching, and financial support. Depending on the pilot design and duration, we will provide between \$25,000 and \$150,000 for each pilot.

This program is not designed to give leaders time to think about a new school. It is to help teams go from “We have some of the students, a place to test, and a good idea about what specific design elements need the most testing.” If you are at an earlier stage, 4.0 Schools can help you but this should be considered a tool for the later stages of school model creation. It is best suited for leaders who’ve completed the 4.0 Launch Program or can demonstrate a similar level of preparation, including at least 10 hours of field-testing with students.

As a follow up to our 3-month Launch Program, 4.0 Schools will help small teams of school builders run small-scale (tiny) pilots of ambitious new school models with families and students who want to participate in well-structured, carefully-monitored, very-small scale (smaller than a typical private school classroom).

**Draft:** Do not cite without permission from the author.

## **Tiny Cohort 1**

There are four groups in our first cohort in The Tiny Schools Project:

### *1881 Institute*<sup>3</sup>

The 1881 Research Institute is a hands-on training high school that builds community and hope while using the power of STEM.

### *NOLA Micro Schools*<sup>4</sup>

NOLA Micro Schools prepares students to pursue their passions and creativity through a blending of state-of-the-art software, quest-like projects with real-world applications, Socratic discussions and apprenticeships in diverse, student-centered, multi-age classrooms.

### *Rooted School*<sup>5</sup>

Rooted School is an open-enrollment high school that prepares students for employment in high-growth, high-wage industries.

### *Noble Minds Institute*<sup>6</sup>

The Noble Minds institute for Whole Child Learning is a New Orleans-based learning lab that focuses on academic and personal development, opening in 2016.

Each team is led by an alum of our Launch program,<sup>7</sup> where they conducted a series of day- or week-long pop-up school experiences (think food-truck or pop-up restaurant) with parents and students in New Orleans. Based on the feedback they

**Draft:** Do not cite without permission from the author.

received in the pop-ups and coaching from 4.0, each team has designed a more extensive real-world pilot of their school model—something we call a tiny school.

Each tiny school pilot will last between 2 and 12 months, serve fewer than 15 students, include no more than 2 teachers, focus heavily on self-directed learning, include lots of data about how students are doing, and explore cost-saving approaches that improve sustainability. (Public school models should run without philanthropy after three years; private schools must aim for less than \$6,000 per child.)

### **Simplifying the Pilot by Asking for Help Outside the Classroom**

We challenged each founder to ask existing schools and organizations to carry as much of the operational load as possible during their tiny school pilot so they could focus on testing academic elements of their models.

What they've come up with is far more creative than I expected. Here are their four very different approaches:

#### *1. The Tiny Two-Month Summer School*

1881 is partnering with Adinkra NOLA (a home school collective that doesn't have extensive high school student summer programming) and Tuskegee Institute on this tiny pilot—a two-month, full-day summer program.

#### *2. The Tiny Low-Cost Private School*

NOLA Micro is subletting unused space in a local private school (that's also leased to public charter schools) to run a tiny version of their low-cost private school.

**Draft:** Do not cite without permission from the author.

3. *The Tiny School within a Public Charter School*

Rooted is contracting with a local public charter school for a year to run a tiny version of their school with kids who will volunteer to be in the pilot but stay enrolled at the host school.

4. *The Tiny School within a District Public School*

Noble Minds is still finalizing where they'll pilot, but one option on the table (and the one that most fascinates me) is contracting with a local district for a year to run a tiny version of their school with kids who will volunteer to be in the pilot but stay enrolled at the host school.

I don't know about you, but this collaboration – especially between the aspiring charters and existing public schools – is a big deal to me. That leaders of existing schools—public charter, private and public, district-led—would so willingly help out here is amazing. A fixed mindset – like the one I used to have – would lead many to avoid this kind of thing.

4.0 is working closely with each founder and their host partners to craft smart agreements that maximize their chances for success. We'll miss some things; partnering like this will come with some challenges. We'll try and adapt as fast as we can during each pilot. If we get something that starts to work, we're planning to share what we know in the form of a **model tiny school agreement** that anyone can use.

**Draft:** Do not cite without permission from the author.

Is building a tiny 10–15 student version of a new school model a perfect test? No way. I can give you a long list of operational and financial mistakes easily made once a school gets bigger even if their tiny pilot is amazing.

But even a few months into this effort, the support from willing partners in existing schools has allowed each tiny school team to pay far more attention to the core work of educating students than the politics, logistics and operational details that tend to overwhelm founders of schools that have to start bigger than these four do. I think these schools will learn far more in these constrained, simpler pilots than they would starting the way most new charters do. And over the long term, that willingness to go slow at first may in fact let them grow faster later on. And best of all, the students in these pilots will get the full attention of the model founders because other schools are willing to help them out.

That’s one of the tiny victories we’ve had that I’m going to celebrate.

## **SQUINT, AND TELL ME WHAT YOU SEE**

We’re 52 startups and schools into our work at 4.0, and I’m starting to see some interesting trends that might suggest where school might go in the future.

- Schools can get smaller, more responsive, and more flexible by relying on technology and customer-centric thinking instead of chasing “economies of scale” in huge buildings and huge bureaucracies.
- Students and families will be able to choose from a network of providers within their community offering a wide variety of more personalized schooling options instead of having to exercise choice by moving to new communities.

**Draft:** Do not cite without permission from the author.

- Students will exercise more ownership over their learning than in the past.
- We'll supplement teacher qualitative judgment about student progress with data from a variety of learning channels (independent learning platforms, student to student learning, parent-to-teacher and student-created data).
- Family members will understand what's happening in class and know how to support from home in real-time instead of at the end of a grading period or school year.
- Students will spend more time outside the school building, relying on mobile platforms to capture learning and share work with teachers and each other.
- Schools will be more connected to their communities through partnerships with civic institutions like museums as well as employers to more closely align learning to the most promising local careers.

If you want, you can try this yourself; go to [4pt0.org/ventures](http://4pt0.org/ventures) and tell me what you see.

## **STAY TINY OUT THERE!**

I believe in taking many more, but much smaller bets on the future of school. I believe that the best way to innovate is to start small and grow only when we've built something parents, teachers, and students want.

This process must take place within a community of humans, not because we believe in some abstract idea of the power of communities, but because in the early exploratory stages, that community of volunteers plays a critical role in the development of the solutions.

**Draft:** Do not cite without permission from the author.

Here's why community matters so much. People who willingly volunteer give our entrepreneurs critical feedback when they are still testing things out. Without that community, entrepreneurs and leaders have nowhere to test, so they must pick between doing nothing and experimenting with teachers, kids and families who haven't volunteered.

That's why the unit of change is the community, not the individual. An individual without a community of people who've willingly agreed to help them refine their ideas can wreak havoc if they test their ideas on people who haven't been asked. And that's why I pause when I hear someone – myself included – too quickly draw the conclusion that the methods and incentives we see in places like Silicon Valley should just be ported over to education and we'll be good. This is a public good in our democracy, so the concept of testing and exploring new solutions requires a little more care and deliberation.

If we do our testing thoughtfully, we can get bolder ideas to come to life with less risk to the public. We *can* create the conditions for more ideas to surface, for more of those ideas to get tuned before they're thrown at hundreds or thousands of children.

My view of the future of school? I'm not completely sure, but I think it starts with an army of humble leaders getting to know the human issues that teachers, families and students face every day, setting out to solve those problems, even they start with just a handful of people. Those teachers, families and students are talking to them, telling them what's working, cheering them on as they make the next version better.

That may sound like a tiny idea, but someday, I think it could be big.

---

<sup>1</sup> Carol Dweck, *Mindset: The New Psychology of Success* (New York: Ballantine Books, 2006).

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Baihy Watson, "1881 Institute." 1881 Institute, <http://www.the1881school.org>.

<sup>4</sup> Kim Gibson, "NOLA Micro Schools," NOLA Micro Schools, <http://nolamicroschools.org>.

<sup>5</sup> Jonathan Johnson, "Rooted School," Rooted School, <http://www.rootedschool.org>.

<sup>6</sup> Vera Triplett, "Noble Minds | Institute for Whole Child Learning," Noble Minds, <http://www.nobleminds.org>.

<sup>7</sup> 4.0 Schools, "4.0 Schools' Launch Program," 4.0 Schools, <http://4pt0.org/programs/launch>.