

EVERYDAY ENTREPRENEURS: 54 STORIES OF OPPORTUNITY, RISK, AND EXECUTION



Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda
Chabot College

Everyday Entrepreneurs: 54 Stories of Opportunity, Risk, and Execution

Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda

Chabot College

This text is disseminated via the Open Education Resource (OER) LibreTexts Project (<https://LibreTexts.org>) and like the thousands of other texts available within this powerful platform, it is freely available for reading, printing, and "consuming."

The LibreTexts mission is to bring together students, faculty, and scholars in a collaborative effort to provide an accessible, and comprehensive platform that empowers our community to develop, curate, adapt, and adopt openly licensed resources and technologies; through these efforts we can reduce the financial burden borne from traditional educational resource costs, ensuring education is more accessible for students and communities worldwide.

Most, but not all, pages in the library have licenses that may allow individuals to make changes, save, and print this book. Carefully consult the applicable license(s) before pursuing such effects. Instructors can adopt existing LibreTexts texts or Remix them to quickly build course-specific resources to meet the needs of their students. Unlike traditional textbooks, LibreTexts' web based origins allow powerful integration of advanced features and new technologies to support learning.



LibreTexts is the adaptable, user-friendly non-profit open education resource platform that educators trust for creating, customizing, and sharing accessible, interactive textbooks, adaptive homework, and ancillary materials. We collaborate with individuals and organizations to champion open education initiatives, support institutional publishing programs, drive curriculum development projects, and more.

The LibreTexts libraries are Powered by [NICE CXone Expert](#) and were supported by the Department of Education Open Textbook Pilot Project, the California Education Learning Lab, the UC Davis Office of the Provost, the UC Davis Library, the California State University Affordable Learning Solutions Program, and Merlot. This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 1246120, 1525057, and 1413739.

Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation nor the US Department of Education.

Have questions or comments? For information about adoptions or adaptations contact info@LibreTexts.org or visit our main website at <https://LibreTexts.org>.

The LibreTexts name, logo, and book covers are trademarked by LibreTexts, Inc. (a 501(c)(3) not-for-profit organization) and protected against unauthorized use.

This text was compiled on 09/28/2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Licensing

Acknowledgements

About the Book

About the Authors

Forward

Preface

Introduction

Part 1: Creating Markets

Chapter 1: Seeing What Others Miss

- 1.1: CASE 1 | Kelli Jones, NoSo Patches
- 1.2: CASE 2 | Deah Berry Mitchell, Nostalgia Black
- 1.3: CASE 3 | Joe Anderson, Reflex Protect
- 1.4: Review

Chapter 2: Defining the Customer

- 2.1: CASE 1 | Nicole Brown, Brown Sugar Box
- 2.2: CASE 2 | Keenan Beasley, Sunday II Sunday
- 2.3: CASE 3 | Sania Vucetaj, Sania's Brow Bar
- 2.4: Review

Chapter 3: Creating Value People Can Recognize

- 3.1: CASE 1 | Monique Little, You Go Natural
- 3.2: CASE 2 | Fri Forjindam, Mycotoo
- 3.3: CASE 3 | Dustin Anthony, BloomingTables
- 3.4: Review

Chapter 4: Earning Attention, Identity, and Trust

- 4.1: CASE 1 | Myron Chandran, Afro Soca Love
- 4.2: CASE 2 | Elizabeth Sutton, Elizabeth Sutton Collection
- 4.3: CASE 3 | Taylor Humphries, Ranked Media and Technologies
- 4.4: Review

Chapter 5: Reaching the Customer

- 5.1: CASE 1 | Mandy Bowman, Official Black Wall Street
- 5.2: CASE 2 | Brendan Ciecko, Cuseum
- 5.3: CASE 3 | FAMOSOS
- 5.4: Review

Chapter 6: Growing Without Losing the Market

- 6.1: CASE 1 | Pinky Cole, Slutty Vegan

6.2: CASE 2 | Derrick Hayes, Big Dave's Cheesesteaks

6.3: CASE 3 | Alia J. Daniels, Revry

6.4: Review

Part 2: Expanding Opportunity

Chapter 1: Seeing Barriers as Opportunities

1.1: CASE 1 | Bree Anderson, Daughters Beyond Incarceration

1.2: CASE 2 | JoAnn Ajayi-Scott, Essence of a Lady, Inc.

1.3: CASE 3 | Alexis Black, Redefining Normal

1.4: Review

Chapter 2: Designing for Access

2.1: CASE 1 | Jessica Chang, Upwards

2.2: CASE 2 | Rubén Arias, BeeReaders

2.3: CASE 3 | Jeremy Glauser, eLuma

2.4: Review

Chapter 3: Building Trust Where the Stakes Are High

3.1: CASE 1 | Nathalie Walton, Expectful

3.2: CASE 2 | Jenna Ahn, Millie

3.3: CASE 3 | Tristan Mackintosh, Safespill Systems

3.4: Review

Chapter 4: Turning Knowledge into Capability

4.1: CASE 1 | Tiffany Aliche, The Budgetnista

4.2: CASE 2 | Eva Drago, Beelinguapp

4.3: CASE 3 | Kewanta Brooks, Elite Kids TV

4.4: Review

Chapter 5: Creating Pathways to Work and Wealth

5.1: CASE 1 | Nitin Agrawal, Interstride

5.2: CASE 2 | Moni Jefferson, Association of Military Spouse Entrepreneurs

5.3: CASE 3 | Brittani Hunter, Mogul Millennial

5.4: Review

Chapter 6: Making Mission Economically Durable

6.1: CASE 1 | Vanessa Bouché, Savhera

6.2: CASE 2 | Brandon Okpalobi, Dibia DREAM

6.3: CASE 3 | Cameka Smith, The BOSS Network

6.4: Review

Part 3: Building Systems

Chapter 1: Finding Leverage in Broken Systems

1.1: CASE 1 | Miku Jha, AgShift

1.2: CASE 2 | Jehiel Oliver, Hello Tractor

1.3: CASE 3 | May Al-Karooni, Globechain

1.4: Review

Chapter 2: Turning Technical Possibility into Reliable Value

2.1: CASE 1 | Robert Devlin, Metalenx

2.2: CASE 2 | Rajan Kumar, Ateios Systems

2.3: CASE 3 | Erica Grant, Quantum Lock Technologies

2.4: Review

Chapter 3: Designing Operations That Hold

3.1: CASE 1 | Jy Maze, Maze Freight Solutions

3.2: CASE 2 | Christina Perla, Makelab

3.3: CASE 3 | Abel Horvath, Fulfillment Hub USA

3.4: Review

Chapter 4: Building Networks, Platforms, and Ecosystems

4.1: CASE 1 | Stella Ashaolu, WeSolv

4.2: CASE 2 | Brian Balbirnie, ACCESS Newswire

4.3: CASE 3 | Robert Hoehn, IdeaScale

4.4: Review

Chapter 5: Scaling Under Constraint

5.1: CASE 1 | Uche Isiugo, Infranergy AI

5.2: CASE 2 | Joanne Rodriguez, Mycocycle

5.3: CASE 3 | Laurel Harrop, Laurel Environmental Group

5.4: Review

Part 4: Conclusion

END

Index

Glossary

Detailed Licensing

Licensing

A detailed breakdown of this resource's licensing can be found in **Back Matter/Detailed Licensing**.

This page titled [Licensing](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

Acknowledgements

Acknowledgments

Students, Entrepreneurs & Experts

A Shared Purpose: Surrounding yourself with smart, caring, and interesting people can yield great results at the end; but make the journey unforgettable.

Everyday Entrepreneurs was made possible through the contributions of people who strengthened its research, organization, and editorial quality.

We would like to first thank **Cristina Moon** and **Caren Parrish** for making the grant accessible to us and fueling our engines to write to this book. We are also very grateful for their patience and support along this journey.

We extend our sincere appreciation to **Caroline Adamson**, whose work as the manuscript's internal editor brought clarity, consistency, and careful judgment to the book. Her thoughtful review helped the authors strengthen the writing while preserving the purpose and character of the stories.

We also thank **Patricia Rosendo, Ethan Sy, Felicia Truong** and **Jessica Cabrera**, students at Chabot College, for their valuable research assistance. Their work collecting information, organizing source materials, and helping coordinate interviews supported the development of the entrepreneur profiles throughout this casebook.

A special thanks to **Talley M. Caruso**, for her professional guidance in the final editing to meet the required standard to make this book widely available.

Finally, we are grateful to the entrepreneurs who shared their experiences and to the students whose questions continually remind us why these stories deserve to be studied.

About the Book

54 Stories of Opportunity, Risk, and Execution

Everyday Entrepreneurs

First Edition

Copyright © 2026 Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda

All rights reserved except for the permissions granted below.

Open License

Except where otherwise noted, the original text of this work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). The license permits sharing and adaptation, including commercial use, provided that appropriate credit is given, a link to the license is supplied, and changes are identified. Attribution must not imply endorsement by the authors, Chabot College, or the Chabot-Las Positas Community College District.

License: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Third-Party Materials

The CC BY 4.0 license applies only to original material owned by the authors. Photographs, illustrations, screenshots, logos, trademarks, quoted passages, and other third-party materials are excluded unless expressly identified as included. Those materials remain subject to the rights and terms established by their respective owners.

Authors

Allan J. Graves • Miguel Colón • Kathrina Q. Miranda

Publication Information

Published by the authors in the United States of America. The authors are educators affiliated with Chabot College; that affiliation does not indicate institutional ownership, publication, sponsorship, or endorsement.

First Edition — 2026

Zero Textbook Cost and Educational Use

This narrative casebook is provided to students at no cost in support of accessible entrepreneurship education and Zero Textbook Cost goals. Educators may adopt, share, and adapt the authors' openly licensed material in accordance with CC BY 4.0 and the exclusions stated above.

Disclaimer

This publication is intended solely for educational purposes and does not constitute legal, financial, tax, investment, or professional business advice. To the best of the authors' knowledge as of the stated research cutoff, the information presented is accurate. Businesses, markets, technologies, organizational structures, and leadership positions may change after publication; readers should consult current and authoritative sources before relying on the material for research or decision-making.

The views and interpretations presented are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views or policies of Chabot College, the Chabot-Las Positas Community College District, or the California Community Colleges.

About the Authors

About The Authors

Educators, Entrepreneurs, and Practitioners

A Shared Purpose: To connect entrepreneurial ideas with the decisions, discipline, and execution required to create lasting value.

This book brings together three Chabot College educators whose work spans entrepreneurship, executive leadership, consulting, business development, capital formation, and organizational growth. Their professional paths differ, but their educational purpose is shared: to help students connect business concepts with the judgment required to act under uncertainty.

Through this textbook, **Everyday Entrepreneurs**, Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda present entrepreneurship as a practice of recognizing opportunity, solving meaningful problems, building capable organizations, and learning from the consequences of real decisions.

Author Headshots & Bios

Author	Bio
Allan J. Graves 	Professor • Entrepreneur • Executive Allan J. Graves has taught entrepreneurship, business, and marketing at Chabot College since 2012. He brings more than two decades of executive leadership and entrepreneurial experience into the classroom, helping students connect opportunity recognition with the practical work of building an enterprise. Graves has founded and led ventures in tourism, business services, and consulting. As founder and chief executive officer of San Francisco Love Tours, he built a highly rated sightseeing company serving the San Francisco market. Earlier, he served as managing partner of SEC Compliance Services and contributed to the company's acquisition. He later held executive leadership roles with Issuer Direct Corporation (NYSE: ISDR) and OppFi (NYSE: OPFI), with responsibilities spanning sales operations, business development, and revenue growth. His teaching combines storytelling, humor, and direct analysis of execution. Graves emphasizes that entrepreneurship extends beyond launching a company: it involves solving meaningful problems, creating durable value, and building income-producing assets supported by sound systems and capable people. Outside the classroom, he is an endurance athlete who has completed multiple Ironman triathlons and draws a close connection between athletic discipline and entrepreneurial perseverance. EDUCATION: Bachelor of Arts in International Relations, San Francisco State University • Master of Business Administration, University of San Francisco

Author	Bio
Miguel Colón 	Professor • Program Founder • Serial Entrepreneur Miguel Colón is a tenured professor of entrepreneurship and business at Chabot College and the founder of the college's Entrepreneurship Program. His teaching is informed by a career spanning business formation, corporate compliance, financial technology, capital formation, and executive leadership. Colón has founded or co-founded more than ten companies, including three that resulted in acquisitions. As founder and chief executive officer of SEC Compliance Services, he built a disclosure management company that was acquired by Issuer Direct Corporation (NYSE: ISDR). He later served as president of Transfer.ly, a Regulation A crowdfunding platform that facilitated more than \$30 million in investment transactions. He has also advised companies on public and private capital, international expansion, mergers and acquisitions, and corporate strategy. Known for a candid and engaging classroom style, Colón asks students to challenge assumptions, weigh evidence, and become comfortable making decisions without complete information. His approach reflects the reality that entrepreneurship requires thoughtful debate, calculated risk, disciplined execution, and continuous learning. EDUCATION: Bachelor of Arts in Management • Master of Business Administration, Saint Mary's College of California
Kathrina Q. Miranda 	Professor • Entrepreneur • Growth Strategist Kathrina Q. Miranda is an adjunct professor of entrepreneurship at Chabot College and an entrepreneur whose work centers on innovation, marketing, organizational development, and strategic growth. As founder of MiMA LLC, Miranda spent more than a decade helping organizations strengthen their digital presence, refine growth strategies, and secure more than \$1.2 million in capital. Following MiMA's merger with Apollo AIS in 2023, she became a co-founder of Apollo AIS, where she continues to advise organizations on sustainable innovation, organizational development, and growth. Miranda has also served on nonprofit and educational boards supporting libraries, education, and international community development. Her work reflects a broad view of entrepreneurship: not only as business creation, but as a means of expanding economic agency and opportunity. She is particularly committed to helping underserved and justice-impacted communities develop the confidence, judgment, and practical skills required to build lasting value. EDUCATION: Bachelor of Arts in Psychology, San Francisco State University • Master of Business Administration in Entrepreneurship and Marketing, Lorry I. Lokey Graduate School of Business at Mills College

Forward

From Advising Businesses to Building One

Knowledge can improve a decision-making process, but it cannot guarantee the customer's response or remove the founder's responsibility for the outcome.

Doug Sidrim de Figueiredo

Co-Founder and U.S. Country Lead Advisor, Tartiner USA

The View Changes When the Risk Becomes Yours

For years, I worked close to consequential business decisions. In legal, commercial, and strategic partnership roles, I saw how established companies evaluate risk, structure agreements, enter markets, build alliances, and pursue growth. From inside organizations such as EcoSecurities, Salesforce and DocuSign, entrepreneurship could appear orderly from a distance: an opportunity is identified, the business impact is mapped, a plan is developed, risks are evaluated, costs are estimated, resources are aligned, and execution follows.

Then I helped bring a Brazilian consumer brand into the United States, and the distance disappeared. Tartiner already had recognition in Brazil as a Premium Nut Butter, but a product that succeeds in one market does not simply arrive fully formed in another. And building a business requires effort on many fronts: U.S. market entry alone meant attention to regulation, labeling, import requirements, permits, positioning, distribution, and customer trust. The work moved quickly from strategy decks and negotiated terms to practical questions when I was getting ready to start at a Farmers Market, with immediate consequences: Will someone stop at our booth/tent? Will they buy it again? Would they recommend it to friends and family?

Selling at the Farmers Market taught me that entrepreneurship is not an abstraction. It is a succession of small tasks and tests conducted in public. A customer walks past. Another asks a question you did not anticipate. A retailer wants proof that demand extends beyond enthusiasm from friends. Inventory must arrive before the opportunity disappears. Every conversation produces information, but only if the entrepreneur is willing to listen rather than defend the original plan.

What Experience Does—and Does Not—Prepare You For

Corporate experience helped. It taught me to understand and evaluate risks, examine agreements carefully, understand incentives, build financial models, structure partnerships, and recognize that growth without structured operations can become fragility. It also created a dangerous temptation: to believe that professional expertise eliminates uncertainty. It does not. Knowledge can improve a decision or a decision making process, but it cannot guarantee the customer's response or remove the founder's responsibility for the outcome.

The transition from advising businesses to building one changed the meaning of familiar words. “Go-to-market” became the work of earning one shelf, one event, and one repeat customer at a time. “Distribution” became a relationship that had to be developed and maintained. “Brand” became the promise people believed after experiencing the product and not the language we preferred to use about it. “Risk” became capital, time, credibility, liability and relationships committed before the result was known.

That is why the entrepreneurs in this book matter. They allow us to study business before the outcome makes every decision look inevitable. Their ventures differ in industry, scale, resources, and ambition, but each founder faced the same essential challenge: act without complete information, learn from consequences, pivot if needed and continue creating value while conditions changed.

Entrepreneurship at Human Scale

That challenge is not unique to a handful of famous founders. Business education often returns to a small group of extraordinary individuals. Their stories are useful, but sometimes, extraordinary outcomes do not show multiple daily challenges and can hide the real work. Scale turns experiments into mythology. Success compresses years of uncertainty and challenges into a clean narrative. Readers may come away impressed without believing that the decisions have anything to do with their own lives.

Everyday entrepreneurs restore the missing scale. They show that entrepreneurship is practiced in markets, storefronts, service routes, offices, warehouses, kitchens, and online communities. It happens when a founder notices something others have overlooked, commits resources to a response, earns the trust of customers, and builds enough capacity for the solution to continue. Before freedom comes hard work and responsibility; before scale comes proof.

Read for Decisions, Not Heroes

Proof is what this book asks you to look for. The strongest way to read these fifty-four stories is not to ask whether each entrepreneur deserves admiration. Ask what the founder knew at the moment of decision. Will someone stop at our booth and taste the product? Will they come back, and tell a friend to come with them?

The recurring question in this casebook—"What would you do?"—is difficult precisely because the evidence is incomplete. That difficulty is the lesson. Entrepreneurship rarely presents itself as a tidy choice between a correct answer and an incorrect one. More often, the founder must decide which risk to accept, which assumption to test, what to protect, and when to change direction.

As I continue building in the United States, I recognize pieces of my own experience in these cases: the optimism required to begin, the humility required to learn, and the discipline required to keep opportunity from outrunning the organization. I also see decisions I would question and paths I might not take. That is not a weakness in the book. It is its purpose. Serious study begins when admiration gives way to examination.

The people in these pages do not offer a formula. They offer something more useful: evidence that entrepreneurship is learned through attention, action, correction, and sustained responsibility. I think of them the way I think of that first customer at our booth: proof arrives one person at a time, and only if you are still there to meet them. Their stories invite readers to think and see potential opportunities more clearly and then to decide what they are willing to build.

Doug Sidrim de Figueiredo
San Francisco Bay Area, California

Preface

Why We Built This Casebook

OUR PURPOSE: To make entrepreneurship practical, demanding, accessible, and grounded in real decisions.

Three sections • Eighteen chapters • Fifty-four entrepreneurs

A Shared Conviction

Entrepreneurship is often introduced through concepts: opportunity recognition, innovation, markets, business models, financing, leadership, and growth. Those concepts matter, but they become meaningful only when students can see how people use them under pressure. Entrepreneurship is ultimately practiced through decisions—what to build, whom to serve, what to risk, when to adapt, and how to turn an idea into an organization capable of creating value.

This casebook grew from that shared conviction. The three of us teach entrepreneurship and business at Chabot College, and our perspectives have also been shaped by building companies, advising organizations, developing markets, leading teams, and confronting the uncertainty that accompanies enterprise. Our paths are different, but our educational purpose is the same: entrepreneurship should be practical, demanding, accessible, and connected to the choices students will face beyond the classroom.

Why These Stories

We were drawn to these 54 founders because they represent entrepreneurship at human scale. They are not the familiar celebrity founders whose companies dominate business books and headlines. They are people building service businesses, consumer brands, technology companies, professional firms, community-centered ventures, and other organizations that solve identifiable problems for real customers. Their stories make entrepreneurship *real*, more immediate and accessible without making it appear easy.

This book presents fifty-four entrepreneurs across eighteen chapters and three thematic sections. The initial candidate pool came from the 2021 *Forbes Next 1000*, which recognized 1,000 entrepreneurs and small-business leaders from across the United States. That list gave us a valuable starting point, but it did not determine the final selection, the organization of the book, or the conclusions presented in these pages.

The fifty-four entrepreneurs were not selected to create a ranking of the “best,” nor does their inclusion suggest that every decision they made should be admired or repeated. We chose them because their experiences illuminate consequential questions about recognizing opportunity, earning customer trust, committing resources, managing uncertainty, responding to setbacks, developing organizations, and pursuing sustainable growth. Together, they provide meaningful variation in industry, market, background, scale, resources, and the problems they set out to address.

These are not conventional biographies. Each profile concentrates on moments when assumptions encountered evidence, ambition met constraint, and a founder’s judgment produced consequences. Placing three entrepreneurs within each chapter makes comparison possible. Similar problems can generate different strategies. Apparent advantages can carry hidden costs. Persistence can become either a strength or a liability. A decision that succeeds in one setting may fail in another.

The value of these cases therefore lies not in copying an entrepreneur’s outcome, but in examining the reasoning, execution, evidence, and context behind it. The purpose is not to turn the founders into heroes or present their experiences as formulas. It is to bring readers closer to entrepreneurship as it is actually practiced: through incomplete information, competing priorities, calculated risks, difficult adjustments, and decisions whose consequences are rarely known in advance.

After identifying the final fifty-four entrepreneurs, we independently researched, organized, wrote, and interpreted the profiles for this casebook. Our work drew upon publicly available materials and, where possible, direct interviews. The resulting chapters

reflect our educational purpose and editorial judgment rather than the selection criteria or editorial conclusions of the original list.

This publication is independent of Forbes and is not sponsored, authorized, or endorsed by Forbes Media. Inclusion in this casebook does not represent a continuation of, or ranking within, the *Forbes Next 1000*.

THE CENTRAL DISCIPLINE: Study the entrepreneur without worshipping the entrepreneur; study the decision without letting the outcome erase the uncertainty that preceded it.

A Book for the Students We Serve

Chabot College serves students with varied cultural, economic, academic, and professional experiences. Some already operate businesses. Some are supporting families while attending school. Some are returning after years in the workforce, and others are encountering entrepreneurship for the first time. Many possess useful knowledge gained through work, family, community, or lived experience but have not yet recognized it as a source of entrepreneurial insight.

We wrote this book for them—and for any reader who has been made to feel that entrepreneurship belongs to someone wealthier, better connected, more credentialed, or more fearless. Access to capital, networks, education, and social privilege undeniably affects opportunity. Those realities should be examined rather than ignored. At the same time, entrepreneurship can begin with careful observation: recognizing a recurring frustration, understanding a community, improving an inefficient process, or seeing a customer whose needs others have overlooked.

What We Ask of the Reader

The profiles should be approached with curiosity and skepticism. Success does not make a founder infallible. Some strategies may no longer fit current conditions; some leadership practices may conflict with a reader's values; and every enterprise creates consequences as well as opportunities. A serious study of entrepreneurship must ask not only what was built, but how it was built, who benefited, who carried the risk, and what followed.

The purpose of the book is not to convince every reader to launch a company. It is to strengthen judgment: the ability to evaluate opportunity, create value, manage uncertainty, act responsibly, and execute when the answer is not obvious. Those abilities matter whether a reader founds a venture, purchases a small business, leads within an established organization, manages a nonprofit, serves a community, or innovates within a profession.

As you move through the cases, compare rather than merely admire. Notice contradictions. Question assumptions. Consider when speed mattered and when patience mattered more; when persistence became an advantage and when it risked becoming stubbornness; when an entrepreneur created genuine value and when growth introduced new responsibilities. The lasting value of these stories will not come from memorizing names, dates, or company facts. It will come from learning to ask better questions before your own outcome is known.

OUR INVITATION: Read actively. Challenge the conclusions. Compare the decisions. Carry forward only the lessons that withstand careful examination.

Allan J. Graves
Miguel Colón
Kathrina Q. Miranda

Introduction

Why These Stories Matter

THE INVITATION: Study the decisions — not merely the success — and use every story to sharpen your own judgment.

Why This Book Exists

We believe entrepreneurship is one of the most powerful ways people can turn insight into action. It begins when someone recognizes a problem, accepts the uncertainty involved in solving it, and commits the time, resources, and reputation necessary to create something of value. Entrepreneurship can produce a business, but its broader significance lies in what that business makes possible: solutions for customers, meaningful work for employees, stronger communities, and organizations capable of enduring beyond their founders.

Building such an organization is neither quick nor romantic. In its earliest stages, a venture may demand more time than conventional employment while offering less stability. Customers need answers, cash must be managed carefully, systems are incomplete, and the founder is often responsible for nearly every consequential decision. Entrepreneurship does not automatically produce wealth, independence, or control over one's time. Those outcomes must be earned through sound economics, disciplined execution, capable leadership, and systems that allow the organization to operate without depending entirely on its founder.

When that transition occurs, a business can become more than another demanding job. It can become an income-producing asset—an organization that consistently creates value, supports the people connected to it, and gives its owners greater choice in how they direct their time and energy. The possibility of building something useful, durable, and larger than one person is central to our shared passion for entrepreneurship.

That passion is also grounded in personal experience. Each of us has seen what happens when professional commitment competes with responsibilities that matter just as deeply. Advancing a career often requires substantial investments of time, creativity, and effort. The resulting work may be meaningful and worthy of pride, yet the authority to step away—to care for a parent, coach a child's team, support a community, or pursue another worthwhile endeavor—may still belong largely to someone else.

We also encountered business owners in ordinary places and became curious about how they had built their livelihoods. Many were not celebrity founders, technological prodigies, or recipients of enormous investments. They owned service companies, distribution businesses, franchises, professional firms, and other enterprises that solved identifiable problems for real customers. Their achievements were not defined by public attention. They were reflected in the value their companies created, the people they employed, the assets they built, and the choices their work eventually made possible.

Yet these entrepreneurs were rarely the subjects of business books. The shelves remained crowded with the same celebrated founders and global corporations. Those stories can be instructive, but their extraordinary scale and familiarity can make entrepreneurship appear distant—something reserved for billionaires, visionaries, or people who began with exceptional advantages.

This book brings entrepreneurship back to human scale. It examines people building in the trenches: identifying needs, earning trust, committing resources, responding to setbacks, and making consequential decisions without knowing how the story will end. Their experiences reveal entrepreneurship not as a personality or a promise of effortless freedom, but as the disciplined work of creating value under uncertainty.

That is the work we believe deserves to be studied—and the reason this book exists.

Why These Fifty-Four Entrepreneurs

The fifty-four entrepreneurs in this book were selected from a working universe of more than one thousand possible profiles.

They are not presented as a ranking of the fifty-four “best” entrepreneurs, nor does inclusion certify every decision they made. We selected them because, taken together, their stories create a useful laboratory for entrepreneurial judgment. Each profile illuminates a particular problem, choice, constraint, operating mechanism, or consequence.

Three entrepreneurs appear in each of the book's eighteen chapters. That structure gives the reader more than one answer to the same entrepreneurial question. A decision that works in one context may fail in another. A founder's apparent advantage may carry hidden costs. Two entrepreneurs may pursue the same opportunity through entirely different models. The comparison is where much of the learning begins.

SELECTION PRINCIPLE: The profiles were chosen for the quality of the questions they allow us to ask — not for fame, glamour, or a flawless record.

Across the collection, we looked for variation in industry, geography, background, venture stage, scale, access to capital, and the nature of the market being served. We also looked for stories with enough credible evidence to distinguish a compelling narrative from an unsupported legend. Most of all, we chose cases that reveal entrepreneurship as a sequence of decisions: seeing a problem, forming a hypothesis, committing resources, persuading others, building an organization, responding to evidence, and living with the result.

Entrepreneurship Is Bigger Than Starting a Business

Starting a company is one expression of entrepreneurship, but it is not the complete definition. Entrepreneurship is the practice of creating value under uncertainty. It requires someone to commit capital, time, effort, or reputation to bring a solution into the marketplace before the outcome is known. It asks a person or team to discover what customers value, assemble resources, coordinate people, and build an organization capable of delivering on a promise.

Entrepreneurs may launch a new venture, acquire an existing one, expand a family business, develop a franchise, commercialize an invention, or redesign a system from inside an established organization. Their work can create jobs, improve access, make markets more efficient, strengthen communities, and address needs that incumbent institutions have overlooked. When the enterprise becomes durable, it can also create a legacy: an income-producing asset, a platform for future opportunity, or an institution that continues to serve after the founder steps away.

Entrepreneurship Is Not a Personality

The popular image of an entrepreneur is often a fearless, charismatic risk-taker who is young, wealthy, brilliant, and certain. That image is memorable—and misleading. You do not have to be born rich, decorated with degrees, unusually extroverted, technically gifted, young, old, or immune to fear. **No single personality owns entrepreneurship.**

What matters is not performing the role of “entrepreneur.” What matters is developing the practices the work requires: noticing unmet needs, listening carefully, testing assumptions, making decisions with imperfect information, communicating a credible promise, learning from evidence, and following through. Courage in this context does not mean the absence of fear. It means understanding what is at stake, reducing avoidable risk, and acting responsibly when certainty is unavailable. These are behaviors that can be studied, practiced, improved, and shared.

The Book's Three-Part Journey

The eighteen chapters are organized into three sections, each containing six entrepreneurial topics. The industry of a featured venture provides context, but the chapter's governing theme determines why the story belongs. The same industry can produce very different entrepreneurial lessons; the same lesson can appear in entirely different industries.

Part I — Creating Markets

The first six chapters examine how entrepreneurs make value visible and bring an opportunity into being. The cases ask how founders identify overlooked demand, earn attention, establish credibility, reach customers, and grow without losing the market

they worked to create. This section begins with the outward-facing work of entrepreneurship: understanding whom you serve, why they should care, and what must be true before an exchange can occur.

Part II — Expanding Opportunity

The next six chapters focus on access, participation, and the capacity to advance. These stories explore what happens when entrepreneurs challenge exclusion, build trust, extend capability, open pathways to mobility, and design models that allow more people to benefit. Opportunity is not treated as a slogan. It is something that must be built into products, institutions, channels, financing, employment, and the everyday mechanics of an organization.

Part III — Building Systems

The final six chapters turn from the opportunity itself to the system that must support it. The cases examine technical reliability, capital, disciplined execution, platforms and networks, and the constraints that appear when an enterprise scales. An idea becomes durable only when its economics, people, processes, governance, and technology can work together. This section asks what founders must build so that value does not depend on heroic effort forever.

ONE BOOK, ONE PROGRESSION: Create value. Expand who can participate. Build the systems that make the value durable.

A Word About Failure

Entrepreneurial stories are often edited backward. Once an enterprise succeeds, early uncertainty can look like destiny and temporary setbacks can become charming anecdotes. The people living those moments did not have that luxury. A lost customer, a failed product, a cash shortage, a damaged partnership, or a mistimed expansion could threaten the venture, the people who depended on it, and the founder's livelihood and reputation.

Failure should therefore be studied honestly, not romanticized. A setback does not automatically produce wisdom, and every failed venture does not lead to a better one. Learning occurs only when people examine the evidence, accept responsibility, revise their assumptions, and change what they do next. Sometimes the lesson allows a company to recover. Sometimes it informs a different opportunity. Sometimes it simply prevents the same mistake from being repeated.

Success, when it arrives, is usually a process rather than a moment. It contains experiments, reversals, defeats, recoveries, and decisions made without assurance. The useful question is not whether the entrepreneur avoided failure. It is whether the entrepreneur recognized reality soon enough, learned the right lesson, and converted that learning into better action.

Study Decisions, Not Success

It is easy to study Apple, Google, Nike, Airbnb, or Starbucks after their success has become part of our shared culture. Hindsight makes the path appear straighter than it was. Brand recognition, scale, and financial results can distract us from the decisions that created—or nearly destroyed—the enterprise along the way.

The more useful discipline is to pause before the outcome and enter the decision as it appeared at the time. What did the entrepreneur know? What remained uncertain? Which alternatives were available? What constraints limited the choice? How quickly did the situation require action? A strong decision can still produce a poor outcome when conditions change, just as a weak decision can occasionally benefit from luck. That is why this book asks you to evaluate the quality of the reasoning and the ability to execute—not simply to applaud the winner.

How to Read This Book

These chapters are not conventional biographies. They do not attempt to record every stage of a person's life or every event in a company's history. They are narrative cases: focused stories about entrepreneurs working through consequential problems in the marketplace. Each chapter provides a theme, evidence, and three points of comparison. Your task is to read actively.

As you encounter each entrepreneur, keep six questions in view:

- What problem was this entrepreneur trying to solve?
- Why did customers care—or why did the entrepreneur believe they would?
- What capital, time, reputation, relationships, or opportunities were placed at risk?
- What advantages did the entrepreneur appear to possess, and how were those advantages created?
- What nearly killed the company, weakened the model, or forced the entrepreneur to adapt?
- What would I have done differently with the information available at the time?

The recurring “What Would You Do?” section is your invitation to move from observation to judgment. Resist the temptation to search immediately for the approved answer. State your assumptions. Identify what evidence you would need. Consider who bears the risk. Choose a course of action and explain how you would execute it. Then compare your reasoning with the entrepreneur’s decision and its consequences.

You do not need to admire every founder or agree with every choice to learn from the case. In fact, disagreement can be productive when it is specific and evidence-based. The goal is not imitation. It is to build a larger library of patterns, tradeoffs, warning signs, and possibilities that you can draw upon when your own moment of uncertainty arrives.

Your Journey Starts—or Continues—Here

Entrepreneurship offers no guaranteed path to money, status, or freedom. It does offer a way to create value, build capability, and claim greater responsibility for how problems are solved. For some people, that work becomes a company. For others, it becomes a new product, a stronger institution, an acquired business, a community resource, or an asset that expands the choices available to a family and the people it employs.

The fifty-four entrepreneurs who follow are not distant monuments. They are decision-makers. Their stories show ideas meeting customers, ambition meeting constraint, and judgment meeting consequence. Read them for what they reveal about markets, opportunity, systems, and yourself. Ask what you would notice, what you would risk, whom you would serve, and what you would build.

BEGIN HERE: Your entrepreneurial journey starts — or continues — by studying real decisions, their outcomes, and the lessons you can carry into your work.

PART 1: CREATING MARKETS

Chapter 1: Seeing What Others Miss

- 1.1: CASE 1 | Kelli Jones, NoSo Patches
- 1.2: CASE 2 | Deah Berry Mitchell, Nostalgia Black
- 1.3: CASE 3 | Joe Anderson, Reflex Protect
- 1.4: Review

Chapter 2: Defining the Customer

- 2.1: CASE 1 | Nicole Brown, Brown Sugar Box
- 2.2: CASE 2 | Keenan Beasley, Sunday II Sunday
- 2.3: CASE 3 | Sania Vucetaj, Sania's Brow Bar
- 2.4: Review

Chapter 3: Creating Value People Can Recognize

- 3.1: CASE 1 | Monique Little, You Go Natural
- 3.2: CASE 2 | Fri Forjindam, Mycotoo
- 3.3: CASE 3 | Dustin Anthony, BloomingTables
- 3.4: Review

Chapter 4: Earning Attention, Identity, and Trust

- 4.1: CASE 1 | Myron Chandran, Afro Soca Love
- 4.2: CASE 2 | Elizabeth Sutton, Elizabeth Sutton Collection
- 4.3: CASE 3 | Taylor Humphries, Ranked Media and Technologies
- 4.4: Review

Chapter 5: Reaching the Customer

- 5.1: CASE 1 | Mandy Bowman, Official Black Wall Street
- 5.2: CASE 2 | Brendan Ciecko, Cuseum
- 5.3: CASE 3 | FAMOSOS
- 5.4: Review

Chapter 6: Growing Without Losing the Market

- 6.1: CASE 1 | Pinky Cole, Slutty Vegan
- 6.2: CASE 2 | Derrick Hayes, Big Dave's Cheesesteaks
- 6.3: CASE 3 | Alia J. Daniels, Revry
- 6.4: Review

CHAPTER 1: SEEING WHAT OTHERS MISS

Seeing What Others Miss

How entrepreneurs recognize opportunity before a market is obvious

The Opportunity Is Not the Idea

Entrepreneurial opportunity is often described as a flash of insight: someone sees an idea that everyone else missed. That account is attractive—and incomplete. An idea becomes an opportunity only when evidence suggests that a real group of people experiences a problem, values a different solution, and can be reached through a workable operating model.

The three stories in this chapter begin with different kinds of evidence. Kelli Jones encountered a small but recurring product failure. Deah Berry Mitchell saw cultural knowledge disappearing from the physical landscape and from conventional tourism. Joe Anderson spent years inside a public argument that offered two polarized choices while leaving a practical middle ground underdeveloped.

None of them simply discovered an empty industry. They reframed what they observed. Jones saw repair as both function and self-expression. Mitchell joined history, food, place, and technology into paid experiences and educational products. Anderson saw nonlethal preparedness as a distinct category between helplessness and lethal force. Their industries are secondary. The shared entrepreneurial act is interpreting an overlooked signal and deciding what to build around it.

CHAPTER LENS

Opportunity recognition is a sequence: notice an anomaly, test whether others share it, define who values a response, and commit resources before certainty arrives.

Three Ways to See What Others Miss

- **FRICTION:** a familiar workaround signals that an accepted inconvenience may be a product opportunity.
- **ABSENCE:** what a market fails to preserve, represent, or make visible may support a new experience or service.
- **FALSE CHOICE:** a polarized category can conceal customers who want a credible third option.

1.1: CASE 1 | Kelli Jones, NoSo Patches

1.2: CASE 2 | Deah Berry Mitchell, Nostalgia Black

1.3: CASE 3 | Joe Anderson, Reflex Protect

1.4: Review

This page titled [Chapter 1: Seeing What Others Miss](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

1.1: CASE 1 | Kelli Jones, NoSo Patches

CASE 1 | FRICTION

Kelli Jones, NoSo Patches

A repair that did not look like surrender

In 2014, Kelli Jones tore a new \$400 Patagonia down parka while crossing a barbed-wire fence. The available repair was duct tape. It could close the rip, but to Jones it made an expensive piece of technical gear look damaged rather than restored. This was not an isolated frustration: synthetic jackets, sleeping bags, tents, and backpacks tear, while replacement can be costly and wasteful. The accepted repair methods emphasized function and treated appearance as irrelevant.[1]

Jones did not begin with outdoor-industry credentials. She began by sourcing materials and testing combinations of adhesive and synthetic fabric. She cut early versions into hearts and stars. That aesthetic decision mattered. It reframed a patch from evidence of failure into a visible choice. When people waiting in the tram line at Jackson Hole Mountain Resort asked about the homemade patches, Jones gained a first form of market evidence: strangers recognized the product, understood its use, and wanted one.[1][2]

The pivotal decision was not merely to sell patches. It was to treat repair as a category that could combine durability, personalization, and conservation. Jones continued testing hundreds of adhesive-and-fabric combinations rather than selling a decorative sticker that might fail under outdoor conditions. In August 2016, NoSo launched through Indiegogo. The campaign financed material purchases and helped build the company's website, converting curiosity in a ski-town tram line into demand from early adopters.[3][4]

NoSo then had to choose a route to market. A purely direct-to-consumer business could tell the brand story online, but specialty retailers already served customers buying technical gear. Wholesale distribution placed the repair product near the equipment it was designed to preserve. The company identifies Jans as its first wholesale account and reports that its patches are now carried by more than 1,000 specialty stores in more than 25 countries.[1][2] Those scale figures come from the company and should be treated as company-reported, not independently audited.

The deeper opportunity was not 'patches.' It was the mismatch between the value customers placed on outdoor gear and the low-quality experience of repairing it. Jones's product reduced the economic cost of replacement, the emotional cost of making valued gear look ruined, and the environmental cost of premature disposal. One observed tear became useful only because she connected it to repeat behavior, validated recognition in the field, and built a product capable of surviving the use case.

Pivotal Decision

Build a technically credible repair product that customers would choose to display — not a temporary fix they would tolerate.

Sources

[1] NoSo Patches, "About Us". <https://nosopatches.com/pages/about> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[2] Shoutout Colorado, "Meet Kelli Jones". <https://shoutoutcolorado.com/meet-ke...jones-founder/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[3] Outdoor Sportswire, "NoSo Puffy Patches Launches Website" (Aug. 25, 2016). <https://www.outdoorsportswire.com/no...-on-indiegogo/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[4] SheJumps, "Announcing the Girafficorn Puffy Patch". <https://www.shejumps.org/post/announ...rn-puffy-patch> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [1.1: CASE 1 | Kelli Jones, NoSo Patches](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

1.2: CASE 2 | Deah Berry Mitchell, Nostalgia Black

CASE 2 | ABSENCE

Deah Berry Mitchell, Nostalgia Black / Soul of DFW

When the place no longer shows the story

Deah Berry Mitchell's opportunity was harder to see because the central problem was absence. Local Black history existed in archives, memories, food traditions, and community knowledge, but it was not always visible in the tourism products or surviving architecture of Dallas–Fort Worth. Mitchell had been writing about the relationship between West African cuisine, slavery, and soul food. While traveling in 2017, she formed an idea that combined her interests in cuisine and local cultural history: a guided bus experience built around historical sites and Black-owned restaurants.[5][6]

Mitchell proposed the concept to writer and publicist Dalila Thomas. They launched in 2018. The format did more than place two activities on the same itinerary. Food gave participants a sensory and social entry point into history; the historical narrative gave the restaurant stops meaning beyond consumption. In Mitchell's framing, the experience was a celebration of culture rather than a meal with commentary.[5][7]

The business model also made overlooked history legible to more than one customer. Individuals could buy tickets. Schools and faculty could use the tours as experiential learning. Employers could use them for cultural education. Black-owned restaurants gained customers and visibility. This multi-sided value did not eliminate the venture's constraints: tours require transportation, coordination, local expertise, reliable partners, and enough demand on specific dates. The model's strength—its grounding in place—also limits how easily it can be copied.

The pandemic exposed that dependence on physical gathering. Mitchell later relaunched the tours in April 2022 under Nostalgia Black, an umbrella company offering tourism, public speaking, research, writing, educational materials, and consultation.[5][8] This was more than diversification for its own sake. It separated the underlying asset—curated cultural knowledge—from a single delivery format.

A further decision emerged from the tours themselves. Mitchell found that some sites no longer contained the original structures needed to make their histories visible. Rather than accept that constraint, she began developing an augmented-reality experience that could layer people and events back onto place. The University of North Texas reported in 2025 that her Deep Ellum application grew from this problem and used augmented reality to help users see and hear histories no longer apparent in the built environment.[9]

Mitchell's case is not simply about finding an underserved demographic. It is about recognizing that markets often undervalue context. Conventional tourism could move people through a city while missing the histories that shaped it. She created value by curating what was scattered, connecting it to food and place, and then experimenting with technology when physical evidence had disappeared.

Pivotal Decision

Treat cultural history as an experience platform with several delivery formats, rather than tying the venture to one bus tour.

Sources

[5] Soul of DFW, "The Soul of DFW Experience". <https://soulofdfw.com/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[6] D Magazine, "A Dallas Bus Tour Highlights Black-owned Businesses" (June 25, 2019). <https://www.dmagazine.com/food-drink...mach-and-soul/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[7] Fort Worth Weekly, “Soul of DFW Tours” (Nov. 18, 2020). <https://www.fweek.com/2020/11/18/...-of-dfw-tours/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[8] Nostalgia Black, “Products and Services”. <https://nostalgiablack.com/products-and-services> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[9] University of North Texas, “Augmented reality app reveals hidden history” (2025). <https://news.unt.edu/news/2025/unt-s...ghborhood.html> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled 1.2: CASE 2 | Deah Berry Mitchell, Nostalgia Black is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

1.3: CASE 3 | Joe Anderson, Reflex Protect

CASE 3 | FALSE CHOICE

Joe Anderson, Reflex Protect

A Third Option In A Polarized Market

Joe Anderson's opportunity developed over decades. In 1993, a gunman attacked Pettit & Martin, the San Francisco law firm where Anderson had worked. Friends and former colleagues were among those killed. Anderson initially engaged with the political debate over guns, but later concluded that the argument was not producing a practical option for people responsible for safety in workplaces and other shared spaces.[10][11]

The problem was not a lack of products labeled for self-defense. It was a category conflict. Firearms could be lethal, required significant responsibility and training, and were prohibited or unacceptable in many settings. Conventional sprays could create cross-contamination or be difficult to deploy accurately indoors. Doing nothing left staff and bystanders without an active response. The market appeared to offer a binary choice—guns or no guns—while many schools, healthcare facilities, houses of worship, and workplaces needed a different risk profile.

In 2016, Anderson met Steve Mangold, a Montanan who had developed and patented a pistol-style spray head. Mangold understood deployment mechanics; Anderson brought entrepreneurial experience and a personal reason to pursue nonlethal workplace defense. They took the idea through the University of Montana's Blackstone LaunchPad and formed Reflex Protect in 2017.[10][11]

Their pivotal decision was to build a system for sensitive indoor environments rather than market another generic defensive spray. Product development combined the trigger with a targeted, non-aerosol gel and a decontamination product. The company also paired the product with training. That bundle changed the customer proposition: administrators were not merely buying a canister; they were adopting a preparedness protocol that had to fit policy, staff confidence, indoor safety, and liability concerns.[12][13]

Early adoption provided evidence but not certainty. Reporting in 2018 and 2019 identified deployments or interest among schools, healthcare facilities, churches, courts, and corrections settings.[12][13] The company later expanded toward tactical and law-enforcement markets and appointed Matt Schaefer as CEO, while Anderson remained identified as a founder.[14] This leadership change matters to the case because recognizing an opportunity and scaling a specialized regulated product are different jobs.

The ethical tension is inseparable from the opportunity. Claims about safety, effectiveness, cross-contamination, and decontamination cannot be treated as marketing language alone. Customers must evaluate training requirements, misuse, medical consequences, regulation, and whether a less-lethal tool changes behavior in beneficial or harmful ways. The venture's market exists precisely because the consequences are serious. That makes verification and governance part of the product, not administrative details.

Pivotal Decision

Define nonlethal preparedness as its own category — and sell a product-plus-training system suited to places where lethal force or indiscriminate spray is unacceptable.

Sources

[10] Reflex Protect, "Our Story". <https://reflexprotect.com/pages/about-us> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[11] Montana Public Radio, "A 21st-Century Fire Extinguisher for Violence" (June 10, 2020). <https://www.mtpr.org/arts-culture/20...r-for-violence> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[12] Missoula Current, “Missoula startup looks to enter national debate”. <https://missoulacurrent.com/missoula-startup-defense/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[13] Missoula Current, “Missoula-made spray offers non-lethal option”. <https://missoulacurrent.com/reflex-protect/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[14] Reflex Protect, “Appoints Matt Schaefer as New CEO”. <https://reflexprotect.com/blogs/news...fer-as-new-ceo> (accessed August 18, 2026).

1.4: Review

What the Three Cases Reveal

These founders did not begin with comparable resources, customers, or industries. Yet their opportunity-recognition processes share a structure.

Examples of overlooked signals, reframing strategies, and early evidence across the three case studies

Case	Overlooked Signal	Reframing	Early Evidence
NoSo Patches	Visible, ugly workarounds on valuable gear	Repair can be durable and expressive	Unprompted interest; crowdfunding; first wholesale account
Nostalgia Black	Black cultural history missing from conventional tourism and the built landscape	History can be a paid, multisensory experience and digital layer	Tour participation; restaurant partnerships; relaunch; institutional use
Reflex Protect	Customers trapped between lethal force, unsuitable sprays, and no active response	Nonlethal preparedness can be a distinct product-and-training category	Incubator support; institutional pilots; early facility adoption

The non-obvious lesson: an opportunity is a commitment under uncertainty

Observation alone is cheap. Many people saw tape on torn jackets, toured Dallas without its Black history, or argued about guns. The entrepreneurial difference was a commitment to test a specific interpretation. Jones invested in material performance. Mitchell assembled partners and a route, then separated cultural knowledge from one delivery channel. Anderson and Mangold developed a specialized system and entered institutions where adoption depended on more than consumer preference.

The cases also warn against a common error: using later success to make the original opportunity look inevitable. None of the early signals proved a large market. Questions in a tram line did not guarantee wholesale demand. A compelling tour concept did not guarantee operational resilience. A patented trigger did not guarantee institutional approval. The evidence justified the next experiment—not certainty.

What Would You Do?

Put yourself in the decision-maker's position. Consider the available evidence, competing priorities, risks, and consequences before deciding what should happen next.

- Signal versus anecdote: what additional evidence would justify moving from personal experience to a venture?
- Category design: each founder changed what the customer believed was being purchased—repair plus identity, tourism plus cultural interpretation, or defense plus preparedness.
- Customer definition: identify the payer, user, beneficiary, and gatekeeper in each case. They are not always the same person.
- Channel as strategy: specialty retail, experiential tourism, institutional procurement, and digital augmentation each shape the offering itself.
- Mission and economics: social or environmental value strengthens a case only when the operating model can continue delivering it.
- Evidence discipline: separate founder claims, independently reported facts, announced intentions, pilots, and demonstrated outcomes.
- Ethical boundaries: opportunity recognition does not excuse weak claims, cultural extraction, safety shortcuts, or promotional storytelling.

Evidence Packet and Editorial Boundaries

This appendix documents the case spine used for the pilot. It is an editorial control, not a substitute for final legal and factual review.

Kelli Jones / NoSo Patches

- Case boundary: 2014–2026
- Verified spine: Founder, origin event, product-development process, 2016 Indiegogo launch, first wholesale account, company-reported current distribution.
- Open verification: Independently corroborate current store/country counts and any environmental-performance claim used in final copy.

Deah Berry Mitchell / Nostalgia Black

- Case boundary: 2017–2026
- Verified spine: Tour concept and launch, co-founder history, 2022 relaunch, current service portfolio, AR application and its origin in missing architecture.
- Open verification: Confirm paid-customer mix, historical tour volumes, partner economics, and app ownership/funding before adding quantitative outcomes.

Joe Anderson / Reflex Protect

- Case boundary: 1993–2026
- Verified spine: Connection to Pettit & Martin shooting, partnership with Steve Mangold, incubator pathway, 2017 formation, product-plus-training model, later CEO transition.
- Open verification: Obtain current regulatory, adoption, safety-testing, and customer evidence. Legal review is mandatory for efficacy and medical claims.

Source Register

See individual pages for source information.

This page titled [1.4: Review](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

CHAPTER 2: DEFINING THE CUSTOMER

Defining the Customer

How defining the customer shapes the entire venture

The Customer Is a Strategic Choice

A venture does not find its customer once and then move on. Defining the customer determines which problem counts, which product attributes matter, what language feels credible, where the offering is sold, and what the organization refuses to become. A broad label such as “women,” “beauty consumers,” or “people who care about wellness” is rarely specific enough to guide those decisions.

The three founders in this chapter narrowed the market in different ways. Nicole Brown centered Black women who were routinely treated as an adaptation or afterthought in everyday consumer goods. Keenan Beasley focused on active women with textured hair who faced a recurring conflict between exercise and maintaining a hairstyle. Sania Vucetaj built around clients who valued long-term brow health and natural fullness, even while industry practices and fashion cycles rewarded faster or more dramatic interventions.

Their industries are secondary. The shared entrepreneurial work is deciding whose experience will be treated as primary. That decision can create loyalty and clarity, but it also imposes discipline. A founder who claims to serve everyone often designs for no one in particular.

CHAPTER LENS

Customer definition is a chain of choices: identify whose constraint matters, define the progress they seek, design around that progress, and let the choice shape product, channel, voice, and boundaries.

Three Ways to Define a Customer

- **IDENTITY AND RECOGNITION:** the customer values being understood without translation or adaptation.
- **USE OCCASION AND CONSTRAINT:** the customer is defined by a recurring situation in which existing products fail.
- **DESIRED LONG-TERM OUTCOME:** the venture attracts customers who value a particular philosophy of care, not merely a category purchase.

2.1: CASE 1 | Nicole Brown, Brown Sugar Box

2.2: CASE 2 | Keenan Beasley, Sunday II Sunday

2.3: CASE 3 | Sania Vucetaj, Sania's Brow Bar

2.4: Review

This page titled [Chapter 2: Defining the Customer](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

2.1: CASE 1 | Nicole Brown, Brown Sugar Box

CASE 1 | IDENTITY AND RECOGNITION

Nicole Brown, Izzy & Liv / Brown Sugar Box

Designed with Black women as the first thought

Nicole Brown's customer definition began before Izzy & Liv. In 2003 she created Mahogany Butterfly, an online community for Black women, after noticing that mainstream women's lifestyle sites rarely spoke to them directly. The project gave Brown an early lesson: a demographic can be highly visible in culture and still be underserved as a primary editorial and commercial audience.[1][2]

After closing that first community and returning to corporate marketing, Brown revisited the idea during a family crisis. Her daughter Olivia was born four months prematurely in 2013 and required prolonged medical care. Brown left her job to care for her and reconsidered the community she had abandoned. She formed Izzy & Liv—named for daughters Isabel and Olivia—not as a generic lifestyle store with diverse imagery added later, but as a brand built from Black women's shared references, joy, humor, and everyday experience.[1][3]

That definition shaped the initial offer. Brown began selling graphic T-shirts through print-on-demand, a low-capital way to test whether cultural recognition could convert into purchases. She then expanded into accessories and home goods. The important strategic move was not product breadth by itself. Each category gave the same customer more places to encounter herself in ordinary consumption—what Brown described as seeing Black women represented in everyday products rather than as an exception.[2]

The Brown Sugar Box, launched in 2017, made the customer definition into a recurring model. Because Brown had already built an audience, the subscription did not begin as a cold acquisition exercise. Forbes reported that 1,000 customers subscribed within two weeks and 10,000 by the end of the first year. Members organized unboxing gatherings and called themselves Brown Sugar Babes, turning a bundle of products into a repeated community ritual.[1] These historical counts were reported by Brown and should not be treated as audited current figures.

The case also shows the operational cost of customer intimacy. Cultural fluency does not prevent inventory errors, cash-flow pressure, or hiring problems. Inc. reported that a misspelled order of 10,000 shirts cost the company \$50,000 to correct.[2] Serving a precisely defined customer can strengthen demand, but the promise raises the cost of inconsistency because trust is part of what the customer is buying.

Pivotal Decision

Treat Black women as the organizing customer—not one segment in a general-market brand—and extend that commitment from content into products, subscriptions, and community.

Sources

[1] Forbes, "This Mother Of Four Tapped Her Talent for Building Online Communities" (Oct. 30, 2020). <https://www.forbes.com/sites/elaineplion-business/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[2] Inc., "How This Founder Turned Her Blog Into a Lifestyle Brand" (Dec. 14, 2020). <https://www.inc.com/anna-meyer/izzy-...n-inc5000.html> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[3] ENSPIRE, "Founder Nicole Brown Speaks on the Success of Izzy and Liv" (Apr. 4, 2021). <https://enspiremag.com/2021/04/found...own-sugar-box/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [2.1: CASE 1 | Nicole Brown, Brown Sugar Box](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

2.2: CASE 2 | Keenan Beasley, Sunday II Sunday

CASE 2 | USE OCCASION AND CONSTRAINT

Keenan Beasley, Sunday II Sunday

The customer appears when the workout ends

Keenan Beasley did not define Sunday II Sunday's customer only by hair texture. The sharper definition was behavioral: active women with textured hair who needed to manage sweat, salt, scalp buildup, dryness, and style preservation between wash days. That use occasion exposed a tradeoff existing hair-care routines had normalized. Some women avoided exercise or limited activity because restoring a style could be costly and time-consuming.[4][5]

Beasley had worked in marketing roles at Procter & Gamble, Reckitt Benckiser, and L'Oréal. He also grew up around active women. Those experiences helped him interpret the problem as more than another opening in the crowded textured-hair category. The customer was trying to achieve two forms of progress at once: live an active life and maintain healthy hair without starting a full wash-and-style process after every workout.[4][6]

That definition shaped the launch assortment in 2020. Sunday II Sunday introduced products for the periods before, during, and after activity, including a micellar rinse intended to remove sweat and buildup without a conventional full wash. The brand's name referenced the period between Sunday wash days; the operating idea was therefore encoded in the brand itself.[4]

The customer choice also affected channel strategy. The company began direct-to-consumer, where it could explain a new "athleisure haircare" category. It later entered Ulta Beauty, and in 2022 Ulta received an early exclusive on a shampoo-and-conditioner launch. Retail expansion made the products easier to find, but it also required the company to translate a nuanced use case into packaging, merchandising, and a short shelf-level explanation.[7]

Beasley's other ventures—including Venture Noire—are relevant to his broader biography but are not the business model under examination here. Sunday II Sunday is a consumer-products company whose strategic lesson is customer definition by circumstance. "Women with textured hair" is a market description. "Active women managing textured hair between workouts and wash days" is a design brief.

Pivotal Decision

Build a hair-care system around the workout-to-wash-day interval, making an overlooked use occasion—not a broad demographic label—the center of product development.

Sources

[4] Beauty Independent, "Keenan Beasley Gets Active with Sunday II Sunday" (June 16, 2020). <https://www.beautyindependent.com/ke...day-ii-sunday/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[5] Fast Company, "Hair-care products designed for fitness-minded women of color" (Sept. 21, 2021). <https://www.fastcompany.com/90674010...women-of-color> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[6] Wisdom in Beauty, interview with Keenan Beasley (Nov. 4, 2021). <https://www.wisdominbeauty.com/artis...haircare-brand> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[7] Retail Dive, "Sunday II Sunday launch will sell on Ulta" (May 2, 2022). <https://www.retaildive.com/news/sund...ts-own/622937/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [2.2: CASE 2 | Keenan Beasley, Sunday II Sunday](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

2.3: CASE 3 | Sania Vucetaj, Sania's Brow Bar

CASE 3 | DESIRED LONG-TERM OUTCOME

Sania Vucetaj, Sania's Brow Bar

Choosing the client who values restraint

Sania Vucetaj entered a market in which thin brows, waxing, and rapid trend changes were widely accepted. After aesthetics training, she became a tweezing-only specialist at Bergdorf Goodman. Her one-hair-at-a-time approach emphasized fuller, natural-looking brows when many customers still equated grooming with aggressive removal.[8][9]

Vucetaj's customer was therefore not simply "someone who wants brow grooming." The better fit was a client willing to prioritize shape, symmetry, follicle health, and gradual regrowth. That definition affected the service method: tweezing rather than waxing or threading, consultation rather than a standardized fast treatment, and patience rather than instant transformation.[8]

Leaving Bergdorf Goodman made the philosophy into an independent venture. Vucetaj opened her first salon in 2005, later moving to Chelsea. She enforced clear boundaries—no waxing, threading, or microblading—and built a specialist service that instructors and peers had doubted could support a salon.[8]

The customer definition also guided product expansion. Vucetaj developed an angled-tip pencil to fit her technique; the current offer combines services, tools, cosmetics, cleansing products, and education.[8][10] This is a service-led specialist brand, not the marketplace platform suggested by an earlier taxonomy label.

Claims about follicle damage, regrowth, or particular treatments reflect Vucetaj's professional position and require independent clinical support before publication as medical fact. The entrepreneurship lesson remains: a clear philosophy selects the customer, structures the service, and establishes what the brand will decline to do.

Pivotal Decision

Build a tweezing-only specialist brand for clients who value long-term brow health over faster services and changing trends.

Sources

[8] Glamour, "The Brow Whisperer: Sania Vucetaj" (Apr. 4, 2024). <https://www.glamour.com/story/sania-...omen-interview> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[9] Sania's Brow Bar, "Sania's Story". <https://www.saniasbrowbar.com/pages/sanias-story> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[10] Sania's Brow Bar, Services. <https://www.saniasbrowbar.com/pages/services> (accessed August 18, 2026).

2.4: Review

What the Three Cases Reveal

Customer definition is not the same as naming a demographic. It becomes strategically useful only when it changes decisions.

Examples of customer definition, what it changes, and boundary or risk across the three case studies

Case	Customer Definition	What It Changes	Boundary or Risk
Izzy & Liv	Black women seeking cultural recognition in everyday products	Voice, assortment, recurring box, community	Authenticity raises expectations; breadth increases operating complexity
Sunday II Sunday	Active women with textured hair between workouts and wash days	Formulation, routine, category language, channel education	A precise use case may require expensive education and proof
Sania's Brow Bar	Clients prioritizing natural fullness and long-term brow care	Method, consultation, product development, refusal rules	Expert claims require evidence; philosophy excludes some demand

The non-obvious lesson: exclusion creates coherence

A useful customer definition excludes as well as includes. Izzy & Liv did not dilute its voice to resemble a general-market lifestyle store. Sunday II Sunday did not begin by addressing every hair concern. Sania's Brow Bar declined popular service methods that conflicted with its philosophy. In each case, the boundary made the venture easier to understand and the operating choices more coherent.

The danger is turning precision into mythology. A founder can overgeneralize from a personal network, confuse a passionate community with a sufficiently large market, or use identity language to avoid testing willingness to pay. Customer definition should produce hypotheses that can be tested: which problem occurs, how often, what customers do now, what they value, and what tradeoffs they will accept.

What Would You Do?

Put yourself in the decision-maker's position. Consider the available evidence, competing priorities, risks, and consequences before deciding what should happen next.

- Demographic versus job-to-be-done: distinguish who the customer is from the progress the customer seeks.
- Primary customer: identify the payer, user, beneficiary, community member, and channel gatekeeper in each case.
- Design consequences: trace how customer definition changes product features, assortment, language, service method, and distribution.
- Product versus community: determine when belonging creates economic value and when it becomes promotional rhetoric.
- Niche and scale: examine whether specificity narrows demand or improves acquisition, retention, and extension opportunities.
- Refusal as strategy: identify what each venture will not offer and whether that boundary strengthens or weakens the model.
- Evidence discipline: separate founder interpretation, customer behavior, reported financial results, and independently verified outcomes.

Evidence Packet and Editorial Boundaries

This appendix records the verified case spine and remaining editorial risk. It is an editorial control, not a substitute for final legal, medical, or factual review.

Nicole Brown / Izzy & Liv

- Case boundary: 2003–2026
- Verified spine: Mahogany Butterfly origin; Izzy & Liv formation; Black women as primary customer; print-on-demand test; 2017 Brown Sugar Box launch; reported early subscription growth and community formation.
- Open verification: Confirm current company status, current subscriber and revenue figures, and permission for any personal medical details before publication.

Keenan Beasley / Sunday II Sunday

- Case boundary: 2020–2026
- Verified spine: Founder identity; active women with textured hair as target; workout-to-wash-day use case; 2020 product launch; DTC-to-Ulta expansion; current founder affiliation.
- Open verification: Verify current ownership, assortment, distribution, clinical substantiation, and any exercise-avoidance statistic before final copy.

Sania Vucetaj / Sania's Brow Bar

- Case boundary: early 2000s–2026
- Verified spine: Bergdorf experience; 2005 independent salon; tweezing-only positioning; fuller-brow philosophy; Chelsea operation; service-plus-product model.
- Open verification: Independently review health, follicle, and regrowth claims; confirm dates, product-development chronology, and current business metrics.

Source Register

See individual pages for source information.

This page titled [2.4: Review](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

CHAPTER 3: CREATING VALUE PEOPLE CAN RECOGNIZE

Creating Value People Can Recognize

How an idea becomes an offering customers understand and value

An Idea Must Become Legible

Founders often overestimate the value of novelty. Customers do not buy an idea because it is original; they buy an offering they can recognize, understand, trust, and use. That requires translation. The founder must decide which benefit leads, what complexity stays behind the scenes, and how the customer will experience value before committing money or attention.

The three cases in this chapter perform that translation differently. Monique Little converted the skill and time required to tie a protective headwrap into a pre-tied, satin-lined product. Fri Forjindam and her Mycotoo partners convert stories and intellectual property into physical worlds where guests can participate. Dustin Anthony combined furniture and indoor gardening, then had to prove that the result was more than a visual novelty.

These are not cases about branding after the product is finished. Each venture changed the offering itself so the value could be recognized quickly. Convenience became part of the headwrap. Narrative became part of the built environment. Drainage, removable glass, and crowdfunding evidence made living furniture credible.

CHAPTER LENS

Value becomes recognizable when the venture compresses a complicated promise into a clear customer experience—and supplies enough proof to make the promise believable.

Three Ways to Make Value Legible

- **REMOVE HIDDEN LABOR:** preserve the desired outcome while eliminating skill, time, or inconvenience.
- **TURN ABSTRACTION INTO PARTICIPATION:** let customers experience a story, identity, or brand world rather than merely hear about it.
- **DEMONSTRATE THE HYBRID:** when an offering crosses categories, use design details and market tests to show how it works.

3.1: CASE 1 | Monique Little, You Go Natural

3.2: CASE 2 | Fri Forjindam, Mycotoo

3.3: CASE 3 | Dustin Anthony, BloomingTables

3.4: Review

This page titled [Chapter 3: Creating Value People Can Recognize](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

3.1: CASE 1 | Monique Little, You Go Natural

CASE 1 | REMOVE HIDDEN LABOR

Monique Little, You Go Natural

The wrap was familiar; the ease was new

In 2016, Monique Little needed a faster way to protect and style her natural hair after the birth of her daughter. Headwraps already existed, but the available solution carried hidden work. Cotton could create friction and absorb moisture; a traditional wrap also required time and tying skill. A generic hat could hide the hair without necessarily protecting it. Little's opportunity was therefore not to introduce customers to headwraps. It was to make the desired result easier to achieve.[1][2]

Using a sewing machine and remnant fabric, Little created a pre-tied wrap with a satin lining. The product translated several benefits into one visible form: protective material on the inside, a finished style on the outside, and a construction that reduced the customer's preparation. When she showed the wrap to followers on Instagram, interest became an early demand signal, and she began producing and selling online.[1]

That design decision mattered more than a broad claim about natural beauty. "Protective," "pre-tied," and "ready to wear" told the customer what work the product removed. Style variety then made convenience feel expressive rather than clinical. You Go Natural could compete as an accessory, but the operating proposition was closer to a repeatable hair-care shortcut.

Growth forced Little to make the promise operational. The company moved production from a home sewing setup into a Dallas facility and raised a reported \$2 million seed round in 2021 to expand manufacturing, staffing, and product development.[1][2] The capital increased capacity, but it also increased inventory and execution risk. During a later Shark Tank appearance, the company disclosed a substantial prior-year loss associated in part with excess inventory, illustrating how quickly a clear product can create a less clear operating problem.[3]

The swim turban extended the same translation logic. Rather than ask customers with textured hair to choose between entering the water and preserving a style, the product made water protection visible as a specific use case. Social-media attention reportedly drove strong sales, and retail placement expanded the brand beyond direct-to-consumer discovery.[3] The figures surrounding the television pitch and later deal require direct confirmation before final publication.

Pivotal Decision

Turn a culturally familiar wrap into a pre-tied, satin-lined system whose convenience and protective purpose are immediately understandable.

Sources

[1] Dallas Innovates, "You Go Natural Raises \$2 Million" (Apr. 21, 2021). <https://dallasinnovates.com/dallas-b...funding-round/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[2] Beauty Independent, "You Go Natural Headwraps Raises \$2M" (June 2, 2021). <https://www.beautyindependent.com/yo...-seed-funding/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[3] Shark Tank Blog, "You Go Natural" episode recap. <https://www.sharktankblog.com/busine...ou-go-natural/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [3.1: CASE 1 | Monique Little, You Go Natural](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

3.2: CASE 2 | Fri Forjindam, Mycotoo

CASE 2 | TURN ABSTRACTION INTO PARTICIPATION

Fri Forjindam, Mycotoo

A Story The Audience Can Enter

Fri Forjindam's product is harder to point to because Mycotoo does not sell one standardized object. The company develops themed entertainment, live events, destinations, and immersive brand experiences. Its clients may begin with intellectual property, a brand, a place, or a story. Mycotoo's job is to convert that abstraction into an experience a guest can move through and remember.[4][5]

Forjindam came to experience design through theatre, fashion, production, and storytelling. In 2012 she joined Cliff Warner and David Wally in building Mycotoo. Her account of the company's formation emphasizes story as the vehicle for connecting audiences, fans, and guests. That orientation became commercially legible only when paired with strategy, master planning, design, development, and production—the disciplines required to move from narrative intention to an operating environment.[4][6]

The key customer is not only the guest. A studio, destination operator, or brand pays for an experience that must serve business and operational objectives while protecting the integrity of the underlying story. The offering therefore has at least two recognition tests: the client must understand how the experience will advance its goals, and the eventual guest must understand what to feel and do without reading the design brief.

Projects associated with Mycotoo include themed destinations and brand experiences tied to properties such as HBO's Westworld and Game of Thrones, Netflix, and Prince's Paisley Park.[5][6] These examples demonstrate range, but awards and recognizable intellectual property can obscure the central work. Immersion is not achieved by adding spectacle. The company must identify the narrative logic, design the guest journey, coordinate physical and media elements, and deliver within safety, capacity, budget, and schedule constraints.

Forjindam has described story as the starting point for turning popular intellectual property into experiences. The entrepreneurial decision was to package a multidisciplinary creative process as an end-to-end development capability. That made Mycotoo's value easier for institutional clients to buy: not isolated creative ideas, but a partner able to carry a concept toward production.[5][7]

Pivotal Decision

Sell the translation from story to operating experience—not creativity in the abstract—by integrating strategy, design, development, and production.

Sources

[4] Fri Forjindam, public account of Mycotoo formation (2026). <https://www.linkedin.com/posts/frifo...765962752-H6CI> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[5] Culturess, "Fri Forjindam Turns Popular IPs into Immersive Experiences" (Nov. 20, 2023). <https://culturess.com/2023/11/20/fri...e-experiences/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[6] Communication Arts, "Constructing Experiences". <https://www.commarts.com/columns/forjindam> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[7] Fast Company, "The Future of Experiences" (Sept. 22, 2020). <https://www.fastcompany.com/90551758...-park-designer> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [3.2: CASE 2 | Fri Forjindam, Mycotoo](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

3.3: CASE 3 | Dustin Anthony, BloomingTables

CASE 3 | DEMONSTRATE THE HYBRID

Dustin Anthony, BloomingTables

Furniture, Planter—or a New Category?

Dustin Anthony's idea combined two recognizable products into something customers had not routinely purchased: a table containing a living terrarium. The visual proposition was immediate, but the value proposition was not. Was BloomingTables functional furniture, decorative plant housing, an indoor garden, or an expensive novelty? A hybrid product must answer that category question through design rather than explanation alone.[8][9]

Anthony launched BloomingTables in 2019. The table used a waterproof planter body beneath a removable glass surface, allowing customers to grow succulents, houseplants, herbs, or microgreens while retaining usable furniture space. The compact form addressed smaller homes and apartments where floor space for both furniture and plants is limited.[8][10]

Early customer feedback changed the product. Succulents require relatively little water, but customers wanted to grow herbs and other plants with different needs. A twist-to-open drain valve expanded the range of viable plants and reduced the risk of overwatering. That feature was strategically important because it answered the objection hidden inside the product's beauty: whether a planted table would be practical to maintain.[9][10]

BloomingTables used Kickstarter to make the hybrid legible before committing to conventional scale. Product images communicated the emotional benefit; specifications, price, and campaign commitments tested whether admiration would become purchasing behavior.[11] Crowdfunding does not prove durable demand, and early backers differ from mainstream furniture buyers. It does, however, convert a concept into a bounded market test with real money and delivery obligations.

The company later offered several furniture formats and supporting plant kits. Anthony's current professional biography states that he led BloomingTables from concept to acquisition and seven-figure revenue, but those claims require independent corroboration before inclusion as established fact.[12] The verified case lesson does not depend on the size of the exit. The entrepreneurial work was turning a striking mash-up into a credible system: waterproof structure, access for care, drainage, size options, and evidence that customers would pay.

Pivotal Decision

Prove that “living furniture” was usable—not merely beautiful—by designing maintenance into the product and testing willingness to pay through crowdfunding.

Sources

[8] SDVoyager, interview with Dustin Anthony (May 2, 2022). <https://sdvoyager.com/interview/expl...loomingtables/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[9] Build With Rise, “Show Off Your Succulents with BloomingTables”. <https://www.buildwithrise.com/storie...bloomingtables> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[10] BloomingTables, FAQ. <https://bloomingtables.com/pages/faq> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[11] Kickstarter, BloomingTables campaign updates (2019). <https://www.kickstarter.com/projects.../posts/2681451> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[12] Dustin Anthony, professional biography. <https://www.linkedin.com/in/dustin-anthony-340827a9> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [3.3: CASE 3 | Dustin Anthony, BloomingTables](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

3.4: Review

What the Three Cases Reveal

Each venture made value recognizable by reducing a different kind of ambiguity.

Examples of customer ambiguity, translation mechanism, and execution risk across the three case studies

Case	Customer ambiguity	Translation mechanism	Execution risk
You Go Natural	A useful wrap still requires material knowledge and tying skill	Pre-tied form combines protection, speed, and style	Manufacturing, inventory, and retail complexity can outrun demand
Mycotoo	A story or brand promise is not yet a guest experience	End-to-end process turns narrative into a designed journey	Creative ambition must survive budgets, operations, safety, and IP control
BloomingTables	A furniture-planter hybrid may look clever but impractical	Functional details and crowdfunding demonstrate use and demand	Novelty, maintenance, shipping, and category confusion can limit scale

The non-obvious lesson: clarity is designed into the offering

Founders often treat customer confusion as a communications problem. These cases show why that diagnosis can be lazy. A better advertisement would not eliminate the need to tie a conventional wrap. A more emotional pitch would not turn intellectual property into a safe, coherent guest journey. A beautiful photograph would not drain a planted table. The strongest translation occurred inside the product or delivery system.

Clarity can also conceal danger. Once an offering is easy to understand, demand may grow faster than manufacturing, staffing, or working capital. A memorable immersive concept can create expectations that operations cannot fulfill. A crowdfunded prototype can attract attention before shipping economics are known. Recognizable value is necessary; it is not evidence that the venture is ready to scale.

What Would You Do?

Put yourself in the decision-maker's position. Consider the available evidence, competing priorities, risks, and consequences before deciding what should happen next.

- Feature versus benefit: identify the customer work removed or progress enabled by each design choice.
- Category design: examine how each venture borrows from an existing category while asking customers to recognize something new.
- Proof architecture: distinguish visual appeal, stated claims, customer behavior, crowdfunding, repeat purchase, retail adoption, and audited outcomes.
- Operational translation: trace how the promise changes manufacturing, staffing, partner coordination, maintenance, and delivery.
- Buyer versus user: compare the institutional client and guest in Mycotoo with the purchaser-user relationship in the product

cases.

- Scaling risk: identify which costs and constraints become more severe after demand is validated.
- Evidence discipline: treat founder biographies, television figures, awards, campaign data, and current company claims according to their source quality.

Evidence Packet and Editorial Boundaries

This appendix records the verified case spine and remaining editorial risk. It is an editorial control, not a substitute for final legal, financial, or factual review.

Monique Little / You Go Natural

- Case boundary: 2016–2026
- Verified spine: Founder and origin; pre-tied satin-lined product; social demand test; Dallas manufacturing expansion; 2021 seed round; product and retail extension.
- Open verification: Confirm current ownership, operating status, retail footprint, Shark Tank deal closure, sales, losses, and product-performance claims.

Fri Forjindam / Mycotoo

- Case boundary: 2012–2026
- Verified spine: Co-founder role; multidisciplinary background; end-to-end experience-development model; representative public projects; story-first design approach.
- Open verification: Confirm current role and company status, project attribution, client permissions, award language, and commercial outcomes.

Dustin Anthony / BloomingTables

- Case boundary: 2019–2026
- Verified spine: Founder identity; living-furniture concept; waterproof planter and removable surface; drainage adaptation; Kickstarter route; current product site.
- Open verification: Confirm campaign totals and fulfillment, patent status, current ownership, acquisition claim, revenue claim, and product-safety evidence.

Source Register

See individual pages for source information.

This page titled [3.4: Review](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

CHAPTER 4: EARNING ATTENTION, IDENTITY, AND TRUST

Earning Attention, Identity, and Trust

Why customers notice, believe, and identify with some ventures

Attention Is Rented; Trust Must Be Earned

A venture can buy impressions, borrow celebrity, or exploit a trend. None of those actions guarantees belief. Attention becomes commercially useful only when people understand what the venture stands for, recognize themselves in it, and trust the experience or recommendation enough to act.

The founders in this chapter build that bridge through different mechanisms. Myron Chandran created Afro Soca Love around connection across African and Caribbean diasporic cultures, using recurring events and marketplaces to turn cultural expression into participation. Elizabeth Sutton built recognition through a distinctive visual language that could move from fine art into interiors and lifestyle products. Taylor Humphries built Ranked around the proposition that brands gain credibility when messages travel through relevant creators and communities rather than through detached advertising alone.

Their industries are secondary. The common decision is where credibility will reside: in a community's repeated experience, in the consistency of an identifiable creator, or in a network of human messengers whose performance can be measured. Each choice creates value—and creates a different failure mode.

CHAPTER LENS

Attention opens the door. Identity tells people whether they belong. Trust determines whether they return, recommend, or buy.

Three Ways to Earn Belief

- **CREATE BELONGING THROUGH PARTICIPATION:** let people experience the identity with others, not simply consume its symbols.
- **BUILD A SIGNATURE SYSTEM:** make the venture recognizable across formats without reducing it to a logo.
- **TRANSFER TRUST THROUGH CREDIBLE MESSENGERS:** connect brands to people whose relevance comes from lived community relationships.

4.1: CASE 1 | Myron Chandran, Afro Soca Love

4.2: CASE 2 | Elizabeth Sutton, Elizabeth Sutton Collection

4.3: CASE 3 | Taylor Humphries, Ranked Media and Technologies

4.4: Review

This page titled [Chapter 4: Earning Attention, Identity, and Trust](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

4.1: CASE 1 | Myron Chandran, Afro Soca Love

CASE 1 | BELONGING THROUGH PARTICIPATION

Myron Chandran, Afro Soca Love

More than a party

Myron Chandran's path began with music. Raised across several cultural contexts and later attending Howard University, he encountered African, Caribbean, and African American communities that shared cultural bonds but were not always socially connected. As a DJ, he saw concerts create temporary unity. He also wanted people to connect with the meaning surrounding the music, not only the performance.[1][2]

Chandran founded Afro Soca Love to strengthen connections between Africa and its diaspora through arts, community, and creativity. The venture used parties and concerts, but it also incorporated marketplaces featuring local vendors. That combination changed the audience's role. People could dance, meet, buy from community businesses, and participate in a visible cultural economy rather than attend a generic nightlife event with Afro-Caribbean music added as decoration.[2][3]

The identity was broad enough to travel yet specific enough to signal belonging. Afro Soca Love expanded to multiple cities and continents, using a recurring name, aesthetic, musical vocabulary, and community promise. Eventbrite reported that, over roughly three and a half years on its platform, the organization sold nearly 30,000 tickets to more than 100 events, with Eventbrite driving 43 percent of sales.[3] Those figures come from Eventbrite's shareholder communication and describe a bounded historical period, not the venture's current lifetime scale.

Expansion created a tension. A community experience gains trust through local relevance, but touring rewards repeatable formats and centralized promotion. The venture had to preserve recognizable identity while allowing each city's vendors, artists, and attendees to make the experience feel locally owned. If the format becomes too standardized, belonging becomes spectacle. If it becomes too loose, the brand stops carrying useful expectations from one market to another.

Afro Soca Love's own sites now report much larger audience, ticket, database, and city figures.[4] Those claims are promotional and require independent verification. The reliable lesson does not depend on their size. Chandran's pivotal move was to make cultural connection the product architecture: music attracted attention, while participation, vendors, and repetition gave the identity social and economic substance.

Pivotal Decision

Design a repeatable cultural gathering in which music attracts attention but participation, local commerce, and shared identity create trust.

Sources

[1] VoyageATL, "Meet Myron Chandran of Afro Soca Love" (Feb. 13, 2019). <https://voyageatl.com/interview/meet...love-buckhead/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[2] Afro Soca Love, "Maga Stories". <https://www.afrosocalove.com/magastories> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[3] Eventbrite, Q1 2023 Shareholder Letter, p. 5. <https://s206.q4cdn.com/385822602/fil...Eventbrite.pdf> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[4] Afro Soca Love, official venture and supply sites. <https://www.afrosocalove.com/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [4.1: CASE 1 | Myron Chandran, Afro Soca Love](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

4.2: CASE 2 | Elizabeth Sutton, Elizabeth Sutton Collection

CASE 2 | A RECOGNIZABLE SIGNATURE

Elizabeth Sutton, Elizabeth Sutton Collection

From Artwork To An Identifiable World

Elizabeth Sutton built attention through a visual language: saturated color, pattern, repetition, and optimistic imagery. For an independent artist, recognizability can be more commercially powerful than stylistic breadth. A customer who can identify the work without seeing the name carries the brand across galleries, social media, collaborations, and products.

Sutton did not keep that signature confined to original canvases. The Elizabeth Sutton Collection expanded through prints, home decor, rugs, tile, tableware, fashion accessories, and other licensed or collaborative applications.[5][6] The strategic question was not simply how to put art on more objects. It was how to preserve enough visual consistency that each object strengthened recognition of the whole collection.

That extension changed the market. Fine art is scarce, high-priced, and often mediated by galleries or designers. A print, tray, tile pattern, or dinnerware collection can create a lower-cost entry point and place the visual identity inside everyday life. The customer may first encounter the artist through a functional product and later move toward more valuable work. At the same time, excessive licensing can flatten art into decoration and make scarcity harder to defend.

Sutton's business activity shows deliberate boundary crossing. Early accounts describe her simultaneously pursuing commissions, design events, manufacturers, a sales force, and philanthropic projects.[7] In 2026, she opened a Manhattan atelier combining a working studio, retail boutique, and home-design destination.[6] That hybrid space makes the brand architecture physical: visitors can see the artist, the process, the original work, and the extended products in one environment.

The trust mechanism is authorship. Customers are not asked to believe that every product is one-of-a-kind. They are asked to believe that a coherent creator stands behind the choices. That makes consistency valuable but also personally demanding. When the founder's identity is the brand, quality problems, overextension, or personal controversy travel across every category.

Pivotal Decision

Treat a distinctive artistic language as a system that can travel across products and spaces—while keeping authorship visible enough to preserve trust.

Sources

[5] Elizabeth Sutton Collection, official site and press archive. <https://www.elizabethsuttoncollection.com/pages/press> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[6] Resident, "Elizabeth Sutton Opens Her First New York City Atelier" (Mar. 20, 2026). <https://resident.com/art-and-culture...estyle-address> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[7] Word of Mouth, "Elizabeth Sutton Collection" (Sept. 14, 2017). <https://www.wordofmouthwriter.com/bl...ton-collection> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [4.2: CASE 2 | Elizabeth Sutton, Elizabeth Sutton Collection](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

4.3: CASE 3 | Taylor Humphries, Ranked Media and Technologies

CASE 3 | TRUSTED MESSENGERS PLUS MEASUREMENT

Taylor Humphries, Ranked Media & Technologies

Who Carries The Message?

Taylor Humphries developed Ranked after examining how cultural ideas spread and who captures the resulting value. He has connected the concept to the viral Mannequin Challenge: a cultural phenomenon associated with a young Black creator whose influence did not automatically produce compensation or ownership. Humphries saw a gap between the people who generate cultural momentum and the brands and platforms that monetize attention.[8]

Ranked connects brands with creators and community members who produce short-form content, then uses software and data to track engagement and campaign performance. The proposition contains two trust transfers. Brands borrow relevance from messengers with credible ties to particular audiences. Creators trust the platform to provide access, payment, and a measurable pathway into commercial work.[8][9]

This is not trust by intuition alone. Ranked describes screening creators across factors such as cultural alignment, content performance, engagement history, reputation, and authenticity, then giving brands dashboards and campaign data.[9] Measurement makes community influence legible to institutional buyers, but it introduces a paradox: the more a platform optimizes authentic expression for conversion, the more audiences may perceive the expression as manufactured.

The company's emphasis on creators of color also addresses an access problem. Conventional influencer markets often reward already-visible personalities, while smaller creators may have strong local or niche credibility without agency representation or brand relationships. Ranked's model attempts to aggregate those distributed relationships so brands can reach them and creators can monetize them.

Ranked currently reports large creator, reach, engagement, and client figures on its own site.[9] A 2025 Los Angeles Sentinel article reported approximately 15,000 creators and named several brand relationships.[8] These numbers differ materially from current company claims and may reflect rapid growth, changing definitions, or promotional inflation. They require direct documentation before publication. The case is strongest when framed around the decision to combine human credibility with accountable distribution—not around unverified scale.

Pivotal Decision

Make community trust purchasable without treating it as invisible labor: recruit relevant creators, compensate participation, and give brands measurable evidence.

Sources

[8] Los Angeles Sentinel, "Taylor Humphries' Ranked Digital Platform" (Apr. 15, 2025). <https://lasentinel.net/new-tech-tayl...s-from-it.html> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[9] Ranked, official platform site. <https://goranked.com/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [4.3: CASE 3 | Taylor Humphries, Ranked Media and Technologies](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

4.4: Review

What the Three Cases Reveal

All three ventures rely on identity, but identity performs a different economic job in each model.

Examples of source of trust, commercial mechanism, and primary risk across the three case studies

Case	Source of Trust	Commercial Mechanism	Primary risk
Afro Soca Love	Shared cultural participation and repeated experience	Tickets, marketplaces, partnerships, and touring	Scale can turn belonging into extractive spectacle
Elizabeth Sutton Collection	Visible authorship and a consistent creative signature	Original art, products, licensing, collaborations, and retail	Overextension can dilute scarcity and creator credibility
Ranked	Relevance of human messengers plus performance evidence	Brand campaigns, creator participation, data, and commerce	Optimization can manufacture the authenticity it claims to protect

The non-obvious lesson: trust cannot be fully automated

Each venture uses systems to extend trust: touring formats, a repeatable visual language, or a software platform. Systems are necessary for scale, but they cannot manufacture the underlying credibility indefinitely. Afro Soca Love still depends on whether communities feel represented rather than harvested. Sutton's products still depend on confidence in the creator and quality of execution. Ranked still depends on audiences believing that creators mean what they say.

The second-order risk is incentive corruption. When belonging, artistic identity, or community influence becomes valuable, participants learn how to perform the signals that the system rewards. The venture must therefore govern not only attention but also the conditions under which trust is created, compensated, measured, and protected.

What Would You Do?

Put yourself in the decision-maker's position. Consider the available evidence, competing priorities, risks, and consequences before deciding what should happen next.

- Attention versus trust: identify the evidence that a person moved from noticing to believing, buying, returning, or recommending.
- Identity as product architecture: determine where identity changes the offering rather than merely decorating promotion.
- Local versus repeatable: examine which elements can be standardized without weakening relevance.
- Founder brand versus institutional brand: compare the benefits and fragility of visible authorship.
- Trust transfer: trace who lends credibility to whom and who captures the economic value.
- Measurement paradox: analyze when performance metrics strengthen accountability and when they distort authentic expression.
- Claim discipline: separate independently reported figures, platform-reported metrics, promotional reach, and verified financial outcomes.

Evidence Packet and Editorial Boundaries

This appendix records the verified case spine and remaining editorial risk. It is an editorial control, not a substitute for final legal, financial, or factual review.

Myron Chandran / Afro Soca Love

- Case boundary: 2017–2026
- Verified spine: Founder and cultural origin; events-plus-marketplace model; cross-city expansion; bounded Eventbrite ticket and event figures; current venture presence.
- Open verification: Confirm founding year, current ownership, city and attendance totals, vendor economics, database claims, and all lifetime revenue or impression figures.

Elizabeth Sutton / Elizabeth Sutton Collection

- Case boundary: 2010s–2026
- Verified spine: Artist-founder identity; signature visual language; expansion into art, products, collaborations, and interiors; 2026 Manhattan atelier.
- Open verification: Confirm chronology, licensing relationships, sales and production model, current company structure, and permissions for named collaborations.

Taylor Humphries / Ranked Media & Technologies

- Case boundary: 2018–2026
- Verified spine: Founder identity; cultural-compensation origin; platform connecting brands and creators; screening and measurement proposition; current site and press presence.
- Open verification: Reconcile creator and reach figures, verify customers and campaign results, document payment model and AI claims, and review privacy, bias, and disclosure practices.

Source Register

See individual pages for source information.

This page titled [4.4: Review](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

CHAPTER 5: REACHING THE CUSTOMER

Reaching the Customer

How distribution and access turn demand into a viable business

Demand Is Useless When Access Fails

Customers can want an offering and still fail to buy it. They may not know where to find it, encounter too much friction, or lose interest between discovery and purchase. Distribution is therefore not an afterthought. It is the system that converts latent demand into an exchange the venture can repeat.

The three cases in this chapter solve different access failures. Mandy Bowman's Official Black Wall Street makes geographically dispersed Black-owned businesses easier to discover and patronize. Brendan Ciecko's Cuseum helps museums and membership organizations move cards, guides, passes, and communications onto visitors' mobile devices. Andres Cohen's FAMOSOS began by making personalized celebrity access purchasable in Latin America and later repositioned around helping brands reach U.S. Hispanic audiences through creators and influencers.

All three are intermediaries, but that label is not enough. Their value depends on reducing a specific distance: between consumer intent and a local business, between an institution and a member, or between a brand and culturally relevant talent. The stronger the channel becomes, the more responsibility it assumes for quality, visibility, data, and economic fairness.

CHAPTER LENS

Distribution creates value when it reduces the distance between demand and delivery—but every intermediary also decides who is visible, who pays, and who captures the margin.

Three Ways to Close the Distance

- **AGGREGATE DISCOVERY:** organize fragmented suppliers so customers can find and compare them.
- **EMBED ACCESS IN THE CUSTOMER JOURNEY:** place credentials, guidance, and communication where the user already acts.
- **BUILD A TWO-SIDED CHANNEL:** recruit talent and demand together, then reduce transaction and cultural translation costs.

5.1: CASE 1 | Mandy Bowman, Official Black Wall Street

5.2: CASE 2 | Brendan Ciecko, Cuseum

5.3: CASE 3 | FAMOSOS

5.4: Review

This page titled [Chapter 5: Reaching the Customer](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

5.1: CASE 1 | Mandy Bowman, Official Black Wall Street

CASE 1 | AGGREGATE DISCOVERY

Mandy Bowman, Official Black Wall Street

Turning intention into a place to look

Mandy Bowman grew up seeing Black-owned businesses struggle and close in Brooklyn. She wanted to support them, but individual consumer intent was scattered and difficult to act on. During a lunch break at a social-media job, she began listing businesses and the steps required to build a directory. Social pages became an early distribution channel while she developed the website.[1][2]

Official Black Wall Street launched in 2015, drawing its name from Tulsa's historic Greenwood District. The venture's basic move was aggregation: give consumers one place to discover, review, and patronize Black-owned businesses rather than requiring each business to solve visibility alone.[2][3] The platform later added an app and geolocation features that could alert users when they were near a listed business.[4]

The model reduces search cost on both sides. Consumers who already want to “buy Black” receive a practical path from intention to action. Businesses gain discovery beyond their individual social followings. The platform can also create trust through reviews, verification, editorial curation, and community identity. Each of those functions is valuable only if the underlying listing data remain accurate and the rules for inclusion are credible.

Bowman extended the venture beyond a directory through founder community and support programs. In a 2025 interview, she described the OBWS Founders Club as a protected space for Black entrepreneurs to build relationships and cited founder reports that the platform helped them attract customers or funding.[5] Those are useful outcome signals, but they are testimonials rather than independently measured economic impact.

The platform's second-order power is allocation. Search order, featured placement, badges, reviews, and notifications influence which businesses receive attention. As the channel grows, Official Black Wall Street must govern conflicts between mission and monetization. Charging for visibility can fund the platform, but it can also reproduce the access problem if the businesses most in need become the least visible.

Pivotal Decision

Build a shared discovery channel for Black-owned businesses, converting consumer intention into searchable, location-aware access.

Sources

[1] JPMorgan Chase, “It’s official — a Wall Street for Black-owned businesses”. <https://www.chase.com/business/knowledge/grow/obws> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[2] Official Black Wall Street, “About”. <https://obws.com/pages/about> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[3] The Story Exchange, “The Enduring Power of Buying Black” (June 11, 2020). <https://thestoryexchange.org/black-w-owned-businesses/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[4] Google Play, “Meet Mandy Bowman”. https://play.google.com/store/apps/details?id=com.mandy_bowman_fcp (accessed August 18, 2026).

[5] Halcyon, Q&A with Mandy Bowman (Feb. 18, 2025). <https://halcyonaccelerator.org/insights/mandy-bowman/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [5.1: CASE 1 | Mandy Bowman, Official Black Wall Street](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

5.2: CASE 2 | Brendan Ciecko, Cuseum

CASE 2 | EMBED ACCESS IN THE JOURNEY

Brendan Ciecko, Cuseum

The institution travels with the member

Brendan Ciecko founded Cuseum in 2014 to help museums and cultural organizations use mobile technology. Early products included mobile guides and digital engagement tools. The company later expanded into digital membership cards, guest passes, loyalty, member portals, and lifecycle communications.[6][7]

Cuseum's distribution problem is subtle. Museums already have buildings, exhibits, websites, and mailing lists. Yet the relationship can break at repeated moments: a member forgets a card, a visitor cannot find interpretive material, a guest does not understand benefits, or a renewal reminder arrives without context. Cuseum places access and communication on the device customers already carry.

The digital membership card illustrates the model. Replacing printed cards can reduce production and mailing costs while giving members a credential that is harder to forget. The same mobile surface can display benefits, guest passes, event information, and renewal prompts. For the institution, distribution and relationship management become part of one system rather than separate administrative tasks.[8]

The COVID-19 pandemic intensified the need for touchless entry and self-guided mobile experiences. Ciecko reported increased demand for digital membership cards and mobile guides as institutions tried to reduce contact while maintaining visitor service.[9] The pandemic did not create the product logic, but it accelerated adoption by making the cost of physical friction more visible.

This case is misclassified if treated only as media or content. Cuseum is an institution-facing software platform whose customer pays to improve access for members and visitors. Its central challenge is integration: the experience depends on reliable connections to membership databases, ticketing, mobile wallets, institutional workflows, and staff behavior. A digital card that does not update correctly creates more friction than the plastic card it replaces.

Pivotal Decision

Move from one-off mobile guides toward an engagement platform that embeds access, credentials, and communication across the member lifecycle.

Sources

[6] Cuseum, Brendan Ciecko biography. <https://cuseum.com/brendan-ciecko> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[7] Boston Magazine, "This Local Company Gets Museum Technology" (Apr. 24, 2018). <https://www.bostonmagazine.com/arts-...nology-boston/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[8] Blackbaud Partner Directory, Cuseum Digital Membership Cards. <https://www.blackbaud.ca/partners/fi...artners/cuseum> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[9] acceso, interview with Brendan Ciecko (Oct. 8, 2021). <https://acceso.com/learn/preparing-...ciecko-cuseum/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [5.2: CASE 2 | Brendan Ciecko, Cuseum](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

5.3: CASE 3 | FAMOSOS

CASE 3 | BUILD A TWO-SIDED CHANNEL

Andres Cohen, FAMOSOS

From a greeting to an influence network

Andres Cohen and Heinz Sohm launched Famosos.com in 2019 after encountering the difficulty of finding a distinctive birthday gift. The initial model made a previously informal form of access purchasable: customers could select a Latin American celebrity, request a personalized video, and send it to a friend or family member.[10][11]

The platform reduced coordination costs. Fans did not need an agent relationship or private contact. Talent received a structured way to price and fulfill requests. FAMOSOS handled discovery, ordering, payment, and delivery. Its geographic and cultural focus mattered because a generic celebrity marketplace might not recruit the artists, athletes, actors, and presenters most relevant to Latin American audiences.

In 2021, the company announced a \$4.5 million seed round to expand in Latin America, launch in Brazil, grow its team, and increase sales.[11] Funding supported both sides of the market, but it did not remove the platform's basic dependency: customers come for talent, and talent participates when demand and economics are attractive. Weakness on either side makes the other side less valuable.

FAMOSOS has since repositioned its public offer around U.S. Hispanic influencer marketing. Its current "About" page says Cohen founded the company after seeing brands misallocate spending while trying to reach U.S. Hispanic consumers.[12] This is a significant strategic evolution, not a cosmetic rebrand. The buyer shifts from an individual purchasing a greeting to a brand purchasing culturally relevant reach, creator management, and campaign execution.

The evolution preserves the company's original asset: relationships with talent and insight into Spanish-speaking and Hispanic markets. It also changes the trust burden. Personalized videos require fulfillment and authenticity. Brand campaigns require disclosure, audience quality, measurement, brand safety, and evidence that cultural relevance is more than demographic targeting. The inherited claim that FAMOSOS had become a full-service "engagement engine" by 2026 is directionally consistent with the current site, but all scale and performance claims require direct documentation.

Pivotal Decision

Use the talent network built for personalized access as the foundation for a broader Hispanic influencer-marketing channel serving institutional buyers.

Sources

[10] El Espectador, "Andrés Cohen, detrás de famosos.com" (Mar. 4, 2021). <https://www.elespectador.com/entrete...de-famososcom/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[11] Refresh Miami, "Famosos.com raises \$4.5 million seed round" (June 3, 2021). <https://refreshmiami.com/news/famoso...form-in-latam/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[12] FAMOSOS, "About". <https://www.famosos.com/about> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [5.3: CASE 3 | FAMOSOS](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

5.4: Review

What the Three Cases Reveal

Distribution is not a single activity. Each venture controls a different point between intention and exchange.

Examples of distance reduced, channel mechanism, and governance risk across the three case studies

Case	Distance Reduced	Channel Mechanism	Governance Risk
Official Black Wall Street	Consumer intention to a dispersed local business	Directory, app, geolocation, reviews, and community	Ranking and paid visibility can reproduce exclusion
Cuseum	Institutional membership to access and ongoing engagement	Mobile credentials, guides, passes, portals, and messages	Integration failure can create friction and data risk
FAMOSOS	Audience demand or brand spending to relevant talent	Two-sided marketplace evolving into managed influencer campaigns	Platform incentives, disclosure, attribution, and cultural extraction

The non-obvious lesson: channels govern markets

A channel does more than carry demand. It structures the market it serves. Official Black Wall Street determines how businesses are categorized and surfaced. Cuseum shapes when and how institutions communicate with members. FAMOSOS selects talent, packages access, and defines which performance signals matter to brands. These choices affect economic outcomes even when the platform claims to be neutral infrastructure.

The scaling trap is assuming that more reach automatically improves the mission. A larger directory with stale listings is worse than a smaller accurate one. More digital features can burden museum staff and members. More creators can weaken campaign quality and make compensation opaque. Distribution creates a viable business only when access remains reliable, trusted, and economically useful to each side.

What Would You Do?

Put yourself in the decision-maker's position. Consider the available evidence, competing priorities, risks, and consequences before deciding what should happen next.

- Demand versus access: identify where customer intent fails before a transaction occurs.
- Channel ownership: determine which venture owns discovery, fulfillment, customer data, or the ongoing relationship.
- Two-sided economics: identify who pays, who supplies value, and which side must be subsidized first.
- Integration as product: analyze why software connections and operational workflows are part of the customer promise.
- Mission and ranking: examine how search, recommendations, featured placement, and fees allocate opportunity.
- Pivot continuity: determine which FAMOSOS assets survived the move from consumer greetings to brand campaigns.
- Evidence discipline: separate listings, users, customers, transactions, testimonials, funding, and independently measured outcomes.

Evidence Packet and Editorial Boundaries

This appendix records the verified case spine and remaining editorial risk. It is an editorial control, not a substitute for final legal, financial, technical, or factual review.

Mandy Bowman / Official Black Wall Street

- Case boundary: 2015–2026
- Verified spine: Founder and Brooklyn origin; directory and social launch; app and geolocation model; founder-community extension; current platform presence.
- Open verification: Confirm listing and user counts, verification rules, ranking and fee structure, current funding, business outcomes, and data/privacy practices.

Brendan Ciecko / Cuseum

- Case boundary: 2014–2026
- Verified spine: Founder identity; museum mobile-guide origin; expansion to digital membership and engagement tools; pandemic acceleration; current platform offer.
- Open verification: Confirm institution counts, product chronology, renewal and cost claims, integrations, ownership, security controls, and current financial status.

Andres Cohen / FAMOSOS

- Case boundary: 2019–2026
- Verified spine: Co-founder identity; personalized celebrity-video origin; 2021 seed round; Latin American focus; current U.S. Hispanic influencer-marketing position.
- Open verification: Confirm ownership and co-founder roles, current talent and client counts, pivot chronology, campaign outcomes, payment model, disclosures, and funding status.

Source Register

See individual pages for source information.

CHAPTER 6: GROWING WITHOUT LOSING THE MARKET

Growing Without Losing the Market

How ventures expand while preserving relevance and differentiation

Growth Changes the Venture It Is Supposed to Strengthen

A venture can prove demand and still fail at growth. Each new location, partner, platform, or customer segment adds reach, but it also adds coordination, cost, and distance from the founder's original insight. The challenge is not simply to become larger. It is to decide what must remain recognizable while the operating system changes.

The three cases in this chapter show different versions of that problem. Pinky Cole built Slutty Vegan into a culturally magnetic restaurant brand, expanded rapidly, then confronted closures, restructuring, loss and repurchase of control, and a 2026 Chapter 11 filing tied to personally guaranteed business obligations. Derrick Hayes is moving Big Dave's Cheesesteaks from a 700-square-foot gas-station counter toward franchising and venue partnerships while packaging a product and family story that customers associate with authenticity. Alia J. Daniels and her co-founders expanded Revry from a queer streaming app into a global LGBTQ-first media network by distributing through mainstream connected-TV and free ad-supported channels while explicitly centering intersectional stories.

These are not three uncomplicated success stories. They are three tests of whether market relevance can survive a change in scale. One case exposes what happens when overhead and expansion exceed operating control. One turns tacit founder knowledge into a repeatable franchise system. One uses larger distribution partners to make a specific community more visible without surrendering the reason the network exists.

CHAPTER LENS

Growth is durable only when the venture identifies what may be standardized, what must remain distinctive, and which new risks arrive with scale.

Three Ways to Protect Relevance While Growing

- **REBUILD AFTER OVEREXTENSION:** reduce complexity, recover control, and treat financial distress as evidence about the growth model.
- **CODIFY AUTHENTICITY:** translate product, service, and story into standards that franchisees and partners can reproduce.
- **DISTRIBUTE THE MISSION:** use larger platforms to extend access while retaining editorial identity and community trust.

6.1: CASE 1 | Pinky Cole, Slutty Vegan

6.2: CASE 2 | Derrick Hayes, Big Dave's Cheesesteaks

6.3: CASE 3 | Alia J. Daniels, Revry

6.4: Review

This page titled [Chapter 6: Growing Without Losing the Market](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

6.1: CASE 1 | Pinky Cole, Slutty Vegan

CASE 1 | REBUILD AFTER OVEREXTENSION

Pinky Cole, Slutty Vegan

A powerful market signal is not an operating system

Pinky Cole launched Slutty Vegan in Atlanta in 2018, first selling plant-based burgers through delivery orders promoted on Instagram and then through a food truck. The concept made vegan food feel culturally specific, humorous, and communal rather than medicinal or niche. Long lines and provocative product names were not decoration; they were part of a market-making system that turned trial into an event.[1][2]

The brand expanded from that local proof point into multiple restaurants, institutional locations, and related concepts. At its peak, public reporting described 14 locations across four states. Growth increased visibility, but it also increased fixed costs, corporate overhead, lease exposure, staffing demands, and the distance between the founder and daily execution.[3]

By 2025, the company had entered a creditor-led restructuring. Cole said she temporarily lost control of Slutty Vegan and later bought the brand back, describing the next phase as “Slutty Vegan 2.0.” Public reporting connected the collapse to aggressive expansion and approximately \$10 million in corporate overhead. Several locations closed, and the company shifted toward a franchise model.[2][4]

The distress did not end with the repurchase. In March 2026, Cole filed for personal Chapter 11 protection. Reporting based on the filing identified roughly \$1.2 million owed to the U.S. Small Business Administration and about \$192,000 in Georgia tax obligations. Cole explained that business debts she had personally guaranteed followed her after the corporate restructuring. The filing concerned her personal finances, but it is inseparable from the governance question in this case: when a founder personally absorbs enterprise risk, apparent company growth can conceal fragility.[3][5]

Slutty Vegan continued to operate in selected markets and announced new franchise expansion in 2026. That makes the case more useful, not less settled. The core customer proposition—bold, accessible plant-based food rooted in Black culture—still has market power. The next system must preserve that proposition while controlling unit economics, franchise quality, debt, tax compliance, and overhead. A comeback is not proven by openings alone; it is proven when each opening strengthens rather than drains the enterprise.

Pivotal Decision

Buy back the brand after creditor restructuring and pursue a leaner, franchise-led “2.0”—a recovery strategy whose durability remains unproven.

Sources

[1] Slutty Vegan, company website. <https://sluttyveganatl.com/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[2] People, “Slutty Vegan Owner Pinky Cole Has a New Outlook After Losing Her Business” (Apr. 2025). <https://people.com/slutty-vegan-owne...usive-11706998> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[3] FOX 5 Atlanta, “Pinky Cole files for Chapter 11 bankruptcy” (Mar. 2, 2026). <https://www.fox5atlanta.com/news/pin...-wives-atlanta> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[4] Axios Atlanta, “Bar Vegan to close Ponce City Market location” (May 1, 2025). <https://www.axios.com/local/atlanta/...ket-pinky-cole> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[5] People, “Slutty Vegan’s Pinky Cole Files for Chapter 11 Bankruptcy” (Mar. 2026). <https://people.com/slutty-vegan-s-pi...ities-11918307> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [6.1: CASE 1 | Pinky Cole, Slutty Vegan](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

6.2: CASE 2 | Derrick Hayes, Big Dave's Cheesesteaks

CASE 2 | CODIFY AUTHENTICITY

Derrick Hayes, Big Dave's Cheesesteaks

Teaching a personal product to travel

Derrick Hayes opened the business that became Big Dave's Cheesesteaks in a 700-square-foot gas-station space in Dunwoody, Georgia. The concept joined three sources of differentiation: a West Philadelphia food tradition, recipes and kitchen knowledge learned through family, and a name honoring his late father, David. The “Dave's Way” sandwich made the memorial story part of the menu rather than a separate brand biography.[6][7]

The original location could rely heavily on Hayes's presence and judgment. National expansion cannot. Franchising requires the venture to specify what the founder once carried tacitly: ingredient standards, preparation sequence, speed, hospitality, training, store economics, site selection, and the tone of the customer experience. Standardization protects quality, but excessive standardization can flatten the very authenticity customers value.

Big Dave's has expanded through stand-alone restaurants, franchise agreements, and high-traffic venue partnerships. Its current materials identify Georgia locations and outposts at Mercedes-Benz Stadium; subsequent deals extended the brand into markets including Florida and Washington, D.C. The company promotes single-unit, multi-unit, and area-development opportunities and frames national growth around franchise operators rather than founder-owned stores alone.[6][8][9]

Venue partnerships are a different kind of scale. A permanent stadium location provides concentrated demand and national visibility, but customers arrive under severe time pressure and with limited menu tolerance. The operating system must therefore preserve recognizable taste and service in a compressed format. What works in a neighborhood store cannot simply be copied into an arena.

The most important metric is not signed units. It is the proportion of opened units that meet quality, profitability, and retention standards over time. Public growth targets and industry rankings signal ambition, not proof of franchise health. For faculty and students, the unanswered questions—unit-level economics, franchisee turnover, same-store performance, and quality audits—are precisely the evidence needed to distinguish a repeatable system from a fast-selling story.

Pivotal Decision

Use franchising and venue partnerships to carry the brand nationally, requiring family-rooted authenticity to become a teachable and auditable operating system.

Sources

[6] Big Dave's Cheesesteaks, “About Us”. <https://www.bigdavesway.com/about-us-1> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[7] Big Dave's Cheesesteaks franchise site, brand story. <https://bigdavesfranchise.com/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[8] Big Dave's Cheesesteaks, franchise information. <https://www.bigdavesway.com/franchise> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[9] Fast Casual, “Big Dave's enters Washington, D.C., with multi-unit franchise deal” (May 19, 2026). <https://www.fastcasual.com/news/big-...ranchise-deal/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled 6.2: CASE 2 | Derrick Hayes, Big Dave's Cheesesteaks is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

6.3: CASE 3 | Alia J. Daniels, Revry

CASE 3 | DISTRIBUTE THE MISSION

Alia J. Daniels, Revry

Going mainstream without becoming generic

In 2015, Alia J. Daniels noticed that a new Apple TV app ecosystem still offered no clear home for programming centered on queer people of color. She joined LaShawn McGhee, Damian Pelliccione, and Christopher Rodriguez to build Revry, an LGBTQ-first streaming network. The founding insight was not that queer viewers lacked all content; it was that mainstream catalogs did not reliably center the intersectional community the founders knew.^{[10][11]}

A subscription app could establish editorial identity, but it limited reach to people willing to discover, download, and pay for another service. Revry expanded through connected-TV and free ad-supported streaming television partners, including Samsung TV Plus, Roku, Vizio, and other distributors. Company-reported data said monthly active viewers across distribution partners grew fivefold to more than 20 million in 2021. That figure is a company claim rather than an independently audited audience measure, but it illustrates the strategic shift: distribution through devices and bundles already in the home.^[12]

The move from a destination app to a distributed network changes the business. Free channels reduce the price barrier and can enlarge advertising inventory. Platform partnerships reduce customer-acquisition friction. At the same time, Revry becomes dependent on partner placement, recommendation systems, advertising demand, measurement standards, and contracts it does not fully control.

Daniels's operating role links scale to mission. Revry's current leadership page identifies her as co-founder and chief operating officer; she also leads PrismRiot, an ad exchange positioned around multicultural audiences and ethical first-party data activation. The company's stated mission emphasizes radical inclusivity, intersectional storytelling, and "queer joy." Those commitments function as editorial constraints: expansion is successful only if broader reach makes those voices more visible rather than substituting generic LGBTQ content that is easier to sell.^{[10][13]}

Revry therefore scales by separating identity from exclusivity. The network does not require a small audience in order to remain specific. It requires programming, partnerships, data practices, and revenue choices that keep the audience recognizable. The growth mechanism is mainstream infrastructure; the differentiation remains who controls the lens.

Pivotal Decision

Move beyond a stand-alone subscription app into free, partner-distributed television channels while retaining an LGBTQ-first, intersectional editorial identity.

Sources

^[10] Revry, "About" and leadership. <https://www.revry.tv/about> (accessed August 18, 2026).

^[11] Revry / Essence recap, "These Black Women Run the Only LGBTQ-First Streaming Platform" (Mar. 31, 2023). <https://www.revry.tv/news/these-black-women-run-the-only-lgbtq-first-streaming-platform> (accessed August 18, 2026).

^[12] Revry, connected-TV audience growth release (Feb. 25, 2022). <https://www.revry.tv/news/tag/OTT> (accessed August 18, 2026).

^[13] Alia J. Daniels, professional biography. <https://aliajdaniels.com/my-story> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [6.3: CASE 3 | Alia J. Daniels, Revry](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

6.4: Review

What the Three Cases Reveal

Each venture must protect a different asset while adopting a different growth architecture.

Examples of what must survive, growth architecture, and primary failure mode across the three case studies

Case	What Must Survive	Growth Architecture	Primary Failure Mode
Slutty Vegan	Cultural energy and an inviting plant-based proposition	Recovery, retrenchment, and franchise-led expansion	Overhead, debt, weak controls, and founder guarantees outrun unit economics
Big Dave's Cheesesteaks	Taste, hospitality, Philadelphia authenticity, and family story	Franchising plus venue partnerships	Signed growth exceeds operator capability or quality control
Revry	Intersectional editorial identity and community trust	FAST, connected-TV, and advertising distribution partners	Platform dependency or broad reach dilutes mission and data ethics

The non-obvious lesson: differentiation must become a constraint

Founders often treat differentiation as a message: the provocative restaurant brand, the authentic cheesesteak, the LGBTQ-first network. At scale, a message is insufficient. Differentiation must become a constraint on operating choices. Slutty Vegan must reject growth that its capital and controls cannot support. Big Dave's must reject operators or formats that cannot reproduce the promise. Revry must reject reach that erases editorial specificity or compromises audience trust.

The deeper tradeoff is control. Founder ownership can preserve intent but concentrate financial risk. Franchising transfers capital and execution but weakens direct supervision. Platform distribution accelerates access but gives powerful partners leverage over discovery and economics. Growth is therefore a governance decision before it is a marketing achievement.

What Would You Do?

Put yourself in the decision-maker's position. Consider the available evidence, competing priorities, risks, and consequences before deciding what should happen next.

- Growth versus health: distinguish openings, signed agreements, audience reach, revenue, cash flow, and durable unit economics.
- Founder risk: examine when personal guarantees, concentrated control, or reputation become hidden financing for expansion.
- Codifying authenticity: identify which parts of a founder-led experience can be standardized and which require judgment.
- Franchise governance: evaluate operator selection, training, audits, incentives, and the difference between selling and supporting units.
- Platform dependency: analyze what Revry gains and surrenders when distribution moves through connected-TV partners.
- Mission as operating constraint: test whether each venture has rules that protect differentiation when growth opportunities conflict with purpose.

- Recovery evidence: determine what would prove that Slutty Vegan 2.0 is structurally different rather than simply opening again.

Evidence Packet and Editorial Boundaries

This appendix records the verified case spine and remaining editorial risk. It is an editorial control, not a substitute for final legal, financial, technical, or factual review. Developments after August 18, 2026 require a new evidence pass.

Pinky Cole / Slutty Vegan

- Case boundary: 2018–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: 2018 launch and delivery/food-truck origin; rapid multi-location growth; 2025 creditor restructuring and founder repurchase; closures and franchise reset; March 2026 personal Chapter 11 filing and reported obligations; continuing operations and announced expansion.
- Open verification: Verify the bankruptcy docket and reorganization status; distinguish personal and company liabilities; confirm current ownership, operating locations, franchise openings, unit economics, creditor claims, lawsuits, taxes, and audited financial condition.

Derrick Hayes / Big Dave's Cheesesteaks

- Case boundary: 2014–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Founder and gas-station origin; family and Philadelphia product story; current franchise offer; Georgia base; stadium presence; reported multi-unit expansion agreements.
- Open verification: Confirm opened versus signed locations, franchise ownership, FDD disclosures, fees, closures, unit economics, same-store sales, franchisee turnover, quality controls, litigation, and current financial status.

Alia J. Daniels / Revry

- Case boundary: 2015–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Co-founder and COO role; unmet intersectional-content origin; LGBTQ-first mission; shift into FAST and connected-TV distribution; company-reported 2021 audience growth; current leadership and PrismRiot role.
- Open verification: Confirm current reach using comparable audited measures; partner availability by territory; revenue mix; profitability and funding; content rights; advertising standards; first-party-data practices; governance; and Daniels's precise role in each strategic decision.

Source Register

See individual pages for source information.

This page titled [6.4: Review](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

PART 2: EXPANDING OPPORTUNITY

Chapter 1: Seeing Barriers as Opportunities

- 1.1: CASE 1 | Bree Anderson, Daughters Beyond Incarceration
- 1.2: CASE 2 | JoAnn Ajayi-Scott, Essence of a Lady, Inc.
- 1.3: CASE 3 | Alexis Black, Redefining Normal
- 1.4: Review

Chapter 2: Designing for Access

- 2.1: CASE 1 | Jessica Chang, Upwards
- 2.2: CASE 2 | Rubén Arias, BeeReaders
- 2.3: CASE 3 | Jeremy Glauser, eLuma
- 2.4: Review

Chapter 3: Building Trust Where the Stakes Are High

- 3.1: CASE 1 | Nathalie Walton, Expectful
- 3.2: CASE 2 | Jenna Ahn, Millie
- 3.3: CASE 3 | Tristan Mackintosh, Safespill Systems
- 3.4: Review

Chapter 4: Turning Knowledge into Capability

- 4.1: CASE 1 | Tiffany Aliche, The Budgetnista
- 4.2: CASE 2 | Eva Drago, Beelinguapp
- 4.3: CASE 3 | Kewanta Brooks, Elite Kids TV
- 4.4: Review

Chapter 5: Creating Pathways to Work and Wealth

- 5.1: CASE 1 | Nitin Agrawal, Interstride
- 5.2: CASE 2 | Moni Jefferson, Association of Military Spouse Entrepreneurs
- 5.3: CASE 3 | Brittani Hunter, Mogul Millennial
- 5.4: Review

Chapter 6: Making Mission Economically Durable

- 6.1: CASE 1 | Vanessa Bouché, Savhera
- 6.2: CASE 2 | Brandon Okpalobi, Dibia DREAM
- 6.3: CASE 3 | Cameka Smith, The BOSS Network
- 6.4: Review

CHAPTER 1: SEEING BARRIERS AS OPPORTUNITIES

Seeing Barriers as Opportunities

How entrepreneurs recognize exclusion and institutional failure as opportunities

A Barrier Is Evidence, Not Yet an Opportunity

Entrepreneurs are often told to “find a problem.” That advice is too shallow for barriers created by incarceration, unequal access to mentorship, or foster care. The people affected already know the problem exists. The entrepreneurial work is to identify the mechanism that keeps producing it, determine which part can be changed, and build an intervention people can trust.

The three cases in this chapter begin with institutional absence. Bree Anderson and her collaborators built Daughters Beyond Incarceration around the needs of girls whose fathers were imprisoned and whose family bonds were treated as collateral damage. JoAnn Ajayi-Scott organized professional and entrepreneurial women into a support network for girls who lacked sustained mentorship, academic help, and access to opportunity. Alexis Black and Justin Black used their experiences in foster care to create stories, workshops, and empowerment tools for young people and families navigating trauma and transition.

None of these ventures “solves” the system it confronts. That is the first discipline of the chapter. A mentoring program does not repeal sentencing policy. A volunteer network does not repair unequal school funding. A book does not replace mental-health care. The opportunity lies in designing a credible point of intervention without exaggerating its reach.

CHAPTER LENS

A social barrier becomes an entrepreneurial opportunity only when lived experience is translated into a specific intervention, a trustworthy delivery system, and evidence that the intervention changes something that matters.

Three Ways to Convert Exclusion into Action

- **REVEAL AN INVISIBLE STAKEHOLDER:** design for people whose costs are absent from the institution’s usual measures.
- **ORGANIZE DORMANT CAPACITY:** turn dispersed volunteers, knowledge, and relationships into sustained support.
- **TRANSLATE EXPERIENCE INTO AGENCY:** convert personal knowledge into stories and tools others can use without treating trauma as spectacle.

1.1: CASE 1 | Bree Anderson, Daughters Beyond Incarceration

1.2: CASE 2 | JoAnn Ajayi-Scott, Essence of a Lady, Inc.

1.3: CASE 3 | Alexis Black, Redefining Normal

1.4: Review

This page titled [Chapter 1: Seeing Barriers as Opportunities](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

1.1: CASE 1 | Bree Anderson, Daughters Beyond Incarceration

CASE 1 | REVEAL AN INVISIBLE STAKEHOLDER

Bree Anderson, Daughters Beyond Incarceration

The sentence reaches beyond the person in prison

Bree Anderson grew up with her father incarcerated for the first 23 years of her life. Her father, Robert Jones, had been sentenced to life without parole and was exonerated in 2015. Dominique Jones also grew up with an incarcerated father. Their experience exposed a stakeholder that criminal-justice systems routinely fail to count: the child living with separation, stigma, disrupted communication, and the uncertainty of reentry.[1][2]

Daughters Beyond Incarceration emerged in New Orleans in 2018. Early public materials identify Dominique Jones and Anderson as leaders with lived experience of parental incarceration. Contemporary reporting describes Jones and her incarcerated father, Charles Brown Jr., as founders and Anderson as co-director; later biographies call Anderson a co-founder. The precise founding attribution therefore requires final verification, but Anderson's operating and advocacy role is well documented.[2][3]

DBI's intervention combined mentoring, education, support, and advocacy for girls with incarcerated fathers. Early program materials emphasized rebuilding parent-child communication, strengthening decision-making and conflict-resolution skills, and supporting children through the trauma associated with incarceration. The model treated the relationship itself as infrastructure: communication with a parent could support a daughter's stability while also affecting the father's reentry.[3]

That design choice matters. A generic youth program could provide activities without addressing the source of isolation. DBI instead organized around a specific experience and used leaders who understood it from inside. Lived experience reduced the risk that participants would have to explain or defend their family circumstances before receiving support.

The limitation is equally important. Claims that stronger bonds reduce recidivism or produce long-term educational outcomes require longitudinal evidence. Public sources establish the mission and program design more clearly than causal impact. The organization's current operating status, participant volume, and Anderson's current formal role also require direct confirmation. A credible case must distinguish a compelling theory of change from a measured result.

Pivotal Decision

Design around daughters as overlooked stakeholders in incarceration, making family connection, trauma-informed mentorship, and advocacy the intervention rather than a generic youth program.

Sources

[1] Southern University Law Center, Bree Anderson biography. <https://www.sulc.edu/page/bree-anderson> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[2] Antigravity Magazine, "Repairing the Parental Bond with Daughters Beyond Incarceration" (Jan. 10, 2019). <https://antigravitymagazine.com/feat...incarceration/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[3] New Orleans Recreation Development Commission, DBI and Free-Dem Foundations program presentation (2018). <https://nordc.org/getattachment//Com...-to-NORDC.pdf/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled 1.1: CASE 1 | Bree Anderson, Daughters Beyond Incarceration is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

1.2: CASE 2 | JoAnn Ajayi-Scott, Essence of a Lady, Inc.

CASE 2 | ORGANIZE DORMANT CAPACITY

JoAnn Ajayi-Scott, Essence of a Lady, Inc.

The missing resource was coordination

JoAnn Ajayi-Scott began Essence of a Lady in Houston in 1989 with her twin sister, Margie Ramsey, and a group of women. The organization started as a social and charitable network. Its later evolution reframed the women around the table as a resource system: professional and entrepreneurial adults could contribute time, expertise, relationships, money, and visibility to girls who lacked consistent access to those assets.[4][5]

In 2003, the organization incorporated and created Young Essence Ladies...Learning, or YELLI, a mentoring program for school-age girls. The model connected adult philanthropy to weekly group mentoring, academic support, field trips, conferences, scholarships, and exposure to careers and entrepreneurship. The E'Ladies Network became the support arm rather than a separate networking club.[4][6]

This is a capacity-aggregation venture. The community may contain teachers, business owners, financial professionals, mentors, and donors, but their availability is fragmented. Schools and families cannot reliably assemble that support one relationship at a time. Essence of a Lady creates a structure through which adults can contribute and youth can receive a more continuous package of support.

Ajayi-Scott's own economics and education background shaped the content. The organization reports financial-literacy instruction, research-based mentoring curricula, programs across multiple school districts, and support from hundreds of women. Its current public materials also extend the model toward boys, young men, adult women, entrepreneurship, and generational wealth.[5][7]

Expansion creates a clarity risk. A network serving girls, boys, entrepreneurs, and adult financial clients can mobilize more people, but it can also blur who the primary beneficiary is and where nonprofit programming ends and Ajayi-Scott's for-profit financial services begin. The public website makes ambitious participation and outcome claims; those figures are organizational self-reports and require records, cohort definitions, and independent validation before they can support causal conclusions.

Pivotal Decision

Convert a women's social and charitable network into the operating backbone for sustained youth mentoring, education, and opportunity access.

Sources

[4] Essence of a Lady, "History and Mission". <https://www.eladies.org/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[5] Essence of a Lady, "The Founder & Founding Committee". <https://www.eladies.org/the-founder-...committee.html> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[6] Essence of a Lady, "Mission". <https://www.eladies.org/mission.html> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[7] Essence of a Lady, "Contact Us" / organizational history. <https://www.eladies.org/contact-us.html> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled 1.2: CASE 2 | JoAnn Ajayi-Scott, Essence of a Lady, Inc. is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

1.3: CASE 3 | Alexis Black, Redefining Normal

CASE 3 | TRANSLATE EXPERIENCE INTO AGENCY

Alexis Black, Redefining Normal

A story can become infrastructure—or remain only a story

Alexis Black entered foster care at 13 after severe family disruption. Justin Black also experienced foster care and the information gaps that accompany transition into adulthood. Their shared premise was that young people should not have to inherit “normal” from trauma, abandonment, or institutions with low expectations.[8][9]

During 2020, Alexis and Justin published *Redefining Normal: How Two Foster Kids Beat the Odds and Discovered Healing, Happiness, and Love*. The memoir made lived experience the entry point, but the venture extended beyond a book. Their public platform offers speaking, workshops, books and exercises, and programming for foster youth, families, and organizations. The couple also developed ROSE—Rising Over Societal Expectations—Empowerment Group.[8][10]

The entrepreneurial mechanism is translation. Personal experience becomes useful to others only after it is organized into language, practices, and settings that support reflection and action. The book can help readers name patterns. Workshops can create structured conversation. Programs can connect testimony to relationship skills, mental well-being, scholarships, or transition resources.

Authorship and venture attribution require care. Public sources describe *Redefining Normal* as co-created by Alexis and Justin. Some sources credit Justin with starting ROSE, while others describe it as a joint venture. This chapter centers Alexis because she is the selected profile, but it does not erase Justin’s co-founder role or convert a shared enterprise into a solo-founder story.[9][11]

The central risk is trauma commodification. A powerful story can attract attention while leaving the audience inspired but unequipped. It can also create pressure on founders to repeatedly disclose painful experiences. A durable model needs boundaries, trained facilitation, referral pathways when participants need clinical care, and outcome measures beyond book sales, speaking engagements, or audience emotion. The barrier becomes an opportunity only when the audience receives usable capacity rather than consuming resilience as content.

Pivotal Decision

Use a co-authored foster-care memoir as the foundation for a broader education and empowerment platform, translating lived experience into tools rather than leaving it as testimony alone.

Sources

[8] Redefining Normal, “About”. <https://www.re-definingnormal.com/about> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[9] Authority Magazine, interview with Alexis Black (Dec. 30, 2020). <https://medium.com/authority-magazin...w-f141a6c3aa22> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[10] Redefining Normal, books and exercises. <https://www.re-definingnormal.com/books> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[11] Comfort Cases, “Redefining Normal with Alexis and Justin Black” (Sept. 1, 2020). <https://comfortcases.org/2020-8-31-e...-justin-black/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [1.3: CASE 3 | Alexis Black, Redefining Normal](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

1.4: Review

What the Three Cases Reveal

The ventures differ less by industry than by the barrier mechanism they choose to interrupt.

Examples of barriers recognized, intervention mechanisms, and evidence of risk across the three case studies

Case	Barrier Recognized	Intervention Mechanism	Evidence Risk
Daughters Beyond Incarceration	Children absorb incarceration's costs but remain institutionally invisible	Lived-experience mentoring, parent-child connection, and advocacy	Theory of change is clearer than longitudinal causal impact
Essence of a Lady	Youth lack sustained access to mentors, knowledge, networks, and opportunity	Aggregate adult philanthropic capacity into recurring programs	Self-reported reach and outcomes need cohort-level verification
Redefining Normal	Foster youth face trauma, low expectations, and fragmented transition knowledge	Memoir, workshops, exercises, and empowerment programming	Attention and inspiration can be mistaken for healing or durable capability

The non-obvious lesson: proximity is an input, not proof

Lived experience can reveal needs outsiders miss, improve language and trust, and prevent damaging assumptions. It does not automatically produce an effective intervention. Founders still need program design, governance, financing, safeguarding, measurement, and the humility to change what is not working.

The opposite mistake is equally costly: treating professional expertise as sufficient while excluding people affected by the system. The stronger model combines proximity with discipline. Participants help define the problem and the standard of dignity; operators build a system that can deliver consistently; evidence determines whether the system deserves to continue or scale.

What Would You Do?

Put yourself in the decision-maker's position. Consider the available evidence, competing priorities, risks, and consequences before deciding what should happen next.

- Problem ownership: identify who experiences the barrier, who has authority, and who currently pays its costs.
- Intervention boundary: specify what each venture can change and what remains outside its control.
- Lived experience: analyze where proximity improves design and where additional professional capability is required.
- Resource aggregation: examine how Essence of a Lady converts episodic goodwill into recurring support.
- Attribution and governance: distinguish founder, co-founder, co-director, partner, and program-originator claims.
- Trauma and consent: identify safeguards against exploiting participants or founders for emotionally powerful content.
- Impact evidence: separate attendance, reach, testimony, skill development, behavior change, educational outcomes, and system-level change.

Evidence Packet and Editorial Boundaries

This appendix records the verified case spine and remaining editorial risk. It is an editorial control, not a substitute for final legal, financial, program, safeguarding, or factual review. Developments after August 18, 2026 require a new evidence pass.

Bree Anderson / Daughters Beyond Incarceration

- Case boundary: 2015–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Anderson’s lived experience; Robert Jones’s exoneration; DBI’s 2018 New Orleans emergence; mentoring, family-connection, and advocacy model; leadership role.
- Open verification: Resolve founding attribution among Anderson, Dominique Jones, and Charles Brown Jr.; confirm current legal and operating status, leadership, participants, programs, funding, safeguarding, outcomes, and recidivism claims.

JoAnn Ajayi-Scott / Essence of a Lady, Inc.

- Case boundary: 1989–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Founder identity; 1989 network origin; 2003 incorporation and YELL! program; adult-network support model; current youth, wealth, and entrepreneurship programming.
- Open verification: Verify participant and mentor counts, cohort dates, graduation and college claims, scholarship totals, curriculum use, current locations, finances, nonprofit/for-profit boundaries, conflicts, insurance-product disclosures, and independent outcomes.

Alexis Black / Redefining Normal

- Case boundary: 2016–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Foster-care background; scholarship-coaching origin; 2020 co-authored memoir; Redefining Normal platform; workshops and resources; ROSE relationship.
- Open verification: Confirm current entity structure, ownership, co-founder and ROSE attribution, program reach, revenue model, curriculum, facilitator qualifications, safeguarding and referral protocols, funding, and independently measured outcomes.

Source Register

See individual pages for source information.

CHAPTER 2: DESIGNING FOR ACCESS

Designing for Access

How ventures redesign delivery when conventional systems exclude people

Access Is a System, Not an Invitation

A service is not accessible merely because it exists. Families can still be unable to find child care. Spanish-speaking students can receive reading software that ignores their language or assumes constant internet. Schools can be legally responsible for therapy while lacking qualified clinicians. In each case, the barrier sits inside delivery—not demand.

Jessica Chang's Upwards supports families, employers, governments, and home-based child-care providers in one network. Rubén Arias's BeeReaders builds literacy tools around Spanish-speaking learners, culturally relevant content, educator visibility, and intermittent connectivity. Jeremy Glauser's eLuma uses teletherapy and school partnerships to connect students with speech, occupational, behavioral-health, and special-education professionals.

These ventures do more than digitize an existing service. Each changes who carries administrative work, where the service is delivered, and how scarce capacity is allocated. That creates a harder obligation: access cannot be purchased by lowering quality, weakening privacy, or shifting invisible burdens onto providers and families.

CHAPTER LENS

Designing for access means locating the actual bottleneck, rebuilding delivery around it, and proving that greater reach does not reduce safety, quality, or dignity.

Three Ways to Redesign Delivery

- **SUPPORT THE SUPPLIER:** remove administrative and business burdens that cause local capacity to disappear.
- **DESIGN FOR THE LEARNER'S CONDITIONS:** treat language, culture, device access, and connectivity as product requirements.
- **MOVE EXPERTISE THROUGH INSTITUTIONS:** use remote delivery to bring scarce specialists to students while preserving professional accountability.

2.1: CASE 1 | Jessica Chang, Upwards

2.2: CASE 2 | Rubén Arias, BeeReaders

2.3: CASE 3 | Jeremy Glauser, eLuma

2.4: Review

This page titled [Chapter 2: Designing for Access](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

2.1: CASE 1 | Jessica Chang, Upwards

CASE 1 | SUPPORT THE SUPPLIER

Jessica Chang, Upwards

Child-care access collapses when providers disappear

Jessica Chang co-founded the company now called Upwards after experiencing the difficulty of finding child care and seeing the operational strain on small providers. The venture began as WeeCare and built a marketplace connecting families with home-based child-care programs. Its model later expanded to employer benefits, government-sponsored care, and tools intended to help providers operate sustainable businesses.[1][2]

The key insight is supply-side. Search technology cannot create a child-care slot when licensing, enrollment, billing, staffing, marketing, subsidy administration, and thin margins push a provider out of business. Upwards therefore treats the home-based caregiver as both a service provider and a small-business operator whose administrative capacity affects the entire local labor market.

The platform now serves several buyers. Families use it to locate care. Employers can fund or facilitate child-care benefits. Governments can sponsor care and administer programs. Providers receive enrollment support, software, payments, and business-development assistance. This multi-sided structure can coordinate resources that are otherwise fragmented, but it also makes accountability harder: the user, payer, provider, and beneficiary may be different parties.[1]

Upwards reports that its Boost program worked with more than 500 home-based providers across over 30 jurisdictions and seven states, supported more than 14,000 families, helped create over 180 jobs, and saw 90 percent of participating providers remain in business. Those figures are useful signals, but they come from a company impact report and require definitions, comparison groups, and independent validation before they establish causation.[3]

The central design risk is marketplace abstraction. Child care is not interchangeable inventory. Families need safety, licensing transparency, fit, continuity, and trust. Providers need predictable economics and control over their work. A larger network improves access only if screening, complaint handling, payment practices, data governance, and provider support grow with it.

Pivotal Decision

Expand from matching families with care to strengthening the small-provider operating system, because search alone cannot solve a supply crisis.

Sources

[1] Upwards, “About Us”. <https://upwards.com/about> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[2] U.S. Chamber of Commerce Foundation, Jessica Chang speaker biography (2024). <https://events.uschamberfoundation.org/jessica-chang> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[3] Upwards, Boost impact report. <https://upwards.com/page/boost-impact-report> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [2.1: CASE 1 | Jessica Chang, Upwards](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

2.2: CASE 2 | Rubén Arias, BeeReaders

CASE 2 | DESIGN FOR THE LEARNER'S CONDITIONS

Rubén Arias, BeeReaders

Language is not a localization layer

Rubén Arias founded BeeReaders in 2020 to improve literacy for Spanish-speaking students across Latin America and the United States. The platform uses Spanish-language and culturally relevant reading content, adaptive activities, assessments, educator reporting, and family support. Its U.S. strategy includes bilingual and dual-language programs rather than treating Spanish as a temporary obstacle to English.[4][5]

That positioning corrects a common design failure. A product built first for English-dominant students and translated later can preserve the wrong examples, reading progression, cultural assumptions, and assessment logic. BeeReaders makes Spanish literacy the core learning problem and treats stronger first-language literacy as an asset for bilingual development and belonging.[4]

Connectivity is another design condition. Portfolio and program descriptions identify an offline-capable mobile experience alongside teacher and family platforms. Students can engage with downloaded reading activities when continuous broadband is unavailable, while educators need usable progress information when devices reconnect.[6]

Offline-first design reduces one barrier but introduces others: device storage, synchronization, account recovery, content updates, privacy, and the risk that students with weaker connections receive stale or narrower experiences. The product must also show that game-like activity leads to reading growth rather than merely more screen time.

Current public descriptions position BeeReaders as AI-powered. Adaptive feedback can help personalize practice, but it raises a higher evidence burden for accuracy, bias across dialects and reading levels, explainability to educators, student-data protection, and age-appropriate use. Reach, funding, revenue, and district-adoption claims vary across public profiles and should not be repeated without direct company records and customer confirmation.

Pivotal Decision

Build literacy around Spanish-speaking learners and intermittent connectivity from the start, rather than translating an English-first, always-online product after the fact.

Sources

[4] NewSchools Venture Fund, BeeReaders venture profile. <https://www.newschools.org/venture/beereaders-2/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[5] Latino Leaders, “BeeReaders with Rubén Arias” (Oct. 12, 2025). <https://podcasts.apple.com/us/podcas...=1000731533722> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[6] International Accelerator, BeeReaders portfolio profile. <https://www.internationalaccelerator...any/beereaders> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [2.2: CASE 2 | Rubén Arias, BeeReaders](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

2.3: CASE 3 | Jeremy Glauser, eLuma

CASE 3 | MOVE EXPERTISE THROUGH INSTITUTIONS

Jeremy Glauser, eLuma

A remote clinician is valuable only when care remains accountable

Jeremy Glauser founded Virtual Speech Therapy in 2016 after identifying a shortage of speech-language professionals serving K-12 special education. The company delivered therapy remotely to schools, then expanded into occupational therapy, counseling, psychology, social work, behavior intervention, and broader mental-health and special-education support. It later adopted the eLuma name as its scope widened.[7][8]

The access mechanism is institutional telepractice. Instead of asking families to locate private specialists, eLuma contracts with school systems and connects credentialed professionals to students during the school day. Remote delivery can reach rural or understaffed districts, reduce geographic recruiting limits, and give schools a more flexible staffing pool.

Technology does not remove the school's obligations. Services tied to individualized education programs require qualified clinicians, documentation, scheduling, privacy, progress monitoring, and coordination with teachers and caregivers. The student may also need a quiet room, working equipment, an on-site facilitator, or hands-on support that cannot be delivered through a screen.

eLuma reports hundreds of thousands of service hours and tens of thousands of students served. The company currently presents a broader offering that includes speech-language pathology, occupational therapy, special-education instruction, mental and behavioral health, and school-wide prevention-to-intervention supports.[9][10] Company-reported scale should be verified against contracts and service records, while clinical and educational effectiveness requires outcome measures—not session volume alone.

The leadership record also needs precision. Current eLuma materials list Glauser as board chair and interim chief executive, while other public pages refer to another executive as CEO. That may reflect timing or a leadership transition. The chapter therefore treats Glauser as founder and requires confirmation of his current operating role before publication.

Pivotal Decision

Use school-contracted telepractice to move scarce specialists across geography, then expand from speech therapy into a broader student-support system.

Sources

[7] eLuma, “Online Therapy Provider, eLuma Celebrates 6th Anniversary” (Nov. 24, 2022). <https://eluma.com/blog/eluma-turns-six/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[8] eLuma, Jeremy Glauser profile and summit recap (Oct. 20, 2021). <https://eluma.com/blog/jeremy-glauser...hanging-world/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[9] eLuma, leadership team. <https://eluma.com/leadership-team/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[10] eLuma, news, press, and current service overview. <https://eluma.com/news-and-press/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [2.3: CASE 3 | Jeremy Glauser, eLuma](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

2.4: Review

What the Three Cases Reveal

Each venture redesigns a different constraint in the delivery chain.

Examples of binding constraint, access design, and quality obligation across the three case studies

Case	Binding Constraint	Access Design	Quality Obligation
Upwards	Local child-care supply is fragile and administratively burdened	Marketplace plus provider operations, employer benefits, and sponsored care	Safety, licensing, provider economics, payment fairness, and complaint resolution
BeeReaders	Spanish-first literacy tools and reliable connectivity are uneven	Culturally relevant, adaptive, offline-capable reading platform	Learning efficacy, dialect fairness, privacy, synchronization, and educator control
eLuma	Schools cannot recruit enough qualified specialists locally	Institution-contracted teletherapy and related student services	Credentials, IEP compliance, clinical quality, privacy, continuity, and on-site support

The non-obvious lesson: access work redistributes burden

Every access innovation moves work. Upwards can remove administrative burden from providers, but the platform must now manage screening, payments, data, and disputes. BeeReaders can move learning beyond the connected classroom, but students, families, and teachers must manage devices and synchronization. eLuma can move clinicians across distance, but schools must create the physical and procedural conditions for remote care.

The question is therefore not whether friction disappears. It is where the friction goes, who is equipped to carry it, and whether that person has power in the design. A venture can claim inclusion while quietly transferring work to the least-resourced participant. Strong access design makes the transfer visible and builds support around it.

What Would You Do?

Put yourself in the decision-maker's position. Consider the available evidence, competing priorities, risks, and consequences before deciding what should happen next.

- Bottleneck diagnosis: identify whether the constraint is search, supply, affordability, language, connectivity, staffing, or institutional process.
- Multi-sided accountability: map the user, beneficiary, provider, payer, regulator, and data subject in each case.
- Burden transfer: determine which tasks disappear, which move, and who inherits them.
- Access versus quality: identify the safeguards that cannot be weakened in the name of reach.
- Offline-first design: analyze synchronization, privacy, update, and equity tradeoffs when connectivity is intermittent.
- Telepractice operations: distinguish clinician availability from a complete, compliant service environment.
- Evidence discipline: separate network size, sessions, engagement, retention, learning gains, clinical outcomes, and causal impact.

Evidence Packet and Editorial Boundaries

This appendix records the verified case spine and remaining editorial risk. It is an editorial control, not a substitute for final legal, financial, clinical, educational, privacy, safeguarding, or factual review. Developments after August 18, 2026 require a new evidence pass.

Jessica Chang / Upwards

- Case boundary: 2017–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Co-founder and CEO identity; WeeCare-to-Upwards evolution; family marketplace; provider support; employer and government channels; current company positioning.
- Open verification: Confirm chronology, ownership, provider and family counts, Boost methodology, retention baseline, job claims, current jurisdictions, fees, payment practices, licensing and screening, complaints, funding, finances, and independent outcomes.

Rubén Arias / BeeReaders

- Case boundary: 2020–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Founder identity; Spanish-literacy mission; culturally responsive content; adaptive tools; offline-capable product description; U.S. bilingual-program expansion.
- Open verification: Confirm co-founder roles, exact offline behavior, AI functions and models, district contracts, learner and revenue counts, funding, efficacy studies, privacy controls, dialect coverage, accessibility, and current financial condition.

Jeremy Glauser / eLuma

- Case boundary: 2016–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Founder identity; Virtual Speech Therapy origin; eLuma rebrand; expansion across related services; school-contracted telepractice; current service categories.
- Open verification: Resolve current CEO/interim CEO status; confirm service hours and students, clinician employment model and credentials, contracts, state licensure, IEP compliance, privacy/security, outcomes, complaints, funding, ownership, and finances.

Source Register

See individual pages for source information.

This page titled [2.4: Review](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

CHAPTER 3: BUILDING TRUST WHERE THE STAKES ARE HIGH

Building Trust Where the Stakes Are High

How ventures earn confidence when error can change a life, a future, or a facility

Trust Is Not Branding When Failure Has Consequences

Customers often buy before they can verify quality. That gap is especially dangerous when the purchase concerns pregnancy, university decisions, or fire protection. In high-stakes markets, testimonials and confidence are not enough. The venture must show who is qualified, what the service can and cannot do, how claims are tested, and what happens when something fails.

Nathalie Walton helped reposition Expectful around holistic support for fertility, pregnancy, and early parenthood after using the app during a high-risk pregnancy. Jenna Ahn co-founded Millie to give international-school students access to mentors, counselors, and tutors during consequential education and career decisions. Tristan Mackintosh founded Safespill Systems to develop ignitable-liquid drainage flooring as an alternative to chemical foam systems in aircraft hangars and industrial settings.

The inherited taxonomy materially misstated two cases: Millie is an education-guidance venture, not a health service, and Safespill is a fire-protection system, not a connected pill bottle. Correcting those errors strengthens the chapter. Trust can be studied across distinct industries because its architecture—credible expertise, transparent limits, external verification, and accountable operations—travels.

CHAPTER LENS

In high-stakes markets, trust is an operating system: qualified people, bounded claims, verifiable evidence, transparent incentives, and a credible response when reality diverges from the promise.

Three Ways to Make Trust Operational

- **BOUND THE PROMISE:** distinguish wellness support from clinical diagnosis and treatment.
- **MAKE ADVICE ACCOUNTABLE:** Make advice accountable: expose mentor qualifications, conflicts, process, and decision ownership.
- **EXTERNALIZE PROOF:** use independent testing, standards, approvals, and operational controls rather than asking buyers to believe the founder.

3.1: CASE 1 | Nathalie Walton, Expectful

3.2: CASE 2 | Jenna Ahn, Millie

3.3: CASE 3 | Tristan Mackintosh, Safespill Systems

3.4: Review

This page titled [Chapter 3: Building Trust Where the Stakes Are High](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

3.1: CASE 1 | Nathalie Walton, Expectful

CASE 1 | BOUND THE PROMISE

Nathalie Walton, Expectful

Personal experience can open the door—but cannot validate the product

Nathalie Walton discovered Expectful as a user during a high-risk pregnancy. She has described using its meditation and hypnobirthing content while navigating stress and a traumatic birth in which she and her son nearly died. After serving as an advisor, she became chief executive and a late-stage co-founder, helping expand the product beyond meditation toward a broader maternal-wellness platform.[1][2]

Her experience gave the company authentic insight into pregnancy anxiety, the mental and emotional gaps in conventional care, and the disproportionate risk Black mothers face. Expectful developed content for fertility, pregnancy, birth preparation, sleep, postpartum life, and parenting, including resources directed toward Black mothers.[1][3]

The trust advantage is proximity. A leader who used the product during a frightening pregnancy can recognize language and emotional needs that a generic wellness team might miss. The trust risk is also proximity: a vivid recovery story can be interpreted as evidence that meditation stabilized a medical condition or prevented harm. A single experience cannot support that causal claim.

The safe business boundary is explicit. Meditation, education, community, and emotional support may complement care; they do not diagnose complications, replace prenatal clinicians, or guarantee outcomes. Product copy, expert review, escalation guidance, and crisis resources must reinforce that boundary, especially when users are anxious and primed to overvalue reassurance.

Expectful currently identifies Walton as co-founder emeritus. Public profiles describe her as having built and sold a women's-health company, but the timing, buyer, transaction terms, ownership, and present governance require confirmation. Trust in the case therefore depends on accurately distinguishing the founder's past operating role from the company's current leadership and clinical responsibilities.

Pivotal Decision

Use Walton's experience as a patient to broaden Expectful's maternal-wellness offer while requiring the venture to separate empathetic support from medical efficacy claims.

Sources

Source Register

[1] Expectful, "How Mindfulness Saved My Pregnancy — Nathalie Walton". <https://expectful.com/articles/how-m...athalie-walton> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[2] TechCrunch, "Expectful's new chief executive experienced the trauma she just raised millions to solve" (Feb. 1, 2021). <https://techcrunch.com/2021/02/01/na...xpectful-seed/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[3] Vogue, "Before Bed: Expectful CEO Nathalie Walton" (Mar. 17, 2021). <https://www.vogue.com/article/before...atable-hot-tub> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled 3.1: CASE 1 | Nathalie Walton, Expectful is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

3.2: CASE 2 | Jenna Ahn, Millie

CASE 2 | MAKE ADVICE ACCOUNTABLE

Jenna Ahn, Millie

Guidance shapes futures without guaranteeing them

Jenna Ahn grew up in South Korea and pursued education across countries before building an education-consulting business while still in college. She later co-founded Millie with Giuseppe Iademarco and Ariel Lau. The company serves international-school students through university guidance, career exploration, tutoring, workshops, and a global mentor network.[4][5]

The trust problem is information asymmetry. Families may be unfamiliar with admissions systems in other countries, while students are making decisions about institutions, majors, careers, and substantial tuition commitments. Counselors and mentors possess knowledge the student cannot easily evaluate until after applications, enrollment, or graduation.

Millie positions mentors as the “big brothers and big sisters” students wish they had. That framing can reduce intimidation and make guidance more personal. It also increases the obligation to disclose how mentors are selected, trained, supervised, matched, and compensated. Relatability is not a substitute for current admissions knowledge, safeguarding, or appropriate boundaries with minors.[6]

Trust also depends on incentives. A counselor who is paid by the family operates differently from an agent compensated by a university. The venture should disclose referral relationships, commissions, promotional arrangements, and whether recommendations are influenced by commercial partnerships. Students must retain ownership of the final decision rather than outsourcing judgment to a persuasive mentor.

Millie states a commitment to accessible support for students facing financial barriers and works with schools as well as individuals. That broadens reach, but public evidence is clearer about the service offer than about placement outcomes, mentor quality, pricing, complaints, and long-term student fit. Acceptance counts alone would be insufficient; a trustworthy model should measure decision confidence, persistence, affordability, and whether the chosen path remains suitable.

Pivotal Decision

Build a global mentor-and-counselor network for international students, making trust depend on transparent selection, incentives, safeguarding, and decision process—not prestige claims alone.

Sources

[4] Millie, Jenna Ahn biography. <https://www.milliegroup.com/people/jenna-ahn/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[5] Millie, “Meet the Mentor: Jenna Ahn” (Aug. 11, 2020). <https://www.milliegroup.com/blog/announcements/mm-jenna/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[6] Columbia Entrepreneurship, Millie venture profile. <https://entrepreneurship.columbia.edu/startup/millie/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [3.2: CASE 2 | Jenna Ahn, Millie](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

3.3: CASE 3 | Tristan Mackintosh, Safespill Systems

CASE 3 | EXTERNALIZE PROOF

Tristan Mackintosh, Safespill Systems

Safety innovation must survive standards, testing, and daily operations

Tristan Mackintosh founded Safespill Systems in Houston in 2013 after leading an aluminum-construction business. Safespill developed a perforated aluminum floor with internal channels that capture spilled ignitable liquid and move it toward containment. If fuel ignites, the system is designed to reduce the pool available to sustain the fire.[7][8]

The company entered a market dominated by foam-based fire-suppression systems in aircraft hangars. Aqueous film-forming foam can suppress fire but contains PFAS chemicals associated with persistent environmental contamination. High-expansion foam can also damage aircraft and endanger personnel during accidental discharge. Safespill's proposition was therefore not merely "safer flooring"; it was a performance-based alternative to an entrenched protection architecture.[8]

No buyer should accept that claim on a founder's assurance. Safespill reports years of fire and materials testing, FM Approvals in 2017 and 2020, and recognition of ignitable-liquid drainage floor assemblies in the 2022 edition of NFPA 409 as an alternative for aircraft hangars. These external mechanisms do not eliminate risk, but they move credibility beyond marketing.[8][9]

Standards recognition is not the end of trust. Every installation interacts with drainage, containment, sprinklers, alarms, aircraft operations, maintenance, and the local authority having jurisdiction. Daily inspections and operating discipline matter because blocked perforations, damaged channels, inadequate containment, or poor maintenance can weaken a system that performed well in controlled testing.[10]

The venture must also manage conflicts between being a product manufacturer, a technical advocate, and a participant in standards discussions. Committee involvement can provide essential expertise, but buyers need transparent test protocols, limitations, installation responsibilities, warranties, and incident reporting. In life-safety systems, the most credible company is not the one claiming zero risk; it is the one showing how risk is tested, allocated, monitored, and corrected.

Pivotal Decision

Pursue external approval and code recognition for a new fire-protection architecture, accepting that adoption would depend on reproducible testing and operational accountability.

Sources

[7] Safespill Systems, leadership and company history. <https://safespill.com/about-us/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[8] Safespill Systems, "NFPA 409 2022 ILDFA Compliance" (Oct. 1, 2021). <https://safespill.com/nfpa-409-2022-ildfa-safespill/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[9] PR Newswire, "Environmentally Safe Fire Protection for Aircraft Hangars Adopted in NFPA 409" (Oct. 5, 2021). <https://www.prnewswire.com/news-rele...301393271.html> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[10] Safespill Systems, "ILDFA Daily Operations". <https://safespill.com/ildfa-daily-operations/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [3.3: CASE 3 | Tristan Mackintosh, Safespill Systems](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

3.4: Review

What the Three Cases Reveal

The evidence required for trust changes with the consequence and the buyer's ability to evaluate the claim.

Examples of the gaps, credibility mechanisms, and unexpected shortcuts across the three case studies

Case	Trust Gap	Credibility Mechanism	Unacceptable Shortcut
Expectful	Vulnerable users may confuse reassurance with medical efficacy	Bounded claims, expert review, escalation guidance, and accurate leadership disclosure	Using a founder's birth story as proof of clinical effect
Millie	Students cannot easily judge advice until after costly decisions	Mentor vetting, transparent incentives, safeguarding, process, and outcome tracking	Treating prestige, testimonials, or acceptance as proof of fit
Safespill	Buyers cannot personally test a facility-scale life-safety system	Independent testing, approvals, standards recognition, installation and maintenance controls	Treating code recognition or a demonstration as a guarantee

The non-obvious lesson: trust requires visible refusal

High-stakes ventures earn trust partly through what they refuse to claim. Expectful should refuse to imply that wellness content treats obstetric risk. Millie should refuse hidden commissions or guaranteed-admission language. Safespill should refuse installations or operating conditions that fall outside tested specifications.

Refusal feels anti-growth because it narrows the market and may slow sales. Its second-order effect is the opposite: it protects customers, prevents the brand from outrunning the evidence, and makes credible expansion possible. When stakes are high, constraint is part of the product.

What Would You Do?

Put yourself in the decision-maker's position. Consider the available evidence, competing priorities, risks, and consequences before deciding what should happen next.

- Claim architecture: separate emotional benefit, process quality, clinical or educational outcome, and safety performance.
- Founder proximity: identify when lived experience improves design and when it is being misused as causal evidence.
- Professional boundaries: determine what requires a clinician, licensed counselor, engineer, regulator, or authority having jurisdiction.
- Incentive disclosure: map who pays, who recommends, and where compensation may distort advice.
- External validation: compare expert review, customer evidence, independent testing, approval, and code recognition.
- Operational trust: identify the maintenance, escalation, complaint, and incident-response systems that must persist after the sale.
- Taxonomy correction: examine how false industry labels would produce false teaching conclusions if left unchallenged.

Evidence Packet and Editorial Boundaries

This appendix records the verified case spine and remaining editorial risk. It is an editorial control, not a substitute for final legal, clinical, educational, engineering, regulatory, financial, or factual review. Developments after August 18, 2026 require a new evidence pass.

Nathalie Walton / Expectful

- Case boundary: 2020–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: User-to-advisor-to-CEO and late-stage co-founder path; high-risk pregnancy and traumatic birth; maternal-wellness expansion; current co-founder emeritus label.
- Open verification: Confirm acquisition and leadership chronology, ownership, transaction, current clinical governance, content-review process, claims substantiation, privacy, adverse-event escalation, subscription practices, outcomes, and conflicts.

Jenna Ahn / Millie

- Case boundary: College consulting origin–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Co-founder and CEO identity; co-founders; international-student focus; mentor, counselor, tutoring, school-partnership, and social-access model.
- Open verification: Confirm legal entities, ownership, current leadership, pricing, mentor vetting and supervision, safeguarding, commissions and school relationships, outcome definitions, placement claims, complaints, funding, revenue, and finances.

Tristan Mackintosh / Safespill Systems

- Case boundary: 2013–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Founder and CEO identity; aluminum-floor drainage architecture; FM Approval claims; NFPA 409 recognition; PFAS-free positioning; current operations.
- Open verification: Verify approval scopes and current listings, test reports, standard language, DoD specifications, installations, incidents, warranties, maintenance requirements, environmental claims, committee roles, ownership, funding, litigation, and finances.

Source Register

See individual pages for source information.

CHAPTER 4: TURNING KNOWLEDGE INTO CAPABILITY

Turning Knowledge into Capability

How ventures help people move from understanding to repeated, independent action

Knowing Is Not the Same as Being Able to Act

Educational ventures often measure what is easiest: registrations, downloads, views, lesson completion, or books sold. Those metrics show exposure. Capability requires more. A learner must be able to apply knowledge in context, repeat the behavior without the instructor, recognize mistakes, and adapt when circumstances change.

Tiffany Aliche's Budgetnista turns personal-finance concepts into daily tasks, tools, community routines, and progressive programs. Eva Drago helped Beelinguapp make language practice feel like reading and listening to content rather than completing isolated drills. Kewanta Brooks created Elite Kids TV so Black children could encounter themselves inside literacy, core-subject, and life-skills content.

Each case reduces a different barrier to action: financial intimidation, the cognitive friction of unfamiliar language, and the disengagement created by absent or stereotyped representation. None proves capability merely by attracting an audience. The teaching question is what the learner can do afterward.

CHAPTER LENS

Knowledge becomes capability when a venture sequences practice, supplies feedback, reduces the cost of repetition, and gives the learner a credible path toward acting without the product.

Three Ways to Build Capability

- **SEQUENCE ACTION:** convert an overwhelming domain into small tasks that build on one another.
- **PRACTICE IN CONTEXT:** embed new skills in meaningful content so recognition and use develop together.
- **STRENGTHEN IDENTIFICATION:** help learners see the skill, the character, and the future as belonging to them.

4.1: CASE 1 | Tiffany Aliche, The Budgetnista

4.2: CASE 2 | Eva Drago, Beelinguapp

4.3: CASE 3 | Kewanta Brooks, Elite Kids TV

4.4: Review

This page titled [Chapter 4: Turning Knowledge into Capability](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

4.1: CASE 1 | Tiffany Aliche, The Budgetnista

CASE 1 | SEQUENCE ACTION

Tiffany Aliche, The Budgetnista

Financial education that ends in a behavior

Tiffany Aliche spent a decade as a preschool teacher before a recession-era job loss and financial setbacks forced her to rebuild. She began teaching women what she was learning about budgeting, savings, credit, debt, insurance, and investing. The Budgetnista grew from workshops and community education into books, challenges, courses, memberships, media, and mentoring.[1][2]

Her central product move was sequencing. The Live Richer Challenge delivered a manageable financial task each day rather than presenting personal finance as one large curriculum. A learner might inventory expenses, set a savings target, automate a transfer, or examine a credit report. The task provides an immediate action, while repetition and community create momentum.[1]

Aliche's teaching style also lowers emotional friction. Plain language, memorable labels, stories, and a large "Dream Catchers" community make money conversations less isolating. That matters because shame and avoidance can block action even when information is available.

The model's boundaries are explicit on the current site: Aliche is an educator, not a lawyer, accountant, credit analyst, or investment broker, and her personal outcomes do not guarantee another learner's results. That disclaimer is not boilerplate. Financial capability includes knowing when general education is insufficient and individualized professional advice is required.[1]

The venture and affiliated community report that millions of women have collectively saved and repaid hundreds of millions of dollars. These are self-reported aggregate claims. They require participant definitions, measurement methods, time periods, duplication controls, and independent validation. The strongest evidence would track whether learners sustain savings, reduce harmful debt, improve resilience, and make informed decisions after the challenge ends.

Pivotal Decision

Translate financial education into short, sequenced challenges supported by tools and community, making action—not content volume—the organizing principle.

Sources

[1] The Budgetnista, Live Richer Challenge archive and current platform. <https://thebudgetnista.com/category/...her-challenge/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[2] Dream Catchers, Tiffany Aliche biography and program claims. <https://dream-catchers-with-thebudgetnista.mn.co/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [4.1: CASE 1 | Tiffany Aliche, The Budgetnista](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

4.2: CASE 2 | Eva Drago, Beelinguapp

CASE 2 | PRACTICE IN CONTEXT

Eva Drago, Beelinguapp

Read the story, hear the language, follow both

Beelinguapp was created by David Montiel as a language-learning application built around bilingual stories and audio. Eva Drago joined in 2020 as co-founder and chief product officer after meeting Montiel through Techstars. She led product, design, content, and marketing, helping develop the experience around customer discovery and sustained engagement.[3][4]

The application presents a story in the language being learned alongside the learner's reference language. Native-speaker audio plays while a karaoke-style highlight follows the text. The learner can connect sound, spelling, sentence structure, and meaning without abandoning the story for a separate dictionary lookup.[5]

This is contextual practice rather than decontextualized memorization. Stories provide sequence, emotion, prediction, and curiosity. A learner who wants to know what happens next has a reason to continue through ambiguity. The product turns comprehensible input into a repeatable habit across multiple languages and genres.

Engagement is not fluency. Parallel text can become a crutch if learners always read the translation. Audio-following can improve recognition without producing spontaneous speech or writing. Capability therefore requires progressive difficulty, retrieval practice, feedback, and opportunities to produce language rather than only consume it.

Beelinguapp reports millions of users or downloads across its public materials, but those figures vary by date and definition. The company's education version, learning-efficacy evidence, retention, paid conversion, and current co-founder roles require confirmation. Product leadership should be credited precisely: Drago joined an existing product and helped scale and shape it; she did not originate the first version alone.

Pivotal Decision

Center product growth on bilingual stories and synchronized audio, using narrative engagement to increase repeated, contextual language exposure.

Sources

[3] Prow Conference, Eva Drago speaker biography. <https://prow.ro/speakers/eva-drago> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[4] Tech.eu, "After 3.5 million downloads, Beelinguapp raises \$1.1 million" (Dec. 15, 2020). <https://tech.eu/2020/12/15/after-3-5...s-1-1-million/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[5] Beelinguapp, "About". <https://beelinguapp.com/es/about> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [4.2: CASE 2 | Eva Drago, Beelinguapp](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

4.3: CASE 3 | Kewanta Brooks, Elite Kids TV

CASE 3 | STRENGTHEN IDENTIFICATION

Kewanta Brooks, Elite Kids TV

Representation can be a learning mechanism

Kewanta Brooks founded Elite Kids TV after searching for educational content that reflected her Black children and finding too little. As an educator and parent, she created the Elite Kids crew—four Black child characters—across videos, books, flash cards, school supplies, and other products for children roughly age ten and under.[6][7]

The venture combines literacy, core subjects, social-emotional topics, practical life skills, and entrepreneurship with character-led entertainment. Representation is not only a cultural benefit in this model. It can affect attention, identification, and the learner's sense that a subject or future role is meant for them.

Brooks launched Elite Kids TV in April 2020, during the disruption of COVID-19. Public profiles describe a mix of screen-based and screen-free materials rather than a simple pivot from physical goods to subscription video. The inherited “crisis pivot” narrative is therefore only partly supported and should not be repeated without a dated product history.[6][7]

The business has used direct sales, Amazon, Etsy, YouTube, grants, pitch competitions, and crowdfunding. That channel diversity improves discovery but can fragment the learning pathway. A child who encounters a single video, flash card, or backpack has not necessarily received a sequenced curriculum. The venture must decide whether it is primarily a media brand, a curriculum company, a product line, or an integrated learning system.

Capability evidence should match the claim. Diverse characters and strong engagement can be measured through reach and response. Literacy or social-emotional gains require age-appropriate assessments, comparison, and evidence that children transfer learning beyond the content. The current operating status, catalog, subscription offer, curriculum review, and audience scale require direct confirmation.

Pivotal Decision

Build early-learning content around Black child characters across screen and physical formats, using identification to support attention while confronting the need for curriculum coherence.

Sources

[6] Graham & Walker, “Female Founder Feature — Kewanta Brooks, Elite Kids TV” (Mar. 16, 2021). <https://grahamwalker.com/blog/female...elite-kids-tv/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[7] CanvasRebel, “Meet Kewanta Brooks” (Jan. 19, 2023). <https://canvasrebel.com/meet-kewanta-brooks/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [4.3: CASE 3 | Kewanta Brooks, Elite Kids TV](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

4.4: Review

What the Three Cases Reveal

Each venture changes the distance between information and independent performance.

Examples of capability mechanisms, useful evidence, and false positives across the three case studies

Case	Capability Mechanism	Useful Evidence	False Positive
The Budgetnista	Sequenced financial tasks, tools, community, and repetition	Sustained savings, debt reduction, resilience, and independent decision-making	Enrollment, motivation, or self-reported aggregate dollars alone
Beelinguapp	Bilingual stories, synchronized audio, contextual repetition, and progression	Comprehension, retention, productive language, and transfer across contexts	Downloads, reading time, or recognition mistaken for fluency
Elite Kids TV	Representative characters joined to literacy, subjects, and life skills	Engagement plus assessed learning and transfer	Representation, merchandise, or views treated as curriculum impact

The non-obvious lesson: the product should eventually become less necessary

A capability venture succeeds when learners can act with less support. A Budgetnista learner should manage routine decisions without restarting a challenge. A Beelinguapp learner should understand and produce language without constant parallel text. An Elite Kids learner should carry literacy, confidence, and problem-solving beyond the characters and platform.

This creates a business-model tension: durable learning can reduce dependence on the product. Strong ventures respond by supporting the next level of capability, community, or practice—not by designing confusion or perpetual beginner status. Retention is valuable only when it reflects continued growth.

What Would You Do?

Put yourself in the decision-maker's position. Consider the available evidence, competing priorities, risks, and consequences before deciding what should happen next.

- Capability definition: state what a learner should be able to do independently after using the venture.
- Task sequencing: analyze how difficulty, feedback, repetition, and confidence build across time.
- Context and transfer: distinguish performance inside the product from use in a new setting.
- Representation as mechanism: examine when identification improves engagement and when it remains symbolic.
- Business-model tension: evaluate how a venture supports mastery without manufacturing dependence.
- Role and chronology: separate originator, later co-founder, product leader, and current executive claims.
- Evidence ladder: distinguish exposure, engagement, completion, knowledge, behavior, outcome, and durable capability.

Evidence Packet and Editorial Boundaries

This appendix records the verified case spine and remaining editorial risk. It is an editorial control, not a substitute for final legal, financial, educational, privacy, safeguarding, or factual review. Developments after August 18, 2026 require a new evidence pass.

Tiffany Aliche / The Budgetnista

- Case boundary: Recession-era rebuilding–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Teacher background; financial setback; Budgetnista education platform; Live Richer sequencing; current courses, community, books, and educational disclaimer.
- Open verification: Verify aggregate participant, savings, and debt claims; methodology; current entities, ownership, revenue, pricing, refunds, affiliate and advisor relationships, outcome persistence, privacy, and finances.

Eva Drago / Beelinguapp

- Case boundary: 2020–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Joined as co-founder and CPO after initial product creation; product, design, content, and marketing role; bilingual parallel-text and audio model; multi-language catalog.
- Open verification: Confirm current role and ownership, user and download figures by date, funding, revenue, education product, retention, efficacy, content rights, accessibility, privacy, AI features, and finances.

Kewanta Brooks / Elite Kids TV

- Case boundary: 2020–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Founder and educator identity; Black-character representation; video and physical products; literacy, core, and life-skills positioning; grants and crowdfunding history.
- Open verification: Confirm current operating status, legal entity, catalog and channels, subscription history, product chronology, curriculum and expert review, reach, outcomes, funding, revenue, safeguarding, content rights, and finances.

Source Register

See individual pages for source information.

This page titled [4.4: Review](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

CHAPTER 5: CREATING PATHWAYS TO WORK AND WEALTH

Creating Pathways to Work and Wealth

How entrepreneurs expand career and economic mobility

Mobility Depends on More Than Talent

People do not miss economic opportunity only because they lack skill or ambition. They also encounter rules they cannot interpret, careers that do not survive relocation, and networks that distribute information and capital unevenly. The failure often occurs at a transition: from international study to authorized work, from one military posting to the next, or from a promising idea to a credible funder conversation.

Nitin Agrawal co-founded Interstride to help international students navigate career, immigration, and global-mobility decisions. Moni Jefferson founded the Association of Military Spouse Entrepreneurs (AMSE) to support business owners whose work must travel with military life. Brittani Hunter built Mogul Millennial around career, founder, and funding information for Black professionals and entrepreneurs.

These ventures create different forms of mobility infrastructure. They do not issue visas, guarantee business survival, or allocate investment capital. They reduce navigation costs: the time, uncertainty, isolation, and insider knowledge required to find a viable route forward.

CHAPTER LENS

A pathway venture creates economic mobility when it helps people cross a consequential transition—not merely consume information about it—and when the pathway remains usable beyond a single location, gatekeeper, or platform.

Three Ways to Build a Pathway

- **MAKE RULES LEGIBLE:** assemble fragmented career and immigration information around the decisions a person must make.
- **MAKE WORK PORTABLE:** connect education, peers, mentors, and markets so a livelihood can survive geographic disruption.
- **MAKE OPPORTUNITY DISCOVERABLE:** translate opaque networks, funding signals, and founder knowledge into credible next actions.

5.1: CASE 1 | Nitin Agrawal, Interstride

5.2: CASE 2 | Moni Jefferson, Association of Military Spouse Entrepreneurs

5.3: CASE 3 | Brittani Hunter, Mogul Millennial

5.4: Review

This page titled [Chapter 5: Creating Pathways to Work and Wealth](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

5.1: CASE 1 | Nitin Agrawal, Interstride

CASE 1 | MAKE RULES LEGIBLE

Nitin Agrawal, Interstride

The missing map between education and work

Nitin Agrawal and Christian Eder came to the United States as international students. Their own experience of navigating an unfamiliar education system, immigration rules, and uncertain career paths led to the idea for Interstride during a dinner with Berkeley friends in 2017. Agrawal has also described difficulty securing an H-1B pathway and eventually leaving the United States—an outcome that exposed how poorly the transition from international education to employment was supported.[1][2]

Interstride organizes career tools, networking, immigration information, courses, and job-search resources around the international-student journey. Universities are the institutional customers; students and alumni receive access through participating institutions. This business-to-institution model matters because the venture is not asking every student to purchase a separate solution to a structural problem.

The product can help a student identify sponsorship-friendly employers, understand work-authorization categories, prepare for sponsorship questions, explore work in other countries, and connect with peers or alumni. Its 2025 acquisition of GoinGlobal broadened the platform from a primarily international-student pathway toward global career mobility. Interstride currently reports more than 550 university partners and 250,000 active users; those are company-reported figures and require definitions and independent confirmation.[1][3]

Legibility is valuable but limited. A platform can explain CPT, OPT, H-1B, or alternative routes; it cannot grant authorization, compel an employer to sponsor, or replace individualized legal advice. Rules change, errors carry high stakes, and AI-assisted search can create unwarranted confidence. The editorial and product burden is therefore unusually demanding: dated guidance, qualified review, jurisdiction labels, referrals, and visible boundaries between information and legal advice.

The strongest outcome evidence would follow students through the transition: relevant interviews, offers, work authorization, time to employment, job quality, geographic alternatives, and persistence. Page views and job searches show use. They do not establish mobility.

Pivotal Decision

Sell an integrated navigation platform through universities, making career and immigration pathways easier for international students to see while placing accuracy and institutional accountability at the center.

Sources

[1] Interstride, “Our Founder Story” and current company-reported scale. <https://www.interstride.com/our-story/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[2] The PIE News, interview with Nitin Agrawal on Interstride and the international-student experience. <https://thepienews.com/nitin-agrawal-interstride/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[3] Interstride, employer and global-career platform overview. <https://www.interstride.com/employers/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [5.1: CASE 1 | Nitin Agrawal, Interstride](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

5.2: CASE 2 | Moni Jefferson, Association of Military Spouse Entrepreneurs

CASE 2 | MAKE WORK PORTABLE

Moni Jefferson, Association of Military Spouse Entrepreneurs

A career that can move when the family moves

Military spouses often build careers under conditions they do not control: permanent-change-of-station moves, deployments, caregiving demands, licensing differences, and employers who may hesitate to invest in a mobile worker. Moni Jefferson experienced that instability as an active-duty Air Force spouse and multi-venture entrepreneur. After years of building military-spouse networks, she founded AMSE in 2019 to create a dedicated system for spouses starting, scaling, and sustaining businesses.[4][5]

AMSE combines a location-independent dashboard with monthly themes, expert instruction, mentorship, peer support, guides, events, and local chapters. Its hybrid design joins portability with place: the digital layer can move with a member, while chapters and partnerships can reconnect the business owner to a new local ecosystem. The operating insight is that a portable business still needs relationships, customers, and context.

Entrepreneurship can preserve identity, income potential, and professional continuity when conventional employment is repeatedly disrupted. Yet it is not an automatic remedy. A portable business may still face registration, tax, procurement, licensing, childcare, broadband, and market-access barriers at every move. It can also shift risk from the employer to a household already carrying military uncertainty.

AMSE's public materials describe free and paid membership, classes, mentoring, guides, campaigns, and community access. Earlier announcements cited membership, event, freelancer, and distribution figures, but definitions and current totals vary by source and date. Evidence of reach should not be converted into claims of viable businesses or household wealth without survival, revenue, earnings, owner-pay, and time-burden data.

Jefferson's achievement is best understood as pathway design rather than a promise that every spouse should become an entrepreneur. A strong ecosystem should expand choice: portable business ownership for those who want it, better remote employment and licensing portability for others, and honest off-ramps when a venture is not economically sound.

Pivotal Decision

Build a military-spouse-specific, hybrid entrepreneurial community whose tools and relationships can travel—while treating entrepreneurship as one mobility option, not a substitute for systemic employment reform.

Sources

[4] Association of Military Spouse Entrepreneurs, "AMSE Story". <https://amseagency.com/aboutamse> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[5] Association of Military Spouse Entrepreneurs, 2019 launch announcement. <https://amseagency.com/amselaunchpr> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled 5.2: CASE 2 | Moni Jefferson, Association of Military Spouse Entrepreneurs is shared under a CC BY 4.0 license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

5.3: CASE 3 | Brittani Hunter, Mogul Millennial

CASE 3 | MAKE OPPORTUNITY DISCOVERABLE

Brittani Hunter, Mogul Millennial

From insider knowledge to a credible next move

Brittani Hunter created Mogul Millennial for Black millennial professionals and entrepreneurs who were often missing from mainstream career and startup media. The platform developed through practical content, founder stories, career guidance, pitch opportunities, and information about grants and venture funding. Hunter's public biographies describe a move from corporate work into full-time entrepreneurship around 2019; the inherited 2017 founding date is not sufficiently supported and should not be treated as settled.[6][7]

Mogul Millennial's mechanism is translation. It turns scattered opportunity signals—what funders seek, how founders pitch, where grants open, how professionals navigate work—into accessible stories and next steps. Representation strengthens the mechanism because readers can observe people with more relevant experiences, constraints, and networks rather than being asked to generalize from a default founder archetype.

Discovery, however, is not access. A funding newsletter may help a founder find an application; it does not improve the application's terms, remove bias from selection, or supply a warm introduction. A pitch event may build skill and visibility without producing investment. Content can generate confidence while leaving the underlying distribution of capital unchanged.

Hunter's newer Capital Klub work sharpens this tension by centering the connection between founders and funding. The relationship among Mogul Millennial, Capital Klub, Hunter's current operating role, and the present product portfolio requires direct confirmation. The chapter therefore treats Mogul Millennial as the verified case spine and the later funding emphasis as an evolution, not as evidence of a completed transition or measurable capital outcomes.

The strongest evidence would trace the funnel from discovery to action and result: opportunities viewed, qualified applications submitted, introductions made, interviews or diligence initiated, capital secured, terms accepted, revenue growth, and founder survival. Audience size alone measures media reach. Economic mobility appears only when information changes access or bargaining power.

Pivotal Decision

Build culturally relevant career and founder media around actionable opportunity discovery, then move closer to the funding bottleneck without confusing visibility with capital access.

Sources

[6] Mogul Millennial, Brittani Hunter author and founder page. <https://www.mogulmillennial.com/auth...rittanihunter/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[7] BAUCE, profile of Brittani Hunter and Mogul Millennial. <https://baucemag.com/brittani-hunter...nial-platform/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [5.3: CASE 3 | Brittani Hunter, Mogul Millennial](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

5.4: Review

What the Three Cases Reveal

A pathway is a designed sequence across a gate—not a collection of resources.

Examples of mobility mechanisms, useful evidence, and false positives across the three case studies

Case	Mobility Mechanism	Useful Evidence	False Positive
Interstride	Integrate career, network, immigration, and global-route information through institutions	Interviews, offers, authorization, job quality, time to employment, and viable alternatives	Users, searches, resources, or institutional contracts treated as career outcomes
AMSE	Combine portable digital support with peer, mentor, market, and local connections	Business survival, revenue, owner pay, customer growth, portability, and sustainable workload	Membership, events, guides, or business starts treated as wealth creation
Mogul Millennial	Translate career and funding networks into relevant stories, signals, and next actions	Applications, introductions, diligence, capital terms, career moves, revenue, and survival	Views, followers, confidence, pitch attendance, or opportunity listings treated as access

The non-obvious lesson: access can become a new tollbooth

Pathway ventures often begin by removing a gatekeeper. As they grow, they can become another one. A university contract may determine which students receive a platform. A membership tier may separate spouses from mentoring or paid opportunities. A media or funding platform may decide whose story, grant, or pitch becomes visible.

The relevant question is not whether the venture charges. Sustainable infrastructure requires revenue. The question is whether price, institutional procurement, algorithmic ranking, or community status recreates the exclusion the venture claims to solve. Good pathway design makes selection rules visible, protects meaningful free access, supplies referrals and off-ramps, and measures who reaches the other side.

What Would You Do?

Put yourself in the decision-maker's position. Consider the available evidence, competing priorities, risks, and consequences before deciding what should happen next.

- Transition failure: identify the precise gate each venture helps a user cross.
- Navigation capital: examine how rules, timing, language, relationships, and confidence function as economic assets.
- Buyer and beneficiary: analyze who pays, who uses, and who remains excluded in each model.
- Portability: distinguish a business that can technically move from one that can retain customers, compliance, and owner income.
- Information versus access: map where content ends and a job, customer, introduction, or investment begins.
- Risk transfer: test whether entrepreneurship expands choice or simply moves labor-market risk onto the individual.
- Outcome ladder: distinguish reach, engagement, action, access, earnings, wealth, and durable mobility.
- New gatekeepers: evaluate pricing, procurement, ranking, membership, data, privacy, and selection power.

Evidence Packet and Editorial Boundaries

This appendix records the verified case spine and remaining editorial risk. It is an editorial control, not a substitute for final legal, immigration, employment, financial, privacy, or factual review. Developments after August 18, 2026 require a new evidence pass.

Nitin Agrawal / Interstride

- Case boundary: 2017–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: International-student origin; co-founder credit with Christian Eder; university-distributed career and immigration platform; 2025 GoinGlobal acquisition; current global-mobility positioning.
- Open verification: Confirm legal entities, ownership, funding, revenue, pricing, university and active-user definitions, retention, acquisition integration, employment outcomes, immigration-review controls, AI use, accessibility, privacy, and finances.

Moni Jefferson / AMSE

- Case boundary: 2014 network-building; 2019 launch–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Founder identity and preferred public name Moni; military-spouse-specific mission; hybrid membership, education, mentoring, resource, guide, event, and chapter model.
- Open verification: Confirm current legal entity, co-founder history, membership and pricing, participation, partners, campaign opportunities, grant claims, business survival, owner earnings, workload, safeguarding, privacy, and finances.

Brittani Hunter / Mogul Millennial

- Case boundary: Approx. 2019–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Founder and CEO identity; Black millennial career and entrepreneur audience; content, founder stories, opportunity and funding discovery, and pitch-oriented programming.
- Open verification: Confirm founding chronology, legal entity, current operating status, ownership, audience, revenue, editorial and sponsor controls, Capital Klub relationship, introductions, funding outcomes, privacy, and finances.

Source Register

See individual pages for source information.

CHAPTER 6: MAKING MISSION ECONOMICALLY DURABLE

Making Mission Economically Durable

How a venture sustains impact without allowing mission or economics to collapse

A Mission Does Not Pay Its Own Bills

Mission-driven ventures are often judged by an impossible standard. If they pursue revenue, critics question the mission. If they depend on grants or donations, critics question the business. The real entrepreneurial problem is not choosing purity over economics. It is designing an economic engine that strengthens the intended impact rather than quietly replacing it.

Vanessa Bouché founded Savhera to create dignified employment for survivors of exploitation and later evolved the organization beyond its original product company. Brandon Okpalobi built Dibia DREAM alongside DIBIA Athletic, using nonprofit and commercial structures to pursue youth development. Cameka Smith built The BOSS Network as a community, media, membership, events, partnership, and capital-access platform for women of color.

The three cases expose different durability choices: change the delivery vehicle, assemble a mission-aligned portfolio, or monetize the value created around a community. None is durable merely because it survives. Durability requires financial continuity, mission fidelity, responsible treatment of beneficiaries, and evidence that the economic model does not create new harm.

CHAPTER LENS

Mission becomes economically durable when revenue, funding, governance, and operating choices reinforce the impact mechanism—and when leaders can change the vehicle without treating the original model as sacred.

Three Ways to Build Durability

- **CHANGE THE VEHICLE:** preserve the social purpose while replacing a delivery model that no longer fits the mission or economics.
- **BUILD A PORTFOLIO:** use distinct entities, customers, and funding sources to support different parts of one mission.
- **MONETIZE ECONSYSTEM VALUE:** charge members, sponsors, advertisers, partners, or investors for value created around a community without selling out that community.

6.1: CASE 1 | Vanessa Bouché, Savhera

6.2: CASE 2 | Brandon Okpalobi, Dibia DREAM

6.3: CASE 3 | Cameka Smith, The BOSS Network

6.4: Review

This page titled [Chapter 6: Making Mission Economically Durable](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

6.1: CASE 1 | Vanessa Bouché, Savhera

CASE 1 | CHANGE THE VEHICLE

Vanessa Bouché, Savhera

When the product is not the mission

In 2017, human-trafficking scholar Vanessa Bouché was leading an academic program in Delhi when a woman in a brothel district told her that she needed dignified employment—not another handout or another request to display her trauma. That demand shaped Savhera, which Bouché co-founded as a wellness enterprise employing survivors to make and sell aromatherapy products.[1][2]

The early model attempted to join two value propositions. Customers bought premium wellness products; survivor employees received living-wage work and a broader human-development system addressing physical, intellectual, economic, and spiritual well-being. Product revenue made employment part of normal operations rather than a program attached after the sale.

That alignment was powerful but economically demanding. A social enterprise had to compete on product quality, price, brand, inventory, fulfillment, and customer acquisition while also funding trauma-informed employment, flexible support, and development. The costs essential to the mission could look inefficient when compared with a conventional product company. Cutting them would improve margins by destroying the mechanism of impact.

Savhera's current public model is materially different. The Savhera Foundation now describes three lines of work: advising social enterprises to embed its human-development model, cultivating survivor leadership through a twelve-month process, and catalyzing systems change through research and speaking. Ava Kamdem serves as executive director, while Bouché is identified as founder. The site explicitly says the work evolved from creating dignified employment for one individual toward cultivating opportunity for survivors more broadly.[1]

That shift should not be disguised as continuity. It is a change in vehicle—from earning primarily through consumer products and survivor employment toward a foundation, advisory, leadership, and knowledge model. The strategic question is whether the new model spreads stronger practices and survivor power at greater scale, or retreats from the harder economics of directly employing survivors. Both possibilities must be tested.

Useful evidence would compare the old and new systems: unrestricted revenue, cost per participant, survivor earnings and retention, advancement, leadership authority, partner adoption, organizational changes, and long-term mobility. A graceful mission narrative is not evidence that the pivot improved either economics or impact.

Pivotal Decision

Allow Savhera's operating model to evolve beyond product sales while retaining dignified work and survivor leadership as the test of mission fidelity—not the continued existence of the original product line.

Sources

Source Register

[1] Savhera Foundation, current mission, work, story, and leadership. <https://www.savhera.org/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[2] NextBillion, "We Need Dignified Jobs" and Savhera human-development model (Aug. 24, 2021). <https://nextbillion.net/jobs-human-t...power-victims/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [6.1: CASE 1 | Vanessa Bouché, Savhera](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

6.2: CASE 2 | Brandon Okpalobi, Dibia DREAM

CASE 2 | BUILD A MISSION-ALIGNED PORTFOLIO

Brandon Okpalobi, Dibia DREAM and DIBIA Athletic

Two structures, one youth-development thesis

Brandon Okpalobi moved to Miami to attend the University of Miami, walked onto its Division I basketball team, earned a scholarship, and became team captain. He later combined sports, education, and mentorship in DIBIA Athletic, founded in 2011, and Dibia DREAM, a nonprofit founded in 2013.[3][4]

The organizations address related but distinct markets. DIBIA Athletic provides sports training and development for athletes and families able to purchase or sponsor programming. Dibia DREAM uses hands-on STEM, recreation, mentorship, and year-round learning to reach underserved and under-resourced youth. One can earn fee revenue; the other can receive charitable contributions, grants, volunteers, and institutional partnerships.

A portfolio can keep one entity from satisfying incompatible expectations. Commercial customers can demand performance; donors can fund access the market will not; partners can supply schools, facilities, technology, staff, or distribution. Learning, reputation, and relationships can move across the portfolio.

The same structure creates risks. Shared branding can blur whether commercial revenue actually subsidizes nonprofit access. Staff time, intellectual property, facilities, referrals, and expenses can move between entities without transparent allocation. A founder-centered ecosystem can become resilient in public and fragile internally if governance, succession, and financial controls remain informal.

Dibia DREAM's current materials describe Okpalobi as founder and CEO and identify STEM education and recreational activities as the nonprofit's core. Public profiles report large cumulative reach, but totals differ by date and source. Participant counts do not establish learning, scholarship, career, or life outcomes. The organization's earlier sports-heavy language and current STEM emphasis also require a dated program history rather than a simplified origin story.[3][5]

Durability evidence must follow both entities separately and together: earned versus contributed revenue, restricted funding, program margins, shared costs, donor concentration, participant retention, STEM learning, scholarships, staff stability, and founder dependence. Without that map, "hybrid model" is a label, not an explanation.

Pivotal Decision

Use separate commercial and nonprofit vehicles to pursue one youth-development mission, gaining funding flexibility while accepting the governance burden of proving how value and costs move between them.

Sources

[3] Dibia DREAM, leadership team and Brandon Okpalobi biography. <https://dibiadream.org/team/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[4] Brandon Okpalobi, founder biography and DIBIA organization chronology. <https://okpalobi.com/about/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[5] Dibia DREAM, mission and program overview. <https://dibiadream.org/our-dream/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [6.2: CASE 2 | Brandon Okpalobi, Dibia DREAM](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

6.3: CASE 3 | Cameka Smith, The BOSS Network

CASE 3 | MONETIZE ECOSYSTEM VALUE

Cameka Smith, The BOSS Network

A community needs infrastructure, not only inspiration

Cameka Smith founded The BOSS Network in 2009 as an online community for professional and entrepreneurial women, with a particular focus on women of color. BOSS stands for “Bringing Out Successful Sisters.” The network combined digital content, relationships, events, education, visibility, and business resources around a simple proposition: economic opportunity is shaped by who can access trusted networks.[6][7]

Community is costly to sustain. Members expect moderation, introductions, programming, opportunities, visibility, and a reason to return. BOSS has used multiple economic relationships around that infrastructure: membership, advertising, sponsorship, events, corporate partnerships, education, and programs connected to capital access. Smith has spoken directly about developing a strategy to monetize the brand rather than assuming community goodwill would finance operations.[6]

This is not inherently mission drift. Companies value access to a defined audience; members value relevant opportunity and relationships. A well-designed platform can charge the party receiving commercial value while protecting meaningful community access.

The conflict is structural. Sponsors may prefer positive visibility to honest discussion. Advertisers may reward audience size rather than member outcomes. Paid tiers can reserve the strongest opportunities for those already able to buy access. A network built to correct exclusion can become another gatekeeper if selection, pricing, endorsements, data use, and conflicts of interest remain opaque.

The current site still presents membership, a directory, events, BOSS On Campus, a BOSS Impact Fund, reports, groups, and partner visibility. Public claims about community size, training reach, grants, or capital should be tied to dates, definitions, recipients, and independently confirmable outcomes. The relationship among the operating network, any nonprofit or fund entities, and partner-funded programs also requires legal and financial clarification.[7]

The decisive evidence is not followers. It is whether members gain durable revenue, customers, jobs, contracts, skills, introductions, or capital on fair terms—and whether the network earns enough unrestricted income to deliver those outcomes without compromising trust.

Pivotal Decision

Treat the network itself as valuable infrastructure and build several revenue relationships around it, while confronting the danger that sponsors, paid access, or opaque selection can capture the community's value.

Sources

[6] KUT, interview with Cameka Smith on The BOSS Network and monetization strategy (May 3, 2023). <https://www.kut.org/life-arts/2023-0...r-cameka-smith> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[7] The BOSS Network, current community, membership, program, and partnership site. <https://www.thebossnetwork.org/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [6.3: CASE 3 | Cameka Smith, The BOSS Network](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

6.4: Review

What the Three Cases Reveal

Economic durability is a system of aligned incentives, not a single revenue stream.

Examples of durability mechanisms, useful evidence, and failure modes across the three case studies

Case	Durability Mechanism	Useful Evidence	Failure Mode
Savhera	Move from product employment to advising, survivor leadership, and systems work	Revenue, survivor earnings and authority, partner adoption, retention, and mobility	Cleaner economics that retreat from direct opportunity
Dibia DREAM	Coordinate nonprofit access with a related commercial venture	Revenue mix, shared costs, donor concentration, learning, staff, and succession	Cross-subsidy claimed without transparent transfers or outcomes
The BOSS Network	Monetize membership, media, events, sponsors, education, and capital access	Renewal, unrestricted income, customers, introductions, capital, and member outcomes	Community value extracted while access becomes less equal

The non-obvious lesson: protect the costly part

The part of a mission venture that looks economically inconvenient is often the impact mechanism. Trauma-informed flexibility, free youth access, careful community moderation, or founder introductions cost money and resist standardization. If leaders optimize those costs away, the venture may become financially healthier and socially irrelevant.

Leaders must name the non-negotiable cost, measure what it produces, and fund it deliberately. Product category, entity structure, program, channel, and brand can change. Mission fidelity should make the vehicle negotiable and the impact mechanism explicit.

What Would You Do?

Put yourself in the decision-maker's position. Consider the available evidence, competing priorities, risks, and consequences before deciding what should happen next.

- Mission mechanism: identify the activity that actually creates impact, not the language used to describe it.
- Economic engine: map who pays, what they receive, and which mission costs the payment supports.
- Model evolution: distinguish a responsible vehicle change from abandonment of difficult beneficiaries or outcomes.
- Entity architecture: examine when separate nonprofit and commercial structures clarify or obscure value transfer.
- Community monetization: determine who creates the network's value and who captures it.
- Restricted and unrestricted money: test whether funding can cover the infrastructure required to deliver the mission.
- Governance and succession: evaluate founder dependence, conflicts, allocation rules, and beneficiary authority.
- Evidence ladder: separate reach, participation, service, short-term outcome, economic mobility, and systems change.

Evidence Packet and Editorial Boundaries

This appendix records the verified case spine and remaining editorial risk. It is an editorial control, not a substitute for final legal, nonprofit, employment, safeguarding, financial, privacy, or factual review. Developments after August 18, 2026 require a new evidence pass.

Vanessa Bouché / Savhera

- Case boundary: 2017–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Delhi origin; founder identity; earlier wellness-product and survivor-employment model; current advising, survivor-leadership, and systems-change model; Ava Kamdem as executive director.
- Open verification: Confirm transition chronology, entities, assets, funding, fees, program design, survivor compensation and authority, outcomes, governance, privacy, and finances.

Brandon Okpalobi / Dibia DREAM and DIBIA Athletic

- Case boundary: 2011–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Founder identity; DIBIA Athletic commercial origin; 2013 Dibia DREAM nonprofit; sports, recreation, mentorship, and current STEM positioning; Miami and New Orleans roots.
- Open verification: Confirm entity separation, boards, shared costs, staff, facilities, intellectual property, earned and contributed revenue, program chronology, participant definitions, learning and scholarship outcomes, safeguarding, succession, and finances.

Cameka Smith / The BOSS Network

- Case boundary: 2009–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Founder and CEO; Bringing Out Successful Sisters name; online community, content, events, membership, partnerships, education, and capital-access positioning.
- Open verification: Confirm entities, ownership, fund relationships, pricing, sponsor controls, audience definitions, grant and capital claims, selection, conflicts, member outcomes, privacy, and finances.

Source Register

See individual pages for source information.

PART 3: BUILDING SYSTEMS

Chapter 1: Finding Leverage in Broken Systems

- 1.1: CASE 1 | Miku Jha, AgShift
- 1.2: CASE 2 | Jehiel Oliver, Hello Tractor
- 1.3: CASE 3 | May Al-Karooni, Globechain
- 1.4: Review

Chapter 2: Turning Technical Possibility into Reliable Value

- 2.1: CASE 1 | Robert Devlin, Metalenz
- 2.2: CASE 2 | Rajan Kumar, Ateios Systems
- 2.3: CASE 3 | Erica Grant, Quantum Lock Technologies
- 2.4: Review

Chapter 3: Designing Operations That Hold

- 3.1: CASE 1 | Jy Maze, Maze Freight Solutions
- 3.2: CASE 2 | Christina Perla, Makelab
- 3.3: CASE 3 | Abel Horvath, Fulfillment Hub USA
- 3.4: Review

Chapter 4: Building Networks, Platforms, and Ecosystems

- 4.1: CASE 1 | Stella Ashaolu, WeSolv
- 4.2: CASE 2 | Brian Balbirnie, ACCESS Newswire
- 4.3: CASE 3 | Robert Hoehn, IdeaScale
- 4.4: Review

Chapter 5: Scaling Under Constraint

- 5.1: CASE 1 | Uche Isiugo, Infranergy AI
- 5.2: CASE 2 | Joanne Rodriguez, Mycocycle
- 5.3: CASE 3 | Laurel Harrop, Laurel Environmental Group
- 5.4: Review

CHAPTER 1: FINDING LEVERAGE IN BROKEN SYSTEMS

Finding Leverage in Broken Systems

Where entrepreneurial intervention can change the behavior of an entire system

Do Not Fix Every Failure

Broken systems invite broad ambition: repair the food supply chain, mechanize small farms, or eliminate commercial waste. That language is inspiring and operationally useless. A venture cannot change every participant, rule, incentive, and physical constraint at once. It needs leverage—a point where one intervention changes several downstream behaviors.

Miku Jha founded AgShift around automated food-quality assessment. Jehiel Oliver moved Hello Tractor from selling branded machines toward a platform that coordinates tractor owners, booking agents, farmers, data, and financing. May Al-Karooni built Globechain so organizations could route surplus assets to new users while documenting environmental and social value.

Each founder intervened at a different coordination failure: subjective inspection, fragmented demand, and disposal workflows that made reuse harder than waste. The relevant question is not whether technology is impressive. It is whether changing that decision point alters incentives, information, utilization, or accountability across the system.

CHAPTER LENS

System leverage exists when a focused intervention changes the choices of multiple participants—and when the venture can prove that the local improvement survives contact with incentives, operations, and physical reality.

Three Forms of System Leverage

- **STANDARDIZE A DECISION:** create a shared, repeatable interpretation where inconsistent judgment produces waste or conflict.
- **AGGREGATE FRAGMENTED DEMAND:** make an expensive asset economical by coordinating many small users, operators, and transactions.
- **REDESIGN THE DEFAULT WORKFLOW:** make reuse easier to execute and measure than disposal.

1.1: CASE 1 | Miku Jha, AgShift

1.2: CASE 2 | Jehiel Oliver, Hello Tractor

1.3: CASE 3 | May Al-Karooni, Globechain

1.4: Review

This page titled [Chapter 1: Finding Leverage in Broken Systems](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

1.1: CASE 1 | Miku Jha, AgShift

CASE 1 | STANDARDIZE A DECISION POINT

Miku Jha, AgShift

Quality is not objective merely because everyone uses the word

Miku Jha founded AgShift in 2016 to address a persistent food-supply problem: agricultural commodities are still inspected through labor-intensive visual judgments that can vary by person, location, customer specification, and time. Inconsistent grading can create disputes, slow receiving, misroute inventory, and discard usable food.[1][2]

AgShift developed Hydra, described as an autonomous food-quality analyzer combining computer vision, artificial intelligence, algorithms, and connected hardware. The product aimed to translate images and product specifications into faster, more consistent assessments for bulk food inspections. Its strategic target was not the whole supply chain. It was the inspection decision through which product acceptance, pricing, routing, and rejection flow.

That is a plausible leverage point because a standardized observation can influence several actors. A grower can understand defects, a buyer can compare loads, a quality team can monitor trends, and managers can investigate recurring loss. If the same data follows the commodity, it can reduce argument and expose where quality deteriorates.

Automation does not make judgment neutral. A model encodes definitions of acceptable appearance and quality. Training data may perform poorly across varieties, seasons, lighting, geographies, packaging, or defects rare in the original dataset. A false rejection can transfer cost to suppliers; a false acceptance can create safety, recall, or brand risk. Human review, calibration, appeal, and traceability remain part of the system.

The public record also requires restraint. Jha's founder tenure is reported as ending in 2021, and she now holds an applied-AI leadership role at ServiceNow. AgShift's website contains mostly 2019-era news and a 2022 copyright, while company databases conflict about current status. This chapter therefore treats AgShift as a historical venture case and does not claim current scale, customers, or operations.[3]

Useful evidence would include accuracy by commodity and condition, disagreement rates with expert inspectors, calibration drift, decision reversals, inspection time, rejected-product recovery, food-waste reduction, customer retention, and economic effects on suppliers. A demo that recognizes defects is not proof of system change.

Pivotal Decision

Concentrate AI on the inspection checkpoint, where a standardized judgment could influence purchasing, routing, quality control, and waste—while accepting that model governance becomes part of the supply system.

Sources

[1] AgShift, historical company and Hydra overview. <https://www.agshift.com/copy-of-about> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[2] VC News Daily, AgShift seed funding and inspection model (Mar. 26, 2018). <https://vcnewsdaily.com/agshift/vent...ing/wjpvvwwvs> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[3] Crunchbase, Miku Jha role chronology and current position. <https://www.crunchbase.com/person/miku-jha> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [1.1: CASE 1 | Miku Jha, AgShift](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

1.2: CASE 2 | Jehiel Oliver, Hello Tractor

CASE 2 | AGGREGATE DEMAND AROUND AN ASSET

Jehiel Oliver, Hello Tractor

The scarce resource was utilization, not only tractors

Jehiel Oliver founded Hello Tractor in 2014 after analyzing the economics of agricultural mechanization in Africa. Smallholder farmers generally could not justify owning equipment, yet many could pay for a few hours of tractor service. A tractor could be economically attractive only if enough nearby demand kept it working.[4][5]

Hello Tractor initially sold small, branded tractors fitted with monitoring technology. Oliver later concluded that manufacturing and distributing machines offered thin margins, high fixed costs, spare-parts obligations, and little competitive advantage. The stronger position was the technology and coordination layer: GPS and sensors for fleet owners, booking tools for local agents, and a marketplace connecting equipment with farmers.[5]

The decisive system move was demand aggregation. Many farmers with small plots are individually uneconomic to serve, and many do not book through smartphones. Community booking agents assemble nearby farms into routes, earn commissions, and make travel worthwhile for tractor owners. Telemetry helps protect the asset, document utilization, and support maintenance, repayment, and financing decisions.

The venture therefore connects several bottlenecks at once: farmer discovery, scheduling, route density, operator incentives, equipment visibility, lender confidence, and service history. Subscription and commission revenue can grow with utilization rather than requiring Hello Tractor to own every machine. Philanthropic or public capital can remain catalytic while the service model is commercial.

The system is not frictionless. A booking platform cannot guarantee fuel, parts, trained operators, soil suitability, timely arrival, fair pricing, or sufficient seasonal demand. Agents can favor better-connected farmers. Telemetry can improve underwriting while enabling surveillance or excluding operators whose data look risky. Financing more tractors before proving utilization creates stranded assets rather than access.

Hello Tractor and partners report millions of farmers served, millions of acres mechanized, thousands of machines, income gains, and strong repayment. Definitions, dates, sampling, attribution, and independent validation vary. The strongest evidence would connect pre-booked demand, utilization, uptime, service price, repayment, farmer yield and income, agent economics, and access for smaller or more remote farms.[6]

Pivotal Decision

Exit low-advantage tractor manufacturing and build the coordination layer that clusters demand, protects assets, guides financing, and makes service delivery economical across many small farms.

Sources

[4] Root Capital, Jehiel Oliver biography and Hello Tractor overview. <https://rootcapital.org/employee/jehiel-oliver/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[5] Huawei Transform, interview with Jehiel Oliver on Hello Tractor's pivot and business model. <https://www.huawei.com/en/media-cent...-jehiel-oliver> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[6] Rockefeller Foundation, Hello Tractor booking-agent and farmer-impact profile (Nov. 30, 2023). <https://www.rockefellerfoundation.or...ith-a-tractor/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [1.2: CASE 2 | Jehiel Oliver, Hello Tractor](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

1.3: CASE 3 | May Al-Karooni, Globechain

CASE 3 | REDESIGN THE DEFAULT WORKFLOW

May Al-Karooni, Globechain

Waste persists because disposal is operationally easy

May Al-Karooni saw usable office furniture being discarded and launched Globechain with £800. The venture became a reuse marketplace connecting organizations holding surplus furniture, fixtures, equipment, stock, and construction materials with charities, small businesses, and individuals able to use them.[7][8]

The core system failure was not ignorance that reuse is desirable. Organizations clear offices, stores, hospitals, or construction sites under deadlines. They need inventory removed, responsibility transferred, collection coordinated, and outcomes documented. Disposal vendors already provide a workflow. Reuse loses when it depends on informal calls, storage, uncertain pickup, or manual reporting.

Globechain inserts reuse into existing asset and project workflows. Organizations identify and list surplus; members request items; the listing organization selects a recipient; the parties coordinate collection; and feedback produces records of items, weight, social value, and carbon deferred. Internal redistribution can precede external listing. The platform explicitly does not provide storage or logistics, limiting asset intensity while leaving execution with participants.[7][9]

Its pricing aligns two sides differently. Registration, requesting, and taking items are presented as free. Organizations pay to list surplus and access environmental, social, and governance data. The business case is therefore not “sell used goods.” It is reduce disposal and storage cost, execute reuse, and produce reporting evidence valuable for ESG disclosures, tenders, and internal decisions.

Measurement is the leverage and the risk. If the platform makes reuse visible inside procurement, facilities, construction, and sustainability reporting, managers have a reason to change practice. If carbon or social-value estimates are weak, double-counted, or optimized for public relations, the reporting layer can legitimize activity without proving additional reuse. Globechain’s newer carbon-credit offer raises the verification burden further.

The company reports more than 10,000 members and very large cumulative reach and diversion ambitions. Those are company claims. Useful evidence would verify listings, completed collections, recipient use, avoided disposal, transport emissions, item life extension, counterfactual destination, customer renewal, time to collection, and calculation methods. A requested item is not necessarily reused, and reuse is not automatically lower-carbon after logistics.

Pivotal Decision

Make reuse free to recipients and charge organizations for the workflow and evidence.

Sources

[7] Globechain, current marketplace, pricing, process, and company-reported claims. <https://marketplace.globechain.com/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[8] Globechain, founder story and company overview. <https://marketplace.globechain.com/about-us> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[9] Globechain, corporate reuse workflow and operating boundaries. <https://marketplace.globechain.com/b...obechain-works> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [1.3: CASE 3 | May Al-Karooni, Globechain](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

1.4: Review

What the Three Cases Reveal

The strongest leverage point changes a decision, a utilization pattern, or a default workflow.

Examples of leverage points, useful evidence, and systems failures across the three case studies

Case	Leverage Point	Useful Evidence	System Failure If Wrong
AgShift	Food-quality inspection and interpretation	Accuracy, calibration, reversals, time, recovery, waste, supplier effects, and retention	Automated bias scales rejection, risk, or supplier loss
Hello Tractor	Demand aggregation, asset visibility, and route economics	Bookings, utilization, uptime, price, repayment, farmer income, agent economics, and inclusion	More financed machines sit idle or serve only easy markets
Globechain	Surplus listing, recipient matching, collection, and impact reporting	Completed reuse, additionality, avoided disposal, transport, life extension, renewal, and methods	Reporting rewards claims while items still move to storage or waste

The non-obvious lesson: leverage concentrates failure too

A high-leverage intervention amplifies more than benefits. A flawed quality model can standardize bad judgment. A financing algorithm can place machines where data are easiest rather than need is greatest. A carbon calculation can turn uncertain reuse into precise-looking claims. The more participants rely on the same coordination layer, the more consequential its errors become.

System entrepreneurs need correction mechanisms equal to their leverage: human appeal, model monitoring, transparent allocation, independent measurement, audit trails, fallback workflows, and the ability for participants to leave. Scale without correction converts a useful tool into a brittle dependency.

What Would You Do?

Put yourself in the decision-maker's position. Consider the available evidence, competing priorities, risks, and consequences before deciding what should happen next.

- System map: identify participants, flows, incentives, constraints, and the exact decision point changed.
- Leverage test: explain which downstream behaviors should change if the intervention works.
- Physical complement: identify fuel, parts, logistics, labor, storage, or collection that software cannot remove.
- Data authority: examine who defines quality, creditworthiness, carbon, social value, and successful use.
- Business-model alignment: determine whether revenue rises when the system outcome improves or merely when activity increases.
- Counterfactual: ask what would have happened to the produce, tractor demand, or surplus asset without the venture.
- Concentrated risk: trace the consequence of model error, exclusion, downtime, gaming, or false reporting.
- Founder and venture status: separate a historically useful case from unsupported claims of current operation.

Evidence Packet and Editorial Boundaries

This appendix records the verified case spine and remaining editorial risk. It is an editorial control, not a substitute for final technical, agricultural, AI, lending, environmental, privacy, legal, or factual review. Developments after August 18, 2026 require a new evidence pass.

Miku Jha / AgShift

- Case boundary: 2016–reported founder exit in 2021; status reviewed Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Founder identity; food-quality inspection problem; Hydra computer-vision and connected-system positioning; historical funding and product claims; Jha's current applied-AI role outside AgShift.
- Open verification: Confirm legal and operating status, ownership, patents, founder departure, customers, deployments, revenue, outcomes, model performance, bias, food-safety boundaries, data rights, privacy, and finances.

Jehiel Oliver / Hello Tractor

- Case boundary: 2014–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Founder and CEO; initial branded-tractor model; pivot to fleet technology and booking marketplace; agents aggregate farmer demand; subscription, commission, telemetry, and financing roles.
- Open verification: Confirm entities and markets, farmer and acre definitions, machine totals, pricing, commissions, utilization, uptime, repayment, income attribution, agent economics, financing terms, data governance, inclusion, and finances

May Al-Karooni / Globechain

- Case boundary: Launch with £800–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Founder and CEO; free-item reuse marketplace; paid business listing and ESG data; internal and external reuse; recipient-organized collection; no storage or logistics; carbon-credit expansion.
- Open verification: Confirm founding date, entities, membership and reach definitions, pricing, completed transfers, item use, diversion and carbon methods, additionality, credit verification, AI matching, customer retention, privacy, and finances.

Source Register

See individual pages for source information.

CHAPTER 2: TURNING TECHNICAL POSSIBILITY INTO RELIABLE VALUE

Turning Technical Possibility into Reliable Value

How an invention becomes dependable enough for adoption

A Prototype Proves Too Little

A technical demonstration answers a narrow question: can this work under selected conditions? A customer asks harder questions. Will it work repeatedly, fit an existing product, survive qualification, arrive at the required volume, meet a standard, and remain supportable after the inventor leaves the room?

Robert Devlin helped move flat, nanostructured optics from laboratory research toward semiconductor manufacturing and consumer-device integration. Rajan Kumar built Ateios around a battery-electrode process intended to improve performance while fitting industrial production and qualification. Erica Grant paired quantum-random key generation with hardware and software for physical access control, then used a national-laboratory collaboration to build and test a prototype.

The three ventures sit at different levels of commercial maturity. That difference is useful. Reliability is not a slogan or a single laboratory measurement. It is a chain of evidence connecting function, repeatability, integration, manufacturing, verification, and customer use. A weak link can keep a technically valid invention out of the market.

CHAPTER LENS

Technical possibility becomes reliable value when a venture reduces the adopter's uncertainty—not only about whether the invention works, but whether the surrounding system can deliver, verify, integrate, and support it.

Three Reliability Mechanisms

- **DESIGN FOR THE ADOPTER'S PRODUCTION SYSTEM:** make the new component compatible with established manufacturing, assembly, and qualification pathways.
- **TURN PERFORMANCE INTO A REPRODUCIBLE SPECIFICATION:** give customers samples, test data, process controls, external verification, and a route to scale.
- **BUILD THE FULL TESTABLE SYSTEM:** connect the core science to hardware, software, users, and a pilot environment that exposes operational failure.

2.1: CASE 1 | Robert Devlin, Metalenz

2.2: CASE 2 | Rajan Kumar, Ateios Systems

2.3: CASE 3 | Erica Grant, Quantum Lock Technologies

2.4: Review

This page titled [Chapter 2: Turning Technical Possibility into Reliable Value](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

2.1: CASE 1 | Robert Devlin, Metalenz

CASE 1 | DESIGN FOR AN EXISTING PRODUCTION SYSTEM

Robert Devlin, Metalenz

The manufacturing method was part of the optical invention

Robert Devlin co-founded Metalenz in 2016 to commercialize metasurface optics developed in Federico Capasso's Harvard laboratory. Conventional optical modules can require multiple curved elements, alignment steps, suppliers, and assembly operations. Metalenz patterns nanoscale structures on a flat surface so a single semiconductor-style element can perform optical functions that otherwise require a more complex stack.[1][2]

The entrepreneurial decision was not simply to make a smaller lens. Metalenz positioned itself as a fabless semiconductor optics company and designed its products for wafer-scale fabrication in established foundries. That choice moved production toward the tools, process controls, yields, metrology, and high-volume supply relationships already used for chips and image sensors. It also required the company to translate delicate laboratory performance into a design that a manufacturing partner could repeat.

A partnership with STMicroelectronics became a crucial bridge. ST announced in 2022 that its FlightSense direct time-of-flight sensor incorporating Metalenz meta-optics had entered volume production; Metalenz now reports that first-generation metasurfaces have exceeded 300 million units in market. The evidence is stronger than a prototype because it includes supplier integration and large-volume production, although the unit figure remains a company report and does not disclose device-level defect, return, or field-failure rates.[3][4]

Reliability also involves restraint. A flat optic is not automatically superior for every wavelength, aperture, temperature, or imaging requirement. Foundry compatibility does not remove qualification, packaging, calibration, intellectual-property, yield, or single-source risk. Later products such as polarization sensing and under-display authentication must earn their own evidence; success of one time-of-flight component does not validate every proposed application.

Useful evidence would include wafer yield, lot-to-lot variation, optical efficiency, temperature and aging performance, assembly tolerances, qualification results, field returns, supplier concentration, cost at volume, and customer requalification burden. The decisive value is not scientific novelty alone. It is a component an OEM can purchase, integrate, and trust at scale.

Pivotal Decision

Commercialize the meta-optic as a semiconductor component designed around existing foundry and sensor supply chains, making manufacturability and integration part of the product.

Sources

[1] Metalenz, company history and current production highlights. <https://metalenz.com/about-us/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[2] Metalenz, launch and Harvard commercialization background (Feb. 4, 2021). <https://metalenz.com/metalenz-launch...phone-sensors/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[3] STMicroelectronics, meta-optics technology enters volume production (June 9, 2022). <https://newsroom.st.com/media-center...tml/n4475.html> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[4] Metalenz, Orion product and ST manufacturing relationship (May 26, 2021). <https://metalenz.com/metalenz-launch...ern-projector/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [2.1: CASE 1 | Robert Devlin, Metalenz](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

2.2: CASE 2 | Rajan Kumar, Ateios Systems

CASE 2 | MAKE PERFORMANCE QUALIFIABLE

Rajan Kumar, Ateios Systems

A better electrode must survive the customer's process

Rajan Kumar founded Ateios Systems after work in nanoscale science and printable energy materials exposed the constraints of conventional battery-electrode manufacturing. The company's RaiCure platform uses energy-curable polymers in place of traditional thermally processed fluorinated binders. Ateios argues that the process can produce electrodes faster, reduce energy and factory footprint, avoid PFAS-class materials, and improve performance.[5][6]

The strategic move was to stop treating a complete custom battery as the only product. Ateios now offers electrode components across common chemistries and works with battery assemblers and device developers on samples, benchmarking, qualification, and production integration. That narrows the adoption burden: a customer can test an electrode in a familiar cell design and existing factory rather than replace the entire battery system at once.

The public evidence has advanced beyond a concept. Ateios reports a \$2.4 million Department of Defense contract, commercial sample availability, pilots with battery assemblers, and a 2026 \$7.25 million Series A to scale production. It also reports third-party PFAS-free certification from Intertek across its electrode portfolio. These milestones reduce different uncertainties—technical development, customer evaluation, capital for capacity, and material claims—but none alone proves durable mass adoption or superior lifetime economics.[7][8]

Battery claims demand careful comparison. Energy density can refer to active material, electrode, cell, or pack. Cycle life depends on chemistry, loading, rate, depth of discharge, temperature, formation, and cutoff voltage. Faster curing matters only if coating uniformity, adhesion, safety, yield, throughput, and cost remain acceptable. A PFAS-free certificate verifies a defined material threshold and test method; it does not establish every environmental or performance claim.

Useful evidence would include customer-qualified specifications, independent cell testing, production yield, coating speed and width, scrap, solvent and energy use, total electrode cost, safety results, capacity retention under comparable conditions, requalification time, repeat orders, and operating capacity. The adopter needs a controlled process and defensible data, not a record-setting number without its test boundary.

Pivotal Decision

Package the manufacturing innovation as electrode products and a qualification pathway that customers can test inside existing cell designs and factories.

Sources

[5] Ateios Systems, current team and company positioning. <https://ateios.com/team> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[6] Ateios Systems, RaiCore LCO electrode launch and disclosed test claims (July 9, 2024). <https://ateios.com/news/ateios-syste...gh-performance> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[7] Ateios Systems, \$2.4M Department of Defense contract (May 18, 2023). <https://ateios.com/news/ateios-syste...als-in-the-u-s> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[8] Ateios Systems, \$7.25M Series A and scaling plan (Mar. 22, 2026). <https://ateios.com/news/ateios-syste...-manufacturing> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [2.2: CASE 2 | Rajan Kumar, Ateios Systems](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

2.3: CASE 3 | Erica Grant, Quantum Lock Technologies

CASE 3 | BUILD THE FULL TESTABLE SYSTEM

Erica Grant, Quantum Lock Technologies

Randomness becomes valuable only inside an operating security architecture

Erica Grant founded Quantum Lock Technologies to connect physical access control with cybersecurity. The venture proposed using quantum-derived random numbers to generate unpredictable digital keys for doors, containers, machinery, computers, and connected equipment. Grant entered Oak Ridge National Laboratory's Innovation Crossroads program and worked through a cooperative research and development agreement with ORNL.[9][10]

The technical core—generating random values—could not by itself secure a door. The venture needed hardware, software, communications, key management, authentication, ledgers, permissions, recovery procedures, and a user workflow. Quantum Lock therefore built a combined system and used laboratory expertise to develop and test a prototype. Contemporary reporting also described planned pilots with ORNL and EPB.

This case illustrates the difference between laboratory reliability and adoption evidence. The 2023 CRADA final report confirms the collaboration, mission, prototype work, and evaluation context. It does not establish broad commercial deployment, certified security, sustained customers, or current company operations. Public profiles now associate Grant with Quantal Security, and the relationship between that entity and Quantum Lock requires confirmation. The chapter therefore treats Quantum Lock as a development-stage historical case, not a scaled success.[10][11]

Security reliability is adversarial. A source of high-quality randomness can still sit inside vulnerable firmware, poor key storage, weak identity proofing, insecure communications, unsafe recovery, or easily bypassed physical hardware. A remote-access feature can improve control while expanding the attack surface. Claims such as “quantum” or “future-proof” should never substitute for a threat model, independent testing, standards alignment, and incident response.

Useful evidence would include randomness test results, entropy provenance, architecture review, penetration testing, hardware tamper resistance, key lifecycle and revocation, latency, uptime, recovery, usability, false acceptance and rejection, pilot completion, vulnerabilities found and remediated, standards mapping, customer conversion, and present operating status. A working prototype proves that components communicate; it does not prove that the system is secure or adoptable.

Pivotal Decision

Move beyond a quantum-randomness concept and build an integrated hardware-software prototype with a national-laboratory partner, creating a system that could be tested in an operational setting.

Sources

[9] UT Research, Innovation & Impact, Erica Grant founder profile (Apr. 26, 2022). <https://utorii.com/check-out-ut-oris-power-players/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[10] Oak Ridge National Laboratory / DOE, Quantum Lock Technologies CRADA final report (Jan. 23, 2023). <https://www.osti.gov/biblio/2573687> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[11] Teknovation, Quantum Lock prototype and planned-pilot profile (Mar. 15, 2022). <https://www.teknovation.biz/erica-gr...ves-in-region/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [2.3: CASE 3 | Erica Grant, Quantum Lock Technologies](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

2.4: Review

What the Three Cases Reveal

Adoption depends on the risk the venture removes for the next organization in the chain.

Examples of reliability mechanisms, strongest public evidence, and unresolved adoption risks across the three case studies

Case	Reliability Mechanism	Strongest Public Evidence	Unresolved Adoption Risk
Metalenz	Foundry-compatible design and sensor-supplier integration	ST volume-production announcement; company-reported 300M+ units	Product-specific yield, field reliability, economics, and supplier concentration
Ateios	Testable electrode specifications, pilots, certification, and scaling capital	DoD contract, samples and pilots, PFAS-free certification, Series A	Independent comparable performance, qualified repeat orders, yield, and scale economics
Quantum Lock	Integrated prototype and lab-backed evaluation	ORNL CRADA final report and prototype-development record	Current status, pilot outcome, independent security validation, and commercial adoption

The non-obvious lesson: the customer adopts evidence, not technology

An adopter cannot directly observe every material property, production condition, security assumption, or future failure. It relies on evidence produced by a system: specifications, process controls, samples, qualification reports, certifications, supplier commitments, pilot results, warranties, and field history. The venture's job is partly to build that evidence system.

This creates a disciplined sequence. First prove the scientific mechanism. Then prove repeatability. Next prove integration and qualification. Finally prove operational and economic value over time. Skipping a stage transfers uncertainty to the customer—and sophisticated customers respond by delaying adoption, demanding a discount, or choosing an inferior but familiar alternative.

What Would You Do?

Put yourself in the decision-maker's position. Consider the available evidence, competing priorities, risks, and consequences before deciding what should happen next.

- Evidence ladder: distinguish proof of principle, repeatability, integration, qualification, production, field use, and commercial renewal.
- Adopter risk: identify the technical, operational, financial, regulatory, and supplier uncertainties borne by the customer.
- Interface strategy: examine whether the venture asks a customer to replace a component, a process, or an entire system.
- Claim boundaries: test the denominator, conditions, comparison baseline, and source behind each performance claim.
- Make-versus-partner: assess which capabilities belong inside the venture and which require foundries, laboratories, certifiers, assemblers, or OEMs.
- Reliability economics: connect yield, failure, qualification, warranty, switching cost, and support to the business model.
- Security skepticism: separate quantum randomness from the reliability of the complete access-control architecture.
- Maturity discipline: compare a volume-produced component, a scaling supplier, and a development-stage historical venture

without treating milestones as equivalent.

Evidence Packet and Editorial Boundaries

This appendix records the verified case spine and remaining editorial risk. It is an editorial control, not a substitute for final engineering, manufacturing, battery, cybersecurity, legal, investment, or factual review. Developments after August 18, 2026 require a new evidence pass.

Robert Devlin / Metalenz

- Case boundary: 2016–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Co-founder and CEO; Harvard metasurface origin; fabless semiconductor-optics model; ST foundry and sensor integration; ST volume-production announcement; company-reported 300M+ first-generation units.
- Open verification: Confirm product-level shipments and dates, OEMs, yields, field returns, qualification, pricing, margins, patents and licenses, supplier concentration, later-product status, customer claims, and finances.

Rajan Kumar / Ateios Systems

- Case boundary: Founding–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Founder and CEO; printable-energy-material origin; RaiCure energy-curable manufacturing; RaiCore electrode model; DoD contract; samples and pilots; reported Intertek certification and 2026 Series A.
- Open verification: Confirm certification directory entry, exact PFAS scope, chemistry-specific test conditions, independent performance, production yield and capacity, cost, pilots, customer qualification, repeat orders, safety, environmental analysis, and finances.

Erica Grant / Quantum Lock Technologies

- Case boundary: Innovation Crossroads Cohort 4–2023 CRADA closeout; status reviewed Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Founder identity; physical-cyber access-control mission; quantum-random digital-key concept; ORNL Innovation Crossroads participation; CRADA prototype and evaluation record.
- Open verification: Confirm legal and operating status, relationship to Quantal Security, patents, team, pilot completion and results, architecture, security testing, vulnerabilities, standards, customers, revenue, funding, and current use of the technology.

Source Register

See individual pages for source information.

CHAPTER 3: DESIGNING OPERATIONS THAT HOLD

Designing Operations That Hold

How entrepreneurs turn promises into repeatable execution

A Promise Is Not an Operation

Customers buy an outcome: the turbine arrives safely, the printed part matches its specification, or the correct order reaches the consumer on time. The venture delivers that outcome through hundreds of less visible decisions—intake, scoping, scheduling, verification, handoffs, exception handling, communication, measurement, and correction.

Jy Maze built Maze Freight Solutions around large, oversized, and mission-critical freight where route, permit, carrier, equipment, escort, and timing errors can stop a shipment. Christina Perla and Manny Mota built Makelab to make custom additive manufacturing feel more like a dependable production service. Abel Horvath built Fulfillment Hub USA around integrated warehousing, inventory, picking, packing, returns, transportation, and multi-location coverage.

All three sell confidence, but confidence is earned differently. Maze plans around variation that cannot be removed. Makelab narrows variation through technical review and process discipline. Fulfillment Hub USA standardizes repeated transactions while preserving paths for special handling. The chapter therefore treats operations as a designed system, not heroic effort by a founder or a slogan about customer service.

CHAPTER LENS

An operation holds when it produces a defined outcome repeatedly, detects deviation early, assigns ownership at every handoff, and learns from exceptions without depending on constant founder rescue.

Three Operational Mechanisms

- **PLAN THE EXCEPTION BEFORE EXECUTION:** use route analysis, permitting, equipment selection, carrier qualification, communication, and contingencies for work that cannot be fully standardized.
- **CONVERT CUSTOM WORK INTO A CONTROLLED FLOW:** standardize intake, design review, quoting, scheduling, production, inspection, and feedback while preserving technical judgment.
- **CREATE ONE OPERATING TRUTH ACROSS NODES:** connect orders, inventory, locations, carriers, service levels, returns, and customer communication through shared data and defined handoffs.

3.1: CASE 1| Jy Maze, Maze Freight Solutions

3.2: CASE 2 | Christina Perla, Makelab

3.3: CASE 3 | Abel Horvath, Fulfillment Hub USA

3.4: Review

This page titled [Chapter 3: Designing Operations That Hold](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

3.1: CASE 1| Jy Maze, Maze Freight Solutions

CASE 1 | PLAN THE EXCEPTION BEFORE EXECUTION

Jy Maze, Maze Freight Solutions

The difficult shipment begins long before pickup

Jy'Juan "Jy" Maze founded Maze Freight Solutions in 2017 after nearly a decade in transportation and freight brokerage. The company operates as a third-party logistics provider, with a current emphasis on oversized, heavy-haul, and mission-critical freight serving industries such as construction, energy, government, aerospace, mining, railroad, and agriculture.[1][2]

A broker does not need to own every truck to control the operating outcome. It must define the shipment, source a suitable carrier, verify authority and insurance, select equipment, plan the route, obtain permits, coordinate escorts, schedule loading, monitor movement, communicate changes, document delivery, and respond when weather, mechanical failure, site conditions, or regulation disrupt the plan.

Maze's operating choice was to compete through planning and relationship accountability rather than a commodity rate quote alone. The current service describes route surveys, state permitting, safety escorts, carrier partners, modal options, and a designated account manager. Heavy-haul work makes that emphasis credible because the variance is structural: dimensions, weight, road limits, bridge clearances, curfews, permits, cranes, and jobsite readiness differ from move to move.

The model is asset-light only in a narrow accounting sense. Maze can avoid owning a full fleet, but it remains dependent on carrier capacity, driver quality, equipment condition, fuel, permitting agencies, escorts, customer data, and timely payment. A weak carrier selection process converts someone else's truck into Maze's reputational, safety, and claims risk. Growth can also overwhelm a small team if exception knowledge lives in individuals rather than checklists, systems, and escalation rules.

Public evidence supports the founder, venture, founding period, service scope, and continued operation. It does not independently establish the manuscript's broad claims of growth, transparency gains, service performance, or customer economics. Useful evidence would include quote-to-book rate, tender acceptance, carrier qualification, permit lead time, pickup and delivery performance, exceptions by cause, claims and safety events, communication response, gross margin by load, days sales outstanding, customer retention, and founder interventions per shipment.

Pivotal Decision

Focus the brokerage on complex freight where disciplined pre-move planning, qualified partners, and continuous communication can command value beyond the lowest transportation rate.

Sources

[1] Maze Freight Solutions, current company, services, leadership, and founder biography. <https://mazefreightsolutions.com/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[2] Startland News, Jy Maze founder and early operating story (Mar. 23, 2021). <https://startlandnews.com/2021/03/jy...ght-solutions/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [3.1: CASE 1| Jy Maze, Maze Freight Solutions](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

3.2: CASE 2 | Christina Perla, Makelab

CASE 2 | TURN CUSTOM WORK INTO A CONTROLLED FLOW

Christina Perla, Makelab

The customer sees one part; the operation sees a chain of variables

Industrial designers Christina Perla and Manny Mota co-founded Makelab in 2017 after encountering the friction of obtaining useful 3D-printed parts: uncertain material choices, manufacturability problems, inconsistent quality, slow back-and-forth, and a gap between uploading a file and receiving a part that works. Makelab became a New York additive-manufacturing service for prototypes, production runs, oversized parts, and design engineering.[3][4]

The operating challenge is high mix and variable volume. Every file can differ in geometry, tolerance, material, orientation, finish, quantity, and end use. A purely manual shop becomes a queue of email, tribal knowledge, rework, and founder judgment. A fully automated upload portal can quote an unprintable or inappropriate design and hide the moment when an engineer should intervene.

Makelab built a hybrid flow: digital upload and quoting, technical and design-for-additive-manufacturing review, technology and material selection, project management, scheduled production, post-processing, inspection, and delivery. Earlier customer documentation from workflow-software provider AMFG describes replacing manual web forms and disconnected internal coordination with a connected order and production workflow. The company now positions human inspection and technical access as complements to quoting and production tools, not defects in automation.[5]

That balance is the entrepreneurial decision. The scalable unit is not merely printer time; it is a reviewed and controlled job. Standard inputs and status data reduce administrative variation, while technical judgment protects the output. The company can move from one-off prototypes toward repeat production only if machine settings, material lots, orientation, post-processing, inspection, and change control produce comparable parts.

Makelab currently reports more than 5,000 parts per week, 97 percent on-time delivery, six technologies, 23 materials, and hand inspection. Those are company claims, and their definitions matter. “On time” requires a promised date and treatment of customer-caused changes. “Parts” can range from simple pieces to complex assemblies. Inspection can mean visual review or measurement against a controlled drawing. Marketing metrics should not be mistaken for an audited quality system.[3]

Useful evidence would include first-pass yield, scrap and reprint rate, dimensional capability by process, material traceability, calibration, queue time, quote accuracy, engineering-review time, promised versus actual delivery, complaint and return rates, corrective actions, repeat production consistency, machine utilization, labor content, gross margin, and customer retention.

Pivotal Decision

Build a hybrid digital-and-human workflow in which software standardizes intake and coordination while technical review and inspection protect manufacturability, quality, and the customer’s schedule.

Sources

[3] Makelab, current services, production flow, and company-reported metrics. <https://www.makelab.com/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[4] Develop3D, Christina Perla and Makelab operating profile (Jan. 17, 2023). <https://develop3d.com/3d-printing/in...-of-copy-shop/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[5] AMFG, Makelab customer case on order and production workflow. <https://www.amfg.ai/customers/makelab> (accessed August 18, 2026).

18, 2026).

This page titled [3.2: CASE 2 | Christina Perla, Makelab](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

3.3: CASE 3 | Abel Horvath, Fulfillment Hub USA

CASE 3 | CREATE ONE OPERATING TRUTH ACROSS NODES

Abel Horvath, Fulfillment Hub USA

Every order is simple until the exceptions accumulate

Abel Horvath founded Fulfillment Hub USA around 2019–2020 after developing logistics software and relocating from Germany to Miami. The company provides third-party logistics for e-commerce and wholesale brands: receiving, storage, inventory, pick-and-pack, shipping, returns, kitting, marketplace preparation, freight, customs support, and specialized handling.[6][7]

The apparent task—put an item in a box—is only the center of a larger system. Product data must match physical inventory. Purchase orders and advance shipping notices must be received. Units must be counted, scanned, located, picked, packed, labeled, routed, and reconciled. Returns must be graded and dispositioned. Brand rules, retailer routing guides, carrier cutoffs, lot or expiration controls, promotions, inserts, and international requirements create exception paths.

Horvath's operating strategy connected software integrations with a network of physical facilities and value-added services. A merchant can send orders from multiple channels into one operating layer, distribute inventory, and use the same partner for direct-to-consumer, retail, marketplace, returns, customization, and transportation work. The promise is fewer handoffs and one accountable operator from receiving through shipment.

Network breadth creates both resilience and drift. More locations can reduce delivery distance and provide backup capacity, but each node adds training, inventory-allocation, labor, lease, systems, carrier, and quality-control complexity. Inventory split across warehouses can strand stock or increase transfers. An integration can automate bad product data. A fast onboarding process can import unresolved discrepancies. “One operation” is true only if procedures, master data, metrics, and escalation remain consistent.

The company currently reports five U.S. locations, more than one million square feet, more than 6,800 orders per day, approximately a 1 p.m. same-day cutoff, and 99.99 percent on-time performance. Inc. lists Fulfillment Hub USA as a 2025 Inc. 5000 honoree. The scale and service metrics remain largely company-reported; the denominator, reporting period, exclusions, audit method, and distinction between shipped-on-time and delivered-on-time require verification.[6][8]

Useful evidence would include inventory accuracy, dock-to-stock time, orders per labor hour, pick accuracy, perfect-order rate, cutoff attainment, carrier tender and delivery performance, return-cycle time, shrink, damage, chargebacks, customer tickets, implementation time, system uptime, warehouse-level variance, peak capacity, cost per order, contribution margin, customer concentration, retention, and remediation when a node misses standard.

Pivotal Decision

Combine a shared software and data layer with multi-location physical fulfillment and in-house services so one operator can own the outcome across channels—accepting the control burden created by every added node.

Sources

[6] Fulfillment Hub USA, current workflow, locations, services, and company-reported metrics. <https://fulfillmenthubusa.com/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[7] Forbes, Abel Horvath and Fulfillment Hub USA launch profile (Feb. 24, 2021). <https://www.forbes.com/sites/chelsea...erce-industry/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[8] Inc., Fulfillment Hub USA 2025 Inc. 5000 company profile. <https://www.inc.com/profile/fulfillment-hub-usa> (accessed August 18, 2026).

18, 2026).

This page titled [3.3: CASE 3 | Abel Horvath, Fulfillment Hub USA](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

3.4: Review

What the Three Cases Reveal

Repeatability is produced by different combinations of standard work, expert judgment, visibility, and correction.

Examples of operating mechanisms, leading controls, and failures across the three case studies

Case	Operating Mechanism	Leading Controls	Failure If Control Breaks
Maze Freight	Pre-plan variable, exception-heavy freight through qualified partners	Scope, route, permits, equipment, carrier, escorts, milestones, escalation	A third-party failure becomes a safety event, delay, claim, or lost customer
Makelab	Standardize custom-job intake and flow while preserving technical review	File review, process selection, scheduling, settings, inspection, change control	Automation accelerates bad quotes, rework, inconsistent parts, or missed dates
Fulfillment Hub USA	Connect orders, inventory, locations, channels, and service paths	Master data, scans, cutoff logic, inventory reconciliation, SOPs, node metrics	Network scale multiplies inventory error, inconsistent service, and hidden exceptions

The non-obvious lesson: operational scale is controlled variance

The goal is not to eliminate every exception. Heavy freight, custom fabrication, and brand fulfillment all contain legitimate variation. The goal is to identify which variation creates customer value, which can be standardized, which needs expert review, and which should be refused because the operation cannot control it.

A strong operation makes exceptions visible and expensive in the right way. It records their cause, assigns an owner, protects the customer, and changes the process when recurrence is avoidable. A weak operation celebrates employee heroics, because heroics hide poor intake, overpromising, missing data, capacity imbalance, and brittle handoffs. Founder rescue is an early-stage advantage and a scaling warning.

What Would You Do?

Put yourself in the decision-maker's position. Consider the available evidence, competing priorities, risks, and consequences before deciding what should happen next.

- Operating promise: define the outcome, customer tolerance, and moment the clock starts and stops.
- Process map: trace intake, decision points, handoffs, verification, communication, and escalation.
- Variance strategy: separate value-creating customization from avoidable process noise.
- Control versus ownership: identify risks retained even when trucks, carriers, facilities, printers, or software are supplied by others.
- Metric integrity: require denominator, time period, exclusions, source, and audit method for every performance percentage.
- Capacity economics: connect utilization, labor, queue time, service level, margin, and peak demand.
- Automation boundary: determine where software should decide, recommend, block, or escalate to a person.
- Network drift: test how procedures and master data remain consistent across carriers, machines, shifts, and locations.

- Founder dependence: locate decisions that still require the founder and design a transfer mechanism.

Evidence Packet and Editorial Boundaries

This appendix records the verified case spine and remaining editorial risk. It is an editorial control, not a substitute for final transportation, safety, manufacturing, quality, warehousing, labor, software, contractual, legal, or factual review. Developments after August 18, 2026 require a new evidence pass.

Jy Maze / Maze Freight Solutions

- Case boundary: 2017–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Founder and president; freight-brokerage background; current operation; third-party logistics and heavy/oversized freight scope; route, permit, escort, carrier, and account-management positioning.
- Open verification: Confirm legal entities, ownership, certifications, revenue and growth, employees, loads, customers, carrier network, authority, insurance, safety, claims, on-time definitions, margins, retention, systems, and founder dependence.

Christina Perla / Makelab

- Case boundary: 2017–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Co-founder and CEO; industrial-design origin; additive-manufacturing service; digital intake and workflow; prototypes through production; current New York factory and company-reported operating metrics.
- Open verification: Confirm ownership, revenue, customers, machines and capacity, 5,000-part and 97% definitions, quality system, yields, tolerances, material traceability, complaints, repeatability, software stack, margins, and finances.

Abel Horvath / Fulfillment Hub USA

- Case boundary: 2019/2020–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Founder and CEO; logistics-software background; Miami launch; continued operation; third-party logistics model; multi-channel services; current location and company-reported scale metrics; 2025 Inc. 5000 listing.
- Open verification: Resolve founding date and entity history; confirm owned versus partner facilities, leases, one-million-square-foot claim, orders, on-time denominator, customers, revenue, integrations, inventory accuracy, labor, licenses, claims, retention, security, margins, and international relationships.

Source Register

See individual pages for source information.

CHAPTER 4: BUILDING NETWORKS, PLATFORMS, AND ECOSYSTEMS

Building Networks, Platforms, and Ecosystems

How ventures create value by connecting participants

Calling It a Platform Doesn't Make It One

Entrepreneurs often call a venture a platform when it has software, several services, or more than one kind of user. The label can conceal the harder question: does connecting participants produce an outcome that none could create as effectively alone? A genuine platform changes what participants can know, do, or reach. A durable ecosystem also gives them a reason to return, contribute, and trust the rules.

Stella Ashaolu built WeSolv around real business challenges that could let employers observe candidates' performance rather than infer ability from résumés and familiar credentials. Brian Balbirnie grew Issuer Direct by connecting disclosure, investor-relations, communications, distribution, data, and service capabilities; the company later became ACCESS Newswire and sold its compliance division. Robert Hoehn co-founded IdeaScale so organizations could invite participants to submit, discuss, vote on, and develop ideas—and then face the governance work required to turn participation into decisions.

These cases do not prove that more users automatically create network effects. WeSolv needed employers, candidates, useful challenges, fair evaluation, and hiring follow-through. ACCESS Newswire can benefit from connected products, audiences, and distribution partners without every customer making the service more valuable to every other customer. IdeaScale often powers a bounded community for one organization rather than a single marketplace shared across all customers. The chapter therefore tests mechanism before vocabulary.

CHAPTER LENS

A network creates value when the connection improves an important exchange, participation strengthens the system, and the operator governs access, quality, incentives, feedback, and harm. More accounts, features, or acquisitions alone do not satisfy that test.

Three Network-Building Mechanisms

- **GENERATE EVIDENCE THROUGH STRUCTURED PARTICIPATION:** design an interaction that reveals information unavailable in conventional records, then make the evidence legible and consequential to both sides.
- **ASSEMBLE COMPLEMENTARY NODES — AND PRUNE THEM:** connect channels, products, data, audiences, and service teams where integration lowers friction, but separate businesses whose economics or operating logic dilute the system.
- **GOVERN CONTRIBUTION FROM INVITATION THROUGH IMPLEMENTATION:** define who may participate, how ideas are evaluated, how decisions are explained, and how contributors learn what happened.

4.1: CASE 1 | Stella Ashaolu, WeSolv

4.2: CASE 2 | Brian Balbirnie, ACCESS Newswire

4.3: CASE 3 | Robert Hoehn, IdeaScale

4.4: Review

This page titled [Chapter 4: Building Networks, Platforms, and Ecosystems](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

4.1: CASE 1 | Stella Ashaolu, WeSolv

CASE 1 | GENERATE EVIDENCE THROUGH STRUCTURED PARTICIPATION

Stella Ashaolu, WeSolv

The résumé is a compressed—and biased—signal

Stella Ashaolu founded WeSolv in 2016 after experiencing how difficult it could be for a capable MBA candidate to generate opportunity. The company's early proposition was not simply another job board. Employers supplied real business challenges; candidates worked on those problems; and the interaction produced performance evidence that could supplement credentials, networks, and résumé pattern matching.[1][2]

That design connects at least three participant groups: employers with unresolved work and hiring needs, candidates seeking a credible way to demonstrate ability, and educational or talent-channel partners that can help organize participation. The network's central asset is not the list of names. It is the structured evidence created when candidates analyze a problem, collaborate, communicate, and present recommendations under comparable conditions.

In 2018, GeekWire reported more than 1,700 candidates from 60 MBA programs and named Salesforce and Discover among companies working with WeSolv. Those figures document an early network, not its present scale. They also do not establish placement rates, candidate outcomes, employer renewal, validity of assessments, or reduction of bias. Technori's 2018 profile records Ashaolu's intent to place more weight on performance; intent is not the same as measured causal impact.[1][2]

The system has demanding governance requirements. A challenge must resemble relevant work without extracting unpaid labor or exposing confidential information. Evaluators need shared criteria and calibration. Team projects must distinguish individual contribution from group output. Candidate consent, data access, retention, appeals, accessibility, and algorithmic use require explicit rules. Employers must act on the evidence; otherwise candidates provide labor and data without receiving a fair opportunity.

The current public record is thin. Ashaolu's professional profiles continue to identify her with WeSolv, and contemporary directories describe the venture as active, but the accessible evidence does not independently verify current customers, candidate scale, operating volume, placements, revenue, or product status. The case therefore uses the documented early mechanism and treats continued scale as unresolved rather than silently carrying a 2018 number into 2026.[3]

Useful evidence would include invited and active candidates, challenge completion, evaluator agreement, employer response time, interview and offer conversion, time to hire, retention, candidate experience, demographic selection patterns at each stage, adverse impact, accommodations, appeals, data deletion, employer renewal, challenge economics, and the share of hiring decisions in which performance evidence changed the outcome.

Pivotal Decision

Replace passive résumé screening with structured, work-relevant participation that can create new evidence of ability—accepting responsibility for whether the challenge, evaluation, data practices, and hiring follow-through are fair.

Sources

[1] GeekWire, WeSolv connects employers and MBA candidates through business challenges (Apr. 13, 2018). <https://www.geekwire.com/2018/wesolv/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[2] Technori, Stella Ashaolu on performance-based evidence and hiring bias (Dec. 5, 2018). <https://technori.com/2018/12/16502-w...ce/sonnemaker/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[3] Worth, Stella Ashaolu and WeSolv founder profile. <https://worth.com/worthy100/stella-ashaolu/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

This page titled [4.1: CASE 1 | Stella Ashaolu, WeSolv](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

4.2: CASE 2 | Brian Balbirnie, ACCESS Newswire

CASE 2 | ASSEMBLE COMPLEMENTARY NODES—THEN DECIDE WHAT BELONGS

Brian Balbirnie, Issuer Direct / ACCESS Newswire

Integration can remove handoffs—or merely collect products

Brian Balbirnie founded Issuer Direct in 2006 and built the public company around services and software used in corporate communications, investor relations, disclosure, webcasting, and related workflows. The network connected issuers and communications teams with investors, media, databases, distribution endpoints, service professionals, and technology. Its value proposition was fewer vendors and more connected execution around high-stakes communications.[4][5]

Acquisition became part of the architecture. In November 2022, Issuer Direct acquired iNewsWire.com LLC, known as Newswire. The announcement said the transaction added press-release distribution, media databases, monitoring, a newsroom, and the Media Advantage Platform; management projected that it would almost double the customer base, raise annual revenue by more than 50 percent, and increase communications revenue by more than 80 percent. Those were transaction-date company projections, not verified realized outcomes.[6]

The strategic question was whether the acquired nodes reinforced one another. A customer preparing an announcement may need workflow, targeting, distribution, monitoring, analytics, an investor-relations site, and an earnings webcast. Shared identity, data, support, billing, and reporting can lower coordination cost. Distribution relationships and accumulated performance data can improve reach and measurement. Yet this is not automatically a classic network effect: one issuer's presence does not necessarily make the platform more valuable to another issuer, and a larger product catalog can create technical debt, overlapping brands, inconsistent pricing, and service complexity.

The architecture changed again in 2025. Issuer Direct renamed itself ACCESS Newswire effective January 27. On February 28, it sold the compliance division—including transfer-agent, EDGAR filing, and proxy capabilities—to EQ for \$12.5 million. The sale narrowed the operating system toward press-release distribution, public-relations software, investor-relations communications, and related services. Pruning was as consequential as acquisition: the venture decided which connections belonged in the future network and which created a different operating burden.[4][7]

Current results complicate a simple scale story. ACCESS Newswire reported 2025 revenue of \$22.6 million, down 2 percent from 2024, with a \$1.6 million GAAP loss from continuing operations and \$3.2 million adjusted EBITDA. In the first quarter of 2026, revenue fell 3 percent year over year to \$5.3 million while average subscription ARR per customer rose and adjusted EBITDA remained positive. These are company-reported public-company results. They show a functioning and evolving platform, not proof that integration has generated accelerating growth.[8][9]

Useful evidence would include active customers by product, subscriptions, product attach rate, cross-sell conversion, retention by cohort, ARR, release volume, revenue per release, distribution reach and quality, deliverability, media engagement, platform uptime, incident response, gross margin, support burden, acquisition integration cost, customer migration, data interoperability, impairment, product retirement, and the economics before and after divestiture.

Pivotal Decision

Use acquisition to connect communications capabilities and audiences, then sell the compliance business and reorganize around the narrower system ACCESS Newswire believed could share customers, data, distribution, and operating focus.

Sources

- [4] ACCESS Newswire, Issuer Direct renames and rebrands as ACCESS Newswire (Jan. 27, 2025). <https://www.newswire.com/news/issuer...nc-a-bold-step> (accessed August 18, 2026).
- [5] ACCESS Newswire, current PR and investor-relations platform description. <https://www.accessnewswire.com/> (accessed August 18, 2026).
- [6] Issuer Direct, acquisition of iNewsWire.com / Newswire and transaction-date projections (Nov. 1, 2022). <https://www.nasdaq.com/press-release...issuer-directs> (accessed August 18, 2026).
- [7] Equiniti, acquisition of ACCESS Newswire compliance division (Mar. 3, 2025). <https://equiniti.com/us/insights/new...cess-newswire/> (accessed August 18, 2026).
- [8] ACCESS Newswire, fourth-quarter and full-year 2025 results (Mar. 12, 2026). <https://www.accessnewswire.com/newsr...esults-1148830> (accessed August 18, 2026).
- [9] ACCESS Newswire, first-quarter 2026 results (May 14, 2026). <https://www.accessnewswire.com/newsr...esults-1166029> (accessed August 18, 2026).

4.3: CASE 3 | Robert Hoehn, IdeaScale

CASE 3 | GOVERN PARTICIPATION SO CONTRIBUTION BECOMES ACTION

Robert Hoehn, IdeaScale

Collecting ideas is easy; sustaining credible participation is not

Robert “Rob” Hoehn and Vivek Bhaskaran founded IdeaScale in 2008–2009 as an idea- and innovation-management platform. Organizations can create communities or campaigns in which employees, customers, partners, citizens, or other invited participants submit ideas, discuss them, vote, and move selected proposals through evaluation and development. The software supplies an interaction structure; the customer organization supplies the purpose, participants, authority, and implementation capacity.[10][11]

This distinction matters. IdeaScale is a platform, but most value may arise inside each customer’s bounded community rather than from one global marketplace. A federal agency can solicit ideas from employees or the public; a company can run an internal challenge; a nonprofit can ask members for proposals. Participation can produce diverse information and surface distributed expertise, but one customer’s confidential community may contribute little direct value to another customer.

Hoehn described a bootstrapped path: free government-facing use and training helped the founders gain visibility and learn the workflow before enterprise sales became material. In a 2016 interview, he reported approximately \$60,000 in first-year revenue, \$90,000 in the second, and roughly \$1 million annually by 2011 without outside financing. Those figures are founder-reported historical context, not audited financial statements.[12]

IdeaScale also pursued a broader participant network through acquisitions. Its 2020 purchase of Betterific added what the acquisition announcement described as an external crowd of 25,000 ideators; the company said it had served hundreds of customers and received nearly one million ideas. The move complemented earlier acquisitions of IdeaVibes and InnovationManagement.se. As with ACCESS Newswire, acquired reach is an input. Its value depends on participant quality, fit, consent, integration, customer demand, and actual use.[13]

Governance determines whether an idea community compounds or decays. Open voting can create popularity bias. Employees may avoid candor if identity and retaliation rules are unclear. Contributors disengage when proposals disappear into a queue or leaders solicit input after deciding. Intellectual property, confidentiality, moderation, accessibility, duplicate ideas, evaluation criteria, conflicts of interest, and implementation ownership require visible rules. The strongest feedback loop is not “more ideas”; it is credible evidence that useful contributions receive explanation, development, resources, and results.

Useful evidence would include invited, registered, and active participants; contribution and return rates; representation; moderation time; duplicates; idea progression; decision latency; evaluator agreement; reasons for rejection; contributor feedback; implementation rate; time to implementation; benefits realized; participation after decisions; privacy and security incidents; customer retention; community health; and whether the external crowd improves outcomes compared with internal participation alone.

Pivotal Decision

Build a configurable system for organizations to host their own innovation communities—and make governance, evaluation, feedback, and implementation the conditions that convert participation into value.

Sources

[10] IdeaScale, current innovation-management platform. <https://ideascale.com/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[11] IdeaScale, Rob Hoehn contributor page and company writing. <https://ideascale.com/contributor/rob-hoehn/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[12] Sramana Mitra, Robert Hoehn interview on IdeaScale's bootstrapped path (Apr. 11, 2016). <https://www.sramanamitra.com/2016/04...-hoehn-part-4/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[13] PR Newswire, IdeaScale acquisition of Betterific and company-reported network figures (Jan. 28, 2020). <https://www.prnewswire.com/news-rele...300993729.html> (accessed August 18, 2026).

4.4: Review

What the Three Cases Reveal

The ventures connect different participants, but their defensible value depends on the exchange they design and the rules they enforce.

Examples of connection value created, governance burden, and false positives across the three case studies

Case	Connection	Value Created	Governance Burden	False Positive
WeSolv	Employers, candidates, challenges, talent channels	Work interaction creates evidence beyond credentials	Challenge fairness, evaluation, data, compensation, hiring follow-through	A candidate database or assessment tool is called a talent network
ACCESS Newswire	Companies, communications tools, media, investors, distribution endpoints	Connected execution, reach, workflow, support, and measurement	Integration, data quality, reliability, product fit, acquisition discipline	A bundle of products is called an ecosystem despite weak reinforcement
IdeaScale	Organizations, employees, customers, citizens, external contributors	Distributed knowledge enters a visible decision process	Access, moderation, voting, privacy, feedback, ownership, implementation	Idea volume is mistaken for innovation or impact

The non-obvious lesson: the operator governs the feedback loop

The operator's scarce resource is not software. It is the credibility of the loop from participation to consequence. Candidates must see that performance evidence changes access. Communications customers must see that integration improves execution rather than adding complexity. Idea contributors must see that decisions are explained and selected ideas receive ownership and resources.

Network growth can make that loop stronger or weaker. More participants can improve matching, coverage, learning, and reach. They can also increase noise, gaming, congestion, bias, moderation cost, security exposure, and disappointment. A venture should therefore track network health, not merely network size: successful exchanges, participant balance, time to value, contribution quality, repeat participation, concentration, dispute resolution, and outcomes for each side.

What Would You Do?

Put yourself in the decision-maker's position. Consider the available evidence, competing priorities, risks, and consequences before deciding what should happen next.

- Platform test: identify the participant groups, the exchange, and the incremental value created by connection.
- Network-effect test: determine whether one participant's activity makes the system more valuable to others—or merely increases revenue for the operator.
- Cold start: trace which side must arrive first and what subsidy, service, or manual work creates initial liquidity.
- Governance: specify access, identity, evaluation, moderation, appeal, data, intellectual-property, and removal rules.

- Incentive balance: identify what each participant contributes, receives, risks, and can do when the exchange disappoints.
- Quality control: distinguish participant count from useful matches, reliable distribution, or implementable ideas.
- Acquisition logic: test whether an acquired product or crowd reinforces the same exchange and operating system.
- Pruning: evaluate when removing a business, feature, participant group, or use case strengthens the network.
- Power and fairness: locate who sets rules, sees data, ranks participants, captures value, and bears error.
- Network health: replace vanity totals with successful exchanges, repeat participation, time to value, concentration, and outcome measures.

Evidence Packet and Editorial Boundaries

This appendix records the verified case spine and remaining editorial risk. It is an editorial control, not a substitute for final employment, assessment, privacy, securities, disclosure, communications, intellectual-property, accessibility, acquisition, legal, or factual review. Developments after August 18, 2026 require a new evidence pass.

Stella Ashaolu / WeSolv

- Case boundary: 2016–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Founder; 2016 launch; performance-based talent mechanism; documented 2018 candidate and MBA-program scale; named historical employer examples; continuing founder association.
- Open verification: Confirm present operating status, legal entity, ownership, product, customers, active candidates, challenges, placements, revenue, employer renewal, assessment validity, evaluator calibration, adverse impact, candidate compensation, data and algorithmic practices, accommodations, outcomes, and causal bias claims.

Brian Balbirnie / Issuer Direct and ACCESS Newswire

- Case boundary: 2006–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Founder and CEO; public-company continuity; 2022 Newswire acquisition and stated rationale; Jan. 2025 rebrand; Feb. 2025 compliance sale; current communications and IR platform; reported 2025 and Q1 2026 results.
- Open verification: Confirm acquired-customer migration, product attach, retention, distribution quality, platform usage, current customer definitions, realized acquisition synergies, impairments, integration cost, security, service incidents, partner concentration, adjusted measures, and post-divestiture segment economics.

Robert Hoehn / IdeaScale

- Case boundary: 2008/2009–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Co-founder; idea- and innovation-management platform; customer-hosted community model; historical bootstrapped path; government use; 2020 Betterific acquisition and stated external-crowd rationale; current platform operation.
- Open verification: Confirm founding date, present role and ownership, audited historical finances, current customers and users, active communities, external-crowd use, participation quality, idea-to-implementation conversion, benefit realization, privacy, security, moderation, accessibility, IP rules, retention, and acquisition integration.

Source Register

See individual pages for source information.

This page titled [4.4: Review](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

CHAPTER 5: SCALING UNDER CONSTRAINT

Scaling Under Constraint

How ventures grow amid regulation, physical limits, and systemic consequences

Constraint Is the System, Not an Obstacle Outside It

Scaling is often described as repeating a successful unit at greater volume. That description fails for energy infrastructure, industrial biotechnology, and regulated recycling. Growth changes the system: more sites create interconnection and capital demands; more biological processing creates feedstock, quality, containment, and permitting burdens; more municipal projects create logistics, commodity-price, safety, and documentation exposure.

Uche Isiugo built Infranergy across renewable infrastructure, energy finance, software, virtual power plants, and—more recently—energy and data-center execution. Joanne Rodriguez built Mycocycle around a fungal process intended to transform difficult construction waste into lower-carbon raw materials. Laurel Harrop built Laurel Environmental Group around the specialized dismantling, logistics, and recycling of street-light fixtures removed during LED conversions.

The cases share an industry but not a scaling mechanism. Infranergy must coordinate technologies, assets, contractors, utilities, markets, and financing. Mycocycle must prove science, product safety, repeatability, economics, and downstream demand at progressively larger scales. Laurel Environmental can expand without owning a national recycling fleet by designing a project-specific network of facilities and logistics partners. In every case, scale is bounded by constraints that cannot be wished away with sales growth.

CHAPTER LENS

A constrained venture scales only when it identifies the binding limit, converts that limit into a designed control, and proves that unit economics, safety, quality, compliance, and stakeholder outcomes survive the next order of magnitude.

Three Scaling Mechanisms

- **ORCHESTRATE A CAPITAL-AND-INFRASTRUCTURE STACK:** connect financing, engineering, construction, controls, market participation, and operations without confusing a broad vision with verified delivery.
- **ADVANCE THROUGH EVIDENCE GATES:** enlarge a novel biological process only after feedstock, detoxification, material performance, cycle time, cost, safety, and customer use are demonstrated at the relevant scale.
- **BUILD A TEMPORARY OPERATING NETWORK AROUND EACH PROJECT:** position facilities, containers, transportation, processors, documentation, and partners near the work rather than forcing every project through one fixed asset base.

5.1: CASE 1 | Uche Isiugo, Infranergy AI

5.2: CASE 2 | Joanne Rodriguez, Mycocycle

5.3: CASE 3 | Laurel Harrop, Laurel Environmental Group

5.4: Review

This page titled [Chapter 5: Scaling Under Constraint](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

5.1: CASE 1 | Uche Isiugo, Infranergy AI

CASE 1 | COORDINATE CAPITAL, INFRASTRUCTURE, SOFTWARE, AND THE GRID

Uche Isiugo, Infranergy AI

Energy scale is a chain of permissions and dependencies

Uche Isiugo founded Infranergy after work spanning finance, aerospace, conventional energy, renewable project finance, asset management, and battery storage. Public biographies describe experience at Boeing, Chevron, Citigroup, NextEra Energy, and Key Capture Energy. His stated entrepreneurial aim joined renewable infrastructure with financial structuring and software that could monitor, optimize, and monetize distributed energy resources.[1][2]

That combination addresses a real constraint: a solar-plus-storage asset is not useful merely because hardware exists. A project needs site control, interconnection, permits, engineering, procurement, construction, financing, insurance, customer agreements, dispatch rules, measurement, market access, cybersecurity, maintenance, and revenue settlement. A virtual power plant adds another layer by coordinating many distributed devices so their combined flexibility can support customers or the grid.

Infranergy's 2023 description proposed helping businesses use spare solar-and-battery capacity to reduce bills, earn income, and support grid reliability. In 2024, the U.S. Department of Energy's Building Technologies Office peer-review program listed Isiugo and Infranergy for a project titled "Virtual Power Plant Utilization to Drive Energy Efficiency & Power Market Optimization for Multifamily Buildings." The DOE listing verifies participation and project scope; it does not establish commercial deployment, savings, market revenue, or portfolio scale.[3][4]

The company's current public positioning has widened toward "Infranergy AI," pairing energy infrastructure, contractor mobilization, construction oversight, operations and maintenance, and hyperscale data-center work. Its website reports multi-gigawatt experience and large workforces supervised. Those are company claims, and the boundary is unclear: founder/team career experience, advisory oversight, financed portfolios, projects directly delivered by Infranergy, and current contracted pipeline are not interchangeable.[5]

Breadth is therefore the central scaling risk. Energy development, virtual-power-plant software, contractor networks, data centers, and finance can reinforce one another, but they also require different customers, licenses, capital, talent, liability controls, sales cycles, and proof. A venture can appear larger by aggregating adjacent claims while becoming harder to govern. The case should reward integration only where interfaces and accountability are visible.

Useful evidence would include legal entities and ownership; capital raised and deployed; projects by stage, geography, customer, and capacity; direct versus team-career attribution; site control; interconnection; permits; contracts; construction milestones; commissioning; uptime; safety; savings; dispatch events; market revenue; participant retention; cybersecurity; software validation; contractor qualification; working capital; gross margin; and contingent liabilities.

Pivotal Decision

Combine infrastructure finance, renewable engineering, distributed-resource optimization, and an execution network—while accepting that each added layer must be separately proven and governed before the integrated story is credible.

Sources

[1] Dylan Green, interview with Uche Isiugo on Infranergy and Emerging Infrastructure Capital. <https://www.dylan-green.com/intervie...of-infranergy/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

- [2] Emerging Infrastructure Capital, Uche Isiugo biography and Infranergy company profile. <https://www.emerging-infra.us/webinar/> (accessed August 18, 2026).
- [3] Infranergy, virtual-power-plant concept and company positioning (Dec. 5, 2023). <https://infranergy.us/infranergy-vpp/> (accessed August 18, 2026).
- [4] U.S. Department of Energy, 2024 Building Technologies Office Peer Review Program. https://www.energy.gov/sites/default...24_Program.pdf (accessed August 18, 2026).
- [5] Infranergy AI, current services, team, and company-reported proof metrics. <https://infranergy.ai/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

5.2: CASE 2 | Joanne Rodriguez, Mycocycle

CASE 2 | DE-RISK A BIOLOGICAL PROCESS BEFORE INDUSTRIAL SCALE

Joanne Rodriguez, Mycocycle

A successful experiment is not yet a waste system or a materials business

Joanne Rodriguez founded Mycocycle in 2018 after decades in construction and building-material sustainability exposed the difficulty of managing petrochemical-containing waste. Working with a mycologist, she explored whether fungi could detoxify materials such as asphalt shingles and convert the treated mass into useful, mycelium-based raw material. The venture formally launched in 2020.[6][7]

Mycocycle's proposition links two markets that normally operate separately. Waste generators and processors need a compliant, economic path for difficult material. Manufacturers need consistent raw materials with defined fire, water, insulation, strength, toxicity, and carbon properties. The fungal process must solve both problems; cheaper disposal without a reliable product leaves value uncaptured, while an attractive material without scalable feedstock and treatment remains a laboratory result.

Argonne National Laboratory describes a roughly three-week process: construction waste is ground and blended with Mycocycle's treatment, then incubated in a climate-controlled container while mycelium helps break down or bind contaminants and creates a usable raw material. Rodriguez entered Argonne's two-year Chain Reaction Innovations program in 2022 to validate, de-risk, and optimize the process. Mycocycle currently describes product families for filler, fiber, and foam applications and a treatment cycle of four weeks or less.[6][8]

Commercialization requires evidence gates. Feedstock varies by source, age, additives, moisture, contamination, and particle size. Fungal strains and process conditions affect yield and treatment. A material safe for one use may not meet another use's code, durability, emissions, or warranty requirements. Containerized processing can reduce transport and standardize conditions, but it introduces equipment utilization, inoculum supply, energy, labor, contamination control, and site-permitting questions.

In May 2024, TechCrunch reported a \$3.6 million seed extension led by Closed Loop Partners and quoted Rodriguez projecting more than \$1 million of revenue and positive margin for that year. A 2025 investor profile confirms the investment thesis and point-of-generation model. The revenue and margin figures remain founder projections unless verified by financial statements. Funding extends the runway to prove the system; it is not evidence that industrial scale has been achieved.[9][10]

Useful evidence would include feedstock specifications and supply contracts; mass balance; contaminant removal and leach testing; fungal strain controls; cycle time; yield; batch failure; energy, water, labor, and consumables; container throughput; emissions and biosafety; permits; third-party certifications; material properties; customer trials; purchase commitments; product liability; transport avoided; life-cycle analysis; revenue by source; price and margin per ton; capital intensity; and end-of-life treatment.

Pivotal Decision

Treat commercialization as a sequence of evidence gates—science, safe processing, repeatable raw material, qualified applications, unit economics, and customer demand—rather than scaling volume ahead of proof.

Sources

[6] Argonne National Laboratory, Mycocycle process and Chain Reaction Innovations profile. <https://chainreaction.anl.gov/mycocycle...ing-materials/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[7] Mycocycle, founder/team history and company milestones. <https://mycocycle.com/our-team/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

- [8] Mycocyce, current process, products, feedstocks, and company claims. <https://mycocyce.com/> (accessed August 18, 2026).
- [9] TechCrunch, Mycocyce seed extension and founder-reported commercialization figures (May 8, 2024). <https://techcrunch.com/2024/05/08/my...ruction-waste/> (accessed August 18, 2026).
- [10] Closed Loop Partners, Mycocyce investment rationale (Mar. 5, 2025). <https://www.closedlooppartners.com/w...e-built-world/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

5.3: CASE 3 | Laurel Harrop, Laurel Environmental Group

CASE 3 | BUILD A PROJECT-SPECIFIC NETWORK AROUND THE WORK

Laurel Harrop, Laurel Environmental Group

The fixture is removed in one day; its obligations travel much farther

Laurel Harrop founded Laurel Environmental Group in 2011 from an approximately 800-square-foot storage unit. Early warehouse-light recycling led her to a niche created by municipal and utility LED conversions: thousands of legacy street-light fixtures had to be accumulated, transported, dismantled, sorted, documented, recycled, and safely disposed across a project territory.[11][12]

The operating unit is a temporary reverse-supply chain. The venture must understand the contractor's removal schedule, place containers, prevent breakage and contamination, consolidate fixtures, select carriers, track material, separate metals, glass, lamps, ballasts, and other components, route each stream to an appropriate processor, and produce documentation for cities, utilities, and contractors. Delays can block crews; weak handling can create environmental, worker-safety, theft, and reputational risk.

Harrop scaled by taking the network to the project. The company says it uses nationwide logistics relationships and, for large jobs, may open a satellite facility near the retrofit. In a 2018 interview, Harrop described opening a 13,000-square-foot Stockton facility for a three-year PG&E effort covering roughly 170,000 fixtures over a 70,000-square-mile territory. PG&E independently identified Laurel Environmental as a woman-owned supplier and described its street-light recycling process and local specialty-recycler network.[11][13]

The current company project list reports work ranging from hundreds of fixtures to programs of 125,000 in Philadelphia, 60,000 in Cleveland, more than 50,000 in Riverside County, 40,000-plus in Los Angeles County, and 170,000 across PG&E territory. These figures are company-reported and mix completed and in-progress work. They establish claimed scope, not audited tonnage, diversion, profitability, schedule performance, or regulatory compliance.[14]

The inherited taxonomy note that operational efficiency made the company indispensable to private-equity land acquisitions is unsupported and appears unrelated to the verified venture. It is excluded. Laurel Environmental's actual scaling logic is stronger and more specific: specialize in a narrow waste stream, learn its components and downstream markets, integrate with public-project schedules, and assemble local capacity rather than own every national asset.

Useful evidence would include contract scope and completion; fixture and weight reconciliation; chain of custody; downstream vendors; hazardous-component handling; permits; worker safety; insurance; claims; diversion and final disposition; commodity-price exposure; transport miles; container turns; labor productivity; satellite-facility costs; days sales outstanding; project gross margin; customer concentration; repeat contracts; partner audits; and documentation acceptance.

Pivotal Decision

Scale a specialized reverse-supply-chain service through local facilities and qualified logistics and recycling partners, preserving one accountable project design while changing the physical network to fit each territory.

Sources

[11] Laurel Environmental Group, current history and founder profile. <https://www.laurel-environmental.com/about> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[12] SDVoyager, Laurel Harrop operating history and founder-reported project scale (Aug. 2, 2018). <https://sdvoyager.com/interview/meet...oup-oceanside/> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[13] PG&E, supplier-diversity release describing Laurel Environmental partnership (Mar. 9, 2017). <https://investor.pgecorp.com/news-events/default.aspx> (accessed August 18, 2026).

[14] Laurel Environmental Group, current services and company-reported project list. <https://www.laurel-environmental.com/services> (accessed August 18, 2026).

5.4: Review

What the Three Cases Reveal

Constraint changes what “repeatability” means. The next unit must survive the physics, rules, and stakeholder consequences of the system it enters.

Examples of binding constraints, scaling mechanisms, proof and failure across the three case studies

Case	Binding Constraint	Scaling Mechanism	Proof Before Expansion	Failure If Skipped
Infranergy	Capital, interconnection, delivery interfaces, market rules	Coordinate finance, assets, software, contractors, and operations	Projects, contracts, commissioning, savings, dispatch, attribution, economics	A broad platform narrative outruns delivery and liability control
Mycocycle	Variable waste, biology, safety, material qualification, throughput	Move through technical and commercial evidence gates	Detoxification, repeatability, specifications, approvals, demand, margin per ton	Volume magnifies batch failure, unsafe material, cost, and market mismatch
Laurel Environmental Group	Project geography, schedules, waste handling, downstream capacity	Configure a temporary local network around each retrofit	Chain of custody, processor qualification, reconciliation, diversion, project margin	National reach produces inconsistent handling, documentation, or economics

The non-obvious lesson: constraint migration is the real scaling curve

Removing one bottleneck reveals another. Financing exposes interconnection. A validated process exposes feedstock and customer qualification. A successful municipal project exposes working capital and partner capacity. The venture that keeps solving yesterday’s constraint can add volume while losing control of the next one.

The leading metric should therefore change by stage. Early work measures technical validity and permission. Demonstration measures repeatability and failure. Commercial launch measures time to value and unit economics. Multi-site expansion measures variance, working capital, safety, quality, and governance across nodes. “Scale” without a moving constraint register is optimism disguised as management.

What Would You Do?

Put yourself in the decision-maker’s position. Consider the available evidence, competing priorities, risks, and consequences before deciding what should happen next.

- Binding constraint: identify the single limit that most restricts the next stage and the evidence that proves it.
- Constraint migration: predict which bottleneck emerges after capital, technology, capacity, or customer demand improves.
- Claim attribution: separate founder career experience, team experience, advisory work, financed assets, and company-delivered projects.
- Evidence gates: define the technical, regulatory, safety, commercial, and economic proof required before volume increases.

- Unit economics: include working capital, failure, transport, downtime, permitting, insurance, disposal, and quality costs.
- Asset boundary: decide what the venture must own, control by contract, monitor, or refuse.
- Regulatory design: treat permits, codes, interconnection, waste rules, and documentation as product requirements.
- System consequences: locate who bears safety, environmental, grid, labor, community, and end-of-life risks.
- Partner dependence: test qualification, redundancy, data visibility, incentives, audit rights, and failure response.
- Scaling stop rule: define the condition that should pause expansion even when demand and funding are available.

Evidence Packet and Editorial Boundaries

This appendix records the verified case spine and remaining editorial risk. It is an editorial control, not a substitute for final engineering, grid, securities, construction, biological safety, waste, environmental, labor, procurement, contracting, insurance, regulatory, legal, or factual review. Developments after August 18, 2026 require a new evidence pass.

Uche Isiugo / Infranergy

- Case boundary: Founding period–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Founder; energy-finance and asset-management background; current company operation; renewable, storage, VPP, execution-network, and data-center positioning; DOE 2024 peer-review project listing; EPA advisory-board appointment.
- Open verification: Resolve entity and brand history; verify direct company projects versus team experience; ownership, capital, customers, contracts, capacity, permits, interconnection, commissioning, savings, market revenue, software validation, current pipeline, safety, cybersecurity, margins, and company-reported proof metrics.

Joanne Rodriguez / Mycocycle

- Case boundary: 2018–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Founder; construction-industry origin; 2020 commercial launch; fungal treatment and raw-material model; Argonne CRI participation; current operation; 2024 reported seed extension and commercialization work.
- Open verification: Verify patents and freedom to operate; feedstocks; detoxification and toxicity definitions; batch data; certifications; product specifications; permits; LCA; throughput; customers; contracts; 2024 revenue and margin; current funding; capital needs; unit economics; safety; and product liability.

Laurel Harrop / Laurel Environmental Group

- Case boundary: 2011–Aug. 18, 2026
- Verified spine: Founder; street-light specialization; current operation; municipal, utility, contractor, logistics, satellite-facility, and recycling model; PG&E supplier evidence; company-reported national project list.
- Open verification: Verify legal entities, ownership, employees, facilities, completed versus active projects, contracts, fixture counts, tonnage, chain of custody, processors, permits, hazardous handling, diversion, safety, insurance, claims, revenue, margins, working capital, customer concentration, and partner audits. Private-equity land-acquisition claim rejected as unsupported.

Source Register

See individual pages for source information.

This page titled [5.4: Review](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

PART 4: CONCLUSION

Conclusion

The Next Decision Is Yours

The Final Lesson: Entrepreneurship is not mastered by admiring outcomes. It is practiced by making better decisions before the outcome is known.

What the Stories Reveal

Across fifty-four entrepreneurs, eighteen chapters, and three thematic sections, no single formula emerges. That is not a weakness in the evidence; it is one of its clearest lessons. Entrepreneurs begin with different resources, operate in different markets, face different constraints, and pursue different definitions of value. What succeeds in one setting may be reckless in another. What looks cautious from the outside may be the most intelligent risk available to the person who understands the customer, the timing, and the consequences.

Still, durable patterns appear. Useful ventures begin with attention: a problem observed closely enough to reveal what customers actually need. Progress requires disciplined experimentation rather than certainty. Growth demands more than effort; it requires systems, capable people, sound economics, and the willingness to let an organization become larger than its founder. Setbacks expose assumptions. Ethical choices determine who carries the risk and who shares in the value created. Over time, the strongest enterprises convert insight into execution and execution into an organization that can endure.

A Pattern, Not a Prescription: Notice carefully. Test assumptions. Protect cash. Serve a real customer. Build capacity. Adapt without abandoning judgment.

Success Is an Outcome; Judgment Is the Skill

It is tempting to read entrepreneurial stories backward. Once a company survives, grows, or becomes valuable, its path can appear inevitable. It was not. The founders in these pages acted without knowing which customer would say yes, which competitor would respond, whether financing would arrive, or whether the next decision would preserve the venture or weaken it. Their outcomes matter, but the more transferable lesson is how they interpreted incomplete information and acted under consequence.

This is why failure cannot be treated as either disgrace or decoration. Some failures produce valuable evidence; others result from preventable neglect, poor economics, weak execution, or harm that should not be romanticized. A setback becomes useful only when it sharpens judgment, changes behavior, and informs the next responsible action. Persistence is powerful when the underlying learning continues. Without learning, persistence can become an expensive refusal to face reality.

From Observation to Action

The point of this casebook is not to produce fifty-four entrepreneurs to imitate. It is to develop readers who can recognize opportunity without ignoring risk, create value without overlooking responsibility, and move from an idea to disciplined action. Entrepreneurship may lead to a new venture, the purchase of an existing business, innovation inside an organization, leadership in a nonprofit, or a better solution within a community. The form can change; the work of judgment remains.

The recurring question—What would you do?—was never intended as a classroom exercise with one approved answer. It is a rehearsal for decisions that will eventually belong to you. What problem is important enough to solve? Whose needs have been overlooked? What evidence would earn your commitment? What are you prepared to risk, and what should never be placed at risk? Which advantage can you build rather than merely inherit? What system must exist so that value can continue without depending

on your constant presence?

The Work Continues

Finishing this book does not complete an entrepreneurial education. Markets change, technologies advance, customer expectations move, and every organization eventually confronts conditions its founders did not predict. The enduring advantage is not possession of a permanent answer. It is the capacity to observe, question, decide, execute, measure, learn, and decide again.

Carry the stories forward as evidence, not commandments. Keep the lessons that survive scrutiny. Reject those that do not. Then apply the same rigor to your own choices. Whether your entrepreneurial journey begins here or is already underway, the next meaningful chapter will not be written by the entrepreneurs in this book. It will be written through the problems you choose to solve, the value you create, the people you bring with you, and the decisions you make when the outcome is still uncertain.

Your Turn: Find a problem worth understanding. Ask better questions. Gather evidence. Make the next responsible decision—and build from there.

END

END

Everyday Entrepreneur

Their Stories End Here. *Yours Begins Now!*

This page titled [END](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

INDEX

A

access

- 5.4: Review
- 5.4: Review
- Part 2: Expanding Opportunity

access design

- 2.4: Review

accessibility

- Chapter 2: Designing for Access

accountability

- 3.4: Review
- Chapter 3: Building Trust Where the Stakes Are High

acquisition

- 4.2: CASE 2 | Brian Balbirnie, ACCESS Newswire

actionable insights

- 5.3: CASE 3 | Brittani Hunter, Mogul Millennial

active women

- 2.2: CASE 2 | Keenan Beasley, Sunday II Sunday

adaptive learning

- 2.2: CASE 2 | Rubén Arias, BeeReaders

additive manufacturing

- 3.2: CASE 2 | Christina Perla, Makelab

adhesive

- 1.1: CASE 1 | Kelli Jones, NoSo Patches

adoption

- 2.4: Review

advocacy

- 1.1: CASE 1 | Bree Anderson, Daughters Beyond Incarceration
- 1.3: CASE 3 | Alexis Black, Redefining Normal
- 1.4: Review

aesthetic training

- 2.3: CASE 3 | Sania Vucetaj, Sania's Brow Bar

Afro Soca Love

- 4.1: CASE 1 | Myron Chandran, Afro Soca Love

aggregation

- 5.1: CASE 1 | Mandy Bowman, Official Black Wall Street

agricultural commodities

- 1.1: CASE 1 | Miku Jha, AgShift

agricultural mechanization

- 1.2: CASE 2 | Jehiel Oliver, Hello Tractor

agricultural technology

- 1.4: Review

AgShift

- 1.1: CASE 1 | Miku Jha, AgShift

AI

- 1.1: CASE 1 | Miku Jha, AgShift

AI applications

- 1.4: Review

Alia J. Daniels

- 6.3: CASE 3 | Alia J. Daniels, Revry

aligned incentives

- 6.4: Review

art licensing

- 4.2: CASE 2 | Elizabeth Sutton, Elizabeth Sutton Collection

arts

- 4.1: CASE 1 | Myron Chandran, Afro Soca Love

athlete development

- 6.2: CASE 2 | Brandon Okpalobi, Dibia DREAM

Atlanta

- 6.1: CASE 1 | Pinky Cole, Slutty Vegan

audience engagement

- 3.2: CASE 2 | Fri Forjindam, Mycotoo

audience growth

- 6.3: CASE 3 | Alia J. Daniels, Revry

audience quality

- 5.3: CASE 3 | FAMOSOS

audio

- 4.2: CASE 2 | Eva Drago, Beelinguapp

authentication

- 2.3: CASE 3 | Erica Grant, Quantum Lock Technologies

authenticity

- 4.3: CASE 3 | Taylor Humphries, Ranked Media and Technologies
- 6.2: CASE 2 | Derrick Hayes, Big Dave's Cheesesteaks
- Chapter 6: Growing Without Losing the Market

automation

- 1.1: CASE 1 | Miku Jha, AgShift
- 3.4: Review
- Chapter 1: Finding Leverage in Broken Systems

B

barriers

- 1.4: Review
- Chapter 1: Seeing Barriers as Opportunities

battery

- 2.2: CASE 2 | Rajan Kumar, Ateios Systems

beauty industry

- 2.2: CASE 2 | Keenan Beasley, Sunday II Sunday
- 2.3: CASE 3 | Sania Vucetaj, Sania's Brow Bar
- 3.1: CASE 1 | Monique Little, You Go Natural

Beelinguapp

- 4.2: CASE 2 | Eva Drago, Beelinguapp

BeeReaders

- 2.2: CASE 2 | Rubén Arias, BeeReaders

Begin Now

- END

behavioral health

- 2.3: CASE 3 | Jeremy Glauser, eLuma

beneficiaries

- Chapter 6: Making Mission Economically Durable

bias reduction

- 4.1: CASE 1 | Stella Ashaolu, WeSolv

Big Dave's Cheesesteaks

- 6.2: CASE 2 | Derrick Hayes, Big Dave's Cheesesteaks

bilingual education

- 2.2: CASE 2 | Rubén Arias, BeeReaders

bilingual stories

- 4.2: CASE 2 | Eva Drago, Beelinguapp
- 4.4: Review

binding constraint

- 5.4: Review

biological process

- 5.2: CASE 2 | Joanne Rodriguez, Mycocyclus

biological processing

- Chapter 5: Scaling Under Constraint

Black children

- 4.3: CASE 3 | Kewanta Brooks, Elite Kids TV

Black history

- 1.2: CASE 2 | Deah Berry Mitchell, Nostalgia Black

Black millennials

- 5.3: CASE 3 | Brittani Hunter, Mogul Millennial

Black mothers

- 3.1: CASE 1 | Nathalie Walton, Expectful

Black women

- 2.1: CASE 1 | Nicole Brown, Brown Sugar Box

BloomingTables

- 3.3: CASE 3 | Dustin Anthony, BloomingTables

bottleneck

- 5.4: Review

brand campaigns

- 5.3: CASE 3 | FAMOSOS

brand development

- 6.2: CASE 2 | Derrick Hayes, Big Dave's Cheesesteaks

brand loyalty

- Chapter 2: Defining the Customer

brand recognition

- 4.2: CASE 2 | Elizabeth Sutton, Elizabeth Sutton Collection

brand relationships

- 4.3: CASE 3 | Taylor Humphries, Ranked Media and Technologies

brand strategy

- 2.3: CASE 3 | Sania Vucetaj, Sania's Brow Bar

branding

- 4.4: Review
- Chapter 3: Creating Value People Can Recognize

Brandon Okpalobi

- 6.2: CASE 2 | Brandon Okpalobi, Dibia DREAM

Bree Anderson

- 1.1: CASE 1 | Bree Anderson, Daughters Beyond Incarceration

Brendan Ciecko

- 5.2: CASE 2 | Brendan Ciecko, Cuseum

Brittani Hunter

- 5.3: CASE 3 | Brittani Hunter, Mogul Millennial

broken systems

- Part 3: Building Systems

brow grooming

- 2.3: CASE 3 | Sania Vucetaj, Sania's Brow Bar

budgeting

- 4.1: CASE 1 | Tiffany Aliche, The Budgetnista

building

- Chapter 4: Building Networks, Platforms, and Ecosystems

business

4.2: CASE 2 | Brian Balbirnie, ACCESS Newswire
5.2: CASE 2 | Moni Jefferson, Association of Military Spouse Entrepreneurs
6.4: Review
Chapter 4: Building Networks, Platforms, and Ecosystems
Chapter 5: Reaching the Customer

business activity

4.2: CASE 2 | Elizabeth Sutton, Elizabeth Sutton Collection

business design

Chapter 3: Designing Operations That Hold

business ethics

1.4: Review

business expansion

6.1: CASE 1 | Pinky Cole, Slutty Vegan

business infrastructure

Chapter 5: Creating Pathways to Work and Wealth

business innovation

Chapter 3: Creating Value People Can Recognize

business model

4.4: Review
6.1: CASE 1 | Vanessa Bouché, Savhera

business models

1.4: Review
1.4: Review

business strategies

Chapter 1: Seeing What Others Miss

business strategy

3.2: CASE 2 | Fri Forjindam, Mycotoo
6.2: CASE 2 | Derrick Hayes, Big Dave's Cheesesteaks
Chapter 1: Finding Leverage in Broken Systems
Chapter 6: Growing Without Losing the Market

business success

Part 4: Conclusion

buyer behavior

3.4: Review

buyer versus user

3.4: Review

C

campaign performance

4.3: CASE 3 | Taylor Humphries, Ranked Media and Technologies

candidate experience

4.1: CASE 1 | Stella Ashaolu, WeSolv

capability

Part 2: Expanding Opportunity

capability mechanism

4.4: Review

capital demands

Chapter 5: Scaling Under Constraint

carbon credits

1.3: CASE 3 | May Al-Karooni, Globechain

career exploration

3.2: CASE 2 | Jenna Ahn, Millie

career integration

5.4: Review

career media

5.3: CASE 3 | Brittani Hunter, Mogul Millennial

career mobility

Chapter 5: Creating Pathways to Work and Wealth

career tools

5.1: CASE 1 | Nitin Agrawal, Interstride

case studies

1.4: Review
1.4: Review
2.4: Review
2.4: Review
2.4: Review
3.4: Review
3.4: Review
4.4: Review
4.4: Review
6.4: Review
6.4: Review
Chapter 6: Growing Without Losing the Market
Part 2: Expanding Opportunity
Part 3: Building Systems

case1

3.1: CASE 1 | Jy Maze, Maze Freight Solutions

case3

6.3: CASE 3 | Cameka Smith, The BOSS Network

category design

3.4: Review

celebrity marketplace

5.3: CASE 3 | FAMOSOS

challenges

Chapter 4: Building Networks, Platforms, and Ecosystems

channel

5.4: Review

charitable network

1.2: CASE 2 | JoAnn Ajayi-Scott, Essence of a Lady, Inc.

clarity

3.4: Review

cognitive skills

Chapter 2: Turning Knowledge into Capability

collaboration

4.4: Review

commercial maturity

Chapter 2: Turning Technical Possibility into Reliable Value

commercial mechanism

4.4: Review

communications

4.2: CASE 2 | Brian Balbirnie, ACCESS Newswire

community

2.1: CASE 1 | Nicole Brown, Brown Sugar Box
4.1: CASE 1 | Myron Chandran, Afro Soca Love
5.2: CASE 2 | Moni Jefferson, Association of Military Spouse Entrepreneurs
6.3: CASE 3 | Cameka Smith, The BOSS Network
Chapter 4: Earning Attention, Identity, and Trust
Chapter 6: Growing Without Losing the Market
Chapter 6: Making Mission Economically Durable

community engagement

2.4: Review
4.3: CASE 3 | Taylor Humphries, Ranked Media and Technologies

community identity

5.1: CASE 1 | Mandy Bowman, Official Black Wall Street

community impact

6.2: CASE 2 | Brandon Okpalobi, Dibia DREAM

community influence

4.4: Review

community knowledge

1.2: CASE 2 | Deah Berry Mitchell, Nostalgia Black

community organization

1.2: CASE 2 | JoAnn Ajayi-Scott, Essence of a Lady, Inc.

community partnerships

5.3: CASE 3 | Laurel Harrop, Laurel Environmental Group

community support

Chapter 1: Seeing Barriers as Opportunities

computer vision

1.1: CASE 1 | Miku Jha, AgShift

confidence

Chapter 3: Building Trust Where the Stakes Are High

constraint

5.4: Review

consumer behavior

Chapter 2: Defining the Customer
Chapter 3: Creating Value People Can Recognize

consumer goods

Chapter 2: Defining the Customer

consumer intent

5.1: CASE 1 | Mandy Bowman, Official Black Wall Street
Chapter 5: Reaching the Customer

contextual practice

4.2: CASE 2 | Eva Drago, Beelinguapp

contractor collaboration

5.3: CASE 3 | Laurel Harrop, Laurel Environmental Group

convenience

3.1: CASE 1 | Monique Little, You Go Natural

corporate restructuring

6.1: CASE 1 | Pinky Cole, Slutty Vegan

creating value

Chapter 3: Creating Value People Can Recognize

creator credibility

4.4: Review

credibility

3.4: Review
Chapter 4: Earning Attention, Identity, and Trust

credible expertise

Chapter 3: Building Trust Where the Stakes Are High

credit

4.1: CASE 1 | Tiffany Aliche, The Budgetnista

criminal justice

1.1: CASE 1 | Bree Anderson, Daughters Beyond Incarceration

crowdfunding

3.3: CASE 3 | Dustin Anthony, BloomingTables

crowdsourcing

4.3: CASE 3 | Robert Hoehn, IdeaScale

culinary tourism

1.2: CASE 2 | Deah Berry Mitchell, Nostalgia Black

cultural education

1.2: CASE 2 | Deah Berry Mitchell, Nostalgia Black

cultural history

1.2: CASE 2 | Deah Berry Mitchell, *Nostalgia Black*

cultural knowledge

Chapter 1: *Seeing What Others Miss*

cultural organizations

5.2: CASE 2 | Brendan Ciecko, *Cuseum*

cultural participation

4.4: *Review*

cultural representation

2.1: CASE 1 | Nicole Brown, *Brown Sugar Box*

Cuseum

5.2: CASE 2 | Brendan Ciecko, *Cuseum*

customer

Chapter 5: *Reaching the Customer*

customer ambiguity

3.4: *Review*

customer definition

2.4: *Review*

Chapter 2: *Defining the Customer*

customer engagement

4.2: CASE 2 | Eva Drago, *Beelinguapp*

customer experience

1.4: *Review*

3.2: CASE 2 | Fri Forjindam, *Mycotoo*

6.2: CASE 2 | Derrick Hayes, *Big Dave's Cheesesteaks*

Chapter 3: *Creating Value People Can Recognize*

customer intent

5.4: *Review*

customer journey

Chapter 5: *Reaching the Customer*

customer needs

Chapter 1: *Seeing What Others Miss*

Part 4: *Conclusion*

customer philosophy

2.3: CASE 3 | Sania Vucetaj, *Sania's Brow Bar*

customer qualification

2.2: CASE 2 | Rajan Kumar, *Ateios Systems*

customer service

Chapter 3: *Designing Operations That Hold*

customer value

3.4: *Review*

Customers

Chapter 4: *Earning Attention, Identity, and Trust*

cybersecurity

2.3: CASE 3 | Erica Grant, *Quantum Lock Technologies*

cycle life

2.2: CASE 2 | Rajan Kumar, *Ateios Systems*

D

Daughters Beyond Incarceration

1.1: CASE 1 | Bree Anderson, *Daughters Beyond Incarceration*

Deah Berry Mitchell

1.2: CASE 2 | Deah Berry Mitchell, *Nostalgia Black*

debt

4.1: CASE 1 | Tiffany Aliche, *The Budgetnista*

decision making

1.1: CASE 1 | Miku Jha, *AgShift*

3.2: CASE 2 | Jenna Ahn, *Millie*

Chapter 1: *Finding Leverage in Broken Systems*

Part 4: *Conclusion*

decision_making

4.3: CASE 3 | Robert Hoehn, *IdeaScale*

delivery chain

2.4: *Review*

delivery systems

Chapter 2: *Designing for Access*

demand

Chapter 5: *Reaching the Customer*

demand aggregation

1.2: CASE 2 | Jehiel Oliver, *Hello Tractor*

demographics

2.4: *Review*

design

2.1: CASE 1 | Robert Devlin, *MetalenZ*

3.3: CASE 3 | Dustin Anthony, *BloomingTables*

design thinking

Chapter 3: *Creating Value People Can Recognize*

designing for access

Chapter 2: *Designing for Access*

detoxification

5.2: CASE 2 | Joanne Rodriguez, *Mycocycle*

diaspora

4.1: CASE 1 | Myron Chandran, *Afro Soca Love*

DIBIA Athletic

6.2: CASE 2 | Brandon Okpalobi, *Dibia DREAM*

differentiation

6.4: *Review*

digital

2.3: CASE 3 | Erica Grant, *Quantum Lock Technologies*

digital experiences

5.2: CASE 2 | Brendan Ciecko, *Cuseum*

digital membership cards

5.2: CASE 2 | Brendan Ciecko, *Cuseum*

dignified work

6.1: CASE 1 | Vanessa Bouché, *Savhera*

directory

5.1: CASE 1 | Mandy Bowman, *Official Black Wall Street*

disciplined action

Part 4: *Conclusion*

distribution

5.4: *Review*

Chapter 5: *Reaching the Customer*

donations

Chapter 6: *Making Mission Economically Durable*

durability mechanisms

6.4: *Review*

durable

Part 2: *Expanding Opportunity*

E

Earning Attention

Chapter 4: *Earning Attention, Identity, and Trust*

economic durability

6.4: *Review*

economic fairness

Chapter 5: *Reaching the Customer*

economic impact

5.1: CASE 1 | Mandy Bowman, *Official Black Wall Street*

economic mobility

5.3: CASE 3 | Brittani Hunter, *Mogul Millennial*

Chapter 5: *Creating Pathways to Work and Wealth*

economic outcomes

5.4: *Review*

economic sustainability

6.1: CASE 1 | Vanessa Bouché, *Savhera*

economic value

2.4: *Review*

economicopportunity

6.3: CASE 3 | Cameka Smith, *The BOSS Network*

economics

Chapter 6: *Making Mission Economically Durable*

ecosystem

6.3: CASE 3 | Cameka Smith, *The BOSS Network*

ecosystems

Chapter 4: *Building Networks, Platforms, and Ecosystems*

Part 3: *Building Systems*

education

1.1: CASE 1 | Bree Anderson, *Daughters Beyond Incarceration*

1.2: CASE 2 | JoAnn Ajayi-Scott, *Essence of a Lady, Inc.*

1.3: CASE 3 | Alexis Black, *Redefining Normal*

2.3: CASE 3 | Jeremy Glauser, *eLuma*

5.1: CASE 1 | Nitin Agrawal, *Interstride*

Chapter 2: *Designing for Access*

education consulting

3.2: CASE 2 | Jenna Ahn, *Millie*

education guidance

Chapter 3: *Building Trust Where the Stakes Are High*

education technology

4.2: CASE 2 | Eva Drago, *Beelinguapp*

educational content

4.3: CASE 3 | Kewanta Brooks, *Elite Kids TV*

educational innovation

2.4: *Review*

educational technology

2.2: CASE 2 | Rubén Arias, *BeeReaders*

educational ventures

Chapter 4: *Turning Knowledge into Capability*

electrode

2.2: CASE 2 | Rajan Kumar, *Ateios Systems*

Elite Kids TV

4.3: CASE 3 | Kewanta Brooks, *Elite Kids TV*

Elizabeth Sutton

4.2: CASE 2 | Elizabeth Sutton, *Elizabeth Sutton Collection*

emotional support

3.1: CASE 1 | Nathalie Walton, *Expectful*

employer collaboration

4.1: CASE 1 | Stella Ashaolu, *WeSolv*

employers

2.1: CASE 1 | Jessica Chang, *Upwards*

employment

5.1: CASE 1 | Nitin Agrawal, *Interstride*

empowerment

1.3: CASE 3 | Alexis Black, *Redefining Normal*

energy density

2.2: CASE 2 | Rajan Kumar, *Ateios Systems*

energy efficiency

5.1: CASE 1 | *Uche Isiugo, Infranergy AI*

energy finance

Chapter 5: *Scaling Under Constraint*

energy infrastructure

Chapter 5: *Scaling Under Constraint*

engagement

4.3: CASE 3 | *Robert Hoehn, IdeaScale*

4.4: Review

engagement engine

5.3: CASE 3 | *FAMOSOS*

engagement platform

5.2: CASE 2 | *Brendan Ciecko, Cuseum*

engineering

3.2: CASE 2 | *Christina Perla, Makelab*

enterprise risk

6.1: CASE 1 | *Pinky Cole, Slutty Vegan*

entrepreneurial decisions

Chapter 2: *Defining the Customer*

entrepreneurial opportunity

Chapter 1: *Seeing What Others Miss*

entrepreneurial strategy

1.4: Review

entrepreneurs

5.3: CASE 3 | *Brittani Hunter, Mogul Millennial*

Chapter 4: *Building Networks, Platforms, and Ecosystems*

Entrepreneurship

1.2: CASE 2 | *JoAnn Ajayi-Scott, Essence of a Lady, Inc.*

4.3: CASE 3 | *Kewanta Brooks, Elite Kids TV*

5.2: CASE 2 | *Moni Jefferson, Association of Military Spouse Entrepreneurs*

5.4: Review

6.2: CASE 2 | *Derrick Hayes, Big Dave's Cheesesteaks*

6.3: CASE 3 | *Cameka Smith, The BOSS Network*

6.4: Review

Chapter 1: *Finding Leverage in Broken Systems*

Chapter 1: *Seeing Barriers as Opportunities*

Chapter 1: *Seeing What Others Miss*

Chapter 3: *Designing Operations That Hold*

Chapter 4: *Earning Attention, Identity, and Trust*

Chapter 5: *Creating Pathways to Work and Wealth*

Chapter 6: *Growing Without Losing the Market*

Chapter 6: *Making Mission Economically Durable*

END

Part 4: *Conclusion*

environmental

3.3: CASE 3 | *Tristan Mackintosh, Safespill Systems*

environmental impact

1.1: CASE 1 | *Kelli Jones, NoSo Patches*

environmental sustainability

5.3: CASE 3 | *Laurel Harrop, Laurel Environmental Group*

environmental value

1.3: CASE 3 | *May Al-Karooni, Globechain*

equipment visibility

1.2: CASE 2 | *Jehiel Oliver, Hello Tractor*

equity

Chapter 2: *Designing for Access*

equity tradeoffs

2.4: Review

ethical choices

Part 4: *Conclusion*

ethical considerations

1.3: CASE 3 | *Joe Anderson, Reflex Protect*

evaluation

4.3: CASE 3 | *Robert Hoehn, IdeaScale*

events

4.1: CASE 1 | *Myron Chandran, Afro Soca Love*

Everyday Entrepreneur

END

evidence

1.4: Review

2.4: Review

3.4: Review

4.4: Review

4.4: Review

5.4: Review

6.4: Review

evidence gates

5.2: CASE 2 | *Joanne Rodriguez, Mycocytle*

evidence generation

4.1: CASE 1 | *Stella Ashaolu, WeSolv*

evidence verification

1.4: Review

exception

3.1: CASE 1 | *Jy Maze, Maze Freight Solutions*

execution

3.1: CASE 1 | *Jy Maze, Maze Freight Solutions*

Chapter 3: *Designing Operations That Hold*

execution network

5.1: CASE 1 | *Uche Isiugo, Infranergy AI*

execution risk

3.4: Review

expansion

Chapter 6: *Growing Without Losing the Market*

Experience

Chapter 4: *Earning Attention, Identity, and Trust*

experience design

3.2: CASE 2 | *Fri Forjindam, Mycotoo*

experiential learning

1.2: CASE 2 | *Deah Berry Mitchell, Nostalgia Black*

expert judgment

3.4: Review

F

failure

5.4: Review

failure modes

6.4: Review

families

2.1: CASE 1 | *Jessica Chang, Upwards*

FAMOSOS

5.3: CASE 3 | *FAMOSOS*

feature versus benefit

3.4: Review

feedback

4.3: CASE 3 | *Robert Hoehn, IdeaScale*

feedback loop

4.4: Review

fertility

3.1: CASE 1 | *Nathalie Walton, Expectful*

financial barriers

3.2: CASE 2 | *Jenna Ahn, Millie*

financial continuity

Chapter 6: *Making Mission Economically Durable*

financial education

4.1: CASE 1 | *Tiffany Aliche, The Budgetnista*

financial literacy

1.2: CASE 2 | *JoAnn Ajayi-Scott, Essence of a Lady, Inc.*

4.1: CASE 1 | *Tiffany Aliche, The Budgetnista*

Chapter 4: *Turning Knowledge into Capability*

financial tasks

4.4: Review

financing

1.2: CASE 2 | *Jehiel Oliver, Hello Tractor*

fine art

4.2: CASE 2 | *Elizabeth Sutton, Elizabeth Sutton Collection*

fluency

4.2: CASE 2 | *Eva Drago, Beelinguapp*

food industry

6.2: CASE 2 | *Derrick Hayes, Big Dave's Cheesesteaks*

food quality

1.1: CASE 1 | *Miku Jha, AgShift*

food supply chain

Chapter 1: *Finding Leverage in Broken Systems*

food truck

6.1: CASE 1 | *Pinky Cole, Slutty Vegan*

foster care

1.3: CASE 3 | *Alexis Black, Redefining Normal*

franchise

Chapter 6: *Growing Without Losing the Market*

franchise model

6.1: CASE 1 | *Pinky Cole, Slutty Vegan*

franchising

6.2: CASE 2 | *Derrick Hayes, Big Dave's Cheesesteaks*

freight management

3.4: Review

Fri Forjindam

3.2: CASE 2 | *Fri Forjindam, Mycotoo*

Fulfillment Hub USA

3.3: CASE 3 | *Abel Horvath, Fulfillment Hub USA*

functionality

3.3: CASE 3 | *Dustin Anthony, BloomingTables*

funding

5.3: CASE 3 | *Brittani Hunter, Mogul Millennial*

5.3: CASE 3 | *FAMOSOS*

funding access

Chapter 5: *Creating Pathways to Work and Wealth*

fungi

5.2: CASE 2 | *Joanne Rodriguez, Mycocytle*

furniture

3.3: CASE 3 | *Dustin Anthony, BloomingTables*

G

geolocation

5.1: CASE 1 | *Mandy Bowman, Official Black Wall Street*

girls empowerment

1.2: CASE 2 | *JoAnn Ajayi-Scott, Essence of a Lady, Inc.*

global mobility

5.1: CASE 1 | *Nitin Agrawal, Interstride*

Globechain

1.3: CASE 3 | *May Al-Karooni, Globechain*

governance

- 4.3: CASE 3 | Robert Hoehn, IdeaScale
- 4.4: Review
- 5.4: Review
- 6.4: Review

governments

- 2.1: CASE 1 | Jessica Chang, Upwards

GPS

- 1.2: CASE 2 | Jehiel Oliver, Hello Tractor

grants

- Chapter 6: Making Mission Economically Durable

growth

- 6.4: Review
- Chapter 6: Growing Without Losing the Market

guided tours

- 1.2: CASE 2 | Deah Berry Mitchell, Nostalgia Black

H

heavyhaul

- 3.1: CASE 1 | Jy Maze, Maze Freight Solutions

Hello Tractor

- 1.2: CASE 2 | Jehiel Oliver, Hello Tractor

Hispanic market

- 5.3: CASE 3 | FAMOSOS

historical narrative

- 1.2: CASE 2 | Deah Berry Mitchell, Nostalgia Black

holistic support

- Chapter 3: Building Trust Where the Stakes Are High

home decor

- 4.2: CASE 2 | Elizabeth Sutton, Elizabeth Sutton Collection

human trafficking

- 6.1: CASE 1 | Vanessa Bouché, Savhera

hybrid product

- 3.3: CASE 3 | Dustin Anthony, BloomingTables

hybrid workflow

- 3.2: CASE 2 | Christina Perla, Makelab

hypnobirthing

- 3.1: CASE 1 | Nathalie Walton, Expectful

I

ideas to action

- Part 4: Conclusion

identity

- 2.1: CASE 1 | Nicole Brown, Brown Sugar Box
- 4.1: CASE 1 | Myron Chandran, Afro Soca Love
- 4.4: Review
- Chapter 4: Earning Attention, Identity, and Trust

immersive experiences

- 3.2: CASE 2 | Fri Forjindam, Mycotoo

immigration information

- 5.1: CASE 1 | Nitin Agrawal, Interstride

impact measurement

- 6.1: CASE 1 | Vanessa Bouché, Savhera

implementation

- 4.3: CASE 3 | Robert Hoehn, IdeaScale

independence

- 4.4: Review

independent artist

- 4.2: CASE 2 | Elizabeth Sutton, Elizabeth Sutton Collection

indoor gardening

- 3.3: CASE 3 | Dustin Anthony, BloomingTables

industrial biotechnology

- Chapter 5: Scaling Under Constraint

industrial design

- 3.2: CASE 2 | Christina Perla, Makelab

industrial scale

- 5.2: CASE 2 | Joanne Rodriguez, Mycocyte

influencer marketing

- 4.3: CASE 3 | Taylor Humphries, Ranked Media and Technologies
- 5.3: CASE 3 | FAMOSOS

information access

- 5.4: Review

Infranergy

- 5.1: CASE 1 | Uche Isiugo, Infranergy AI

infrastructure

- 6.3: CASE 3 | Cameka Smith, The BOSS Network

innovation

- 1.1: CASE 1 | Kelli Jones, NoSo Patches
- 1.4: Review
- 3.3: CASE 3 | Tristan Mackintosh, Safespill Systems
- 4.3: CASE 3 | Robert Hoehn, IdeaScale
- Chapter 1: Seeing What Others Miss

innovative solutions

- Chapter 1: Seeing Barriers as Opportunities

inspections

- 3.3: CASE 3 | Tristan Mackintosh, Safespill Systems

Inspiration

- END

insurance

- 4.1: CASE 1 | Tiffany Aliche, The Budgetnista

integration

- 2.3: CASE 3 | Erica Grant, Quantum Lock Technologies
- 4.2: CASE 2 | Brian Balbirnie, ACCESS Newswire
- 5.4: Review

interconnection

- Chapter 5: Scaling Under Constraint

intermediaries

- Chapter 5: Reaching the Customer

international students

- 3.2: CASE 2 | Jenna Ahn, Millie
- 5.1: CASE 1 | Nitin Agrawal, Interstride
- Chapter 5: Creating Pathways to Work and Wealth

intersectional storytelling

- 6.3: CASE 3 | Alia J. Daniels, Revry

intersectionality

- 6.3: CASE 3 | Alia J. Daniels, Revry

intervention

- 1.4: Review
- Chapter 1: Finding Leverage in Broken Systems
- Chapter 1: Seeing Barriers as Opportunities

invention

- Chapter 2: Turning Technical Possibility into Reliable Value

inventory management

- 1.3: CASE 3 | May Al-Karooni, Globechain
- 3.3: CASE 3 | Abel Horvath, Fulfillment Hub USA

investing

- 4.1: CASE 1 | Tiffany Aliche, The Budgetnista

investor relations

- 4.2: CASE 2 | Brian Balbirnie, ACCESS Newswire

J

Jenna Ahn

- 3.2: CASE 2 | Jenna Ahn, Millie

job placement

- 4.1: CASE 1 | Stella Ashaolu, WeSolv

judgment skill

- Part 4: Conclusion

K

Keenan Beasley

- 2.2: CASE 2 | Keenan Beasley, Sunday II Sunday

Kewanta Brooks

- 4.3: CASE 3 | Kewanta Brooks, Elite Kids TV

key management

- 2.3: CASE 3 | Erica Grant, Quantum Lock Technologies

knowledge

- Chapter 4: Turning Knowledge into Capability

L

language acquisition

- 4.2: CASE 2 | Eva Drago, Beelinguapp

language learning

- 4.2: CASE 2 | Eva Drago, Beelinguapp

language practice

- Chapter 4: Turning Knowledge into Capability

Latin America

- 5.3: CASE 3 | FAMOSOS

Laurel Harrop

- 5.3: CASE 3 | Laurel Harrop, Laurel Environmental Group

learning

- 4.4: Review
- Chapter 4: Turning Knowledge into Capability

learning from failure

- Part 4: Conclusion

leverage

- Chapter 1: Finding Leverage in Broken Systems
- Part 3: Building Systems

leverage points

- 1.4: Review

LGBTQ

- 6.3: CASE 3 | Alia J. Daniels, Revry

lifestyle brand

- 2.1: CASE 1 | Nicole Brown, Brown Sugar Box

literacy

- 2.2: CASE 2 | Rubén Arias, BeeReaders
- 4.3: CASE 3 | Kewanta Brooks, Elite Kids TV
- 4.4: Review

literacy tools

- 2.4: Review
- Chapter 2: Designing for Access

lived experience

- 1.4: Review

logistics

- 3.1: CASE 1 | Jy Maze, Maze Freight Solutions
- 3.3: CASE 3 | Abel Horvath, Fulfillment Hub USA
- 3.4: Review
- Chapter 3: Designing Operations That Hold

M

maintenance

3.3: CASE 3 | *Tristan Mackintosh, Safespill Systems*

Makelab

3.2: CASE 2 | *Christina Perla, Makelab*

manufacturing

2.1: CASE 1 | *Robert Devlin, Metalenz*
2.2: CASE 2 | *Rajan Kumar, Ateios Systems*
Chapter 2: Turning Technical Possibility into Reliable Value
Chapter 3: Designing Operations That Hold

market analysis

1.4: Review
4.2: CASE 2 | *Brian Balbirnie, ACCESS Newswire*
Chapter 1: Seeing What Others Miss

market connections

5.4: Review

market insight

Chapter 1: Seeing What Others Miss

market optimization

5.1: CASE 1 | *Uche Isiugo, Infranergy AI*

market research

Chapter 3: Creating Value People Can Recognize

market segmentation

2.4: Review
Chapter 2: Defining the Customer

market structure

5.4: Review

marketing

2.1: CASE 1 | *Nicole Brown, Brown Sugar Box*
6.4: Review
Chapter 4: Earning Attention, Identity, and Trust
Chapter 5: Reaching the Customer

marketing strategy

2.2: CASE 2 | *Keenan Beasley, Sunday II*
Sunday
4.3: CASE 3 | *Taylor Humphries, Ranked Media and Technologies*

marketplace

2.1: CASE 1 | *Jessica Chang, Upwards*

maternal wellness

3.1: CASE 1 | *Nathalie Walton, Expectful*

MBA candidates

4.1: CASE 1 | *Stella Ashaolu, WeSolv*

measurement

4.4: Review

mechanisms

2.4: Review

media diversity

6.3: CASE 3 | *Alia J. Daniels, Revry*

meditation

3.1: CASE 1 | *Nathalie Walton, Expectful*

membership lifecycle

5.2: CASE 2 | *Brendan Ciecko, Cuseum*

memoir

1.3: CASE 3 | *Alexis Black, Redefining Normal*

memorization

4.2: CASE 2 | *Eva Drago, Beelinguapp*

mental health

2.3: CASE 3 | *Jeremy Glauser, eLuma*

mentoring

1.1: CASE 1 | *Bree Anderson, Daughters Beyond Incarceration*
1.2: CASE 2 | *JoAnn Ajayi-Scott, Essence of a Lady, Inc.*
1.4: Review
3.2: CASE 2 | *Jenna Ahn, Millie*

mentorship

3.4: Review
5.2: CASE 2 | *Moni Jefferson, Association of Military Spouse Entrepreneurs*
6.2: CASE 2 | *Brandon Okpalobi, Dibia DREAM*
Chapter 1: Seeing Barriers as Opportunities

Metalenz

2.1: CASE 1 | *Robert Devlin, Metalenz*

metasurface

2.1: CASE 1 | *Robert Devlin, Metalenz*

micellar rinse

2.2: CASE 2 | *Keenan Beasley, Sunday II*
Sunday

Miku Jha

1.1: CASE 1 | *Miku Jha, AgShift*

military

5.2: CASE 2 | *Moni Jefferson, Association of Military Spouse Entrepreneurs*

military spouses

Chapter 5: Creating Pathways to Work and Wealth

mission

Chapter 6: Making Mission Economically Durable
Part 2: Expanding Opportunity

mobile technology

5.2: CASE 2 | *Brendan Ciecko, Cuseum*

mobility

5.2: CASE 2 | *Moni Jefferson, Association of Military Spouse Entrepreneurs*

mobility mechanism

5.4: Review

Mogul Millennial

5.3: CASE 3 | *Brittani Hunter, Mogul Millennial*

monetize

6.3: CASE 3 | *Cameka Smith, The BOSS Network*

Monique Little

3.1: CASE 1 | *Monique Little, You Go Natural*

monitoring technology

1.2: CASE 2 | *Jehiel Oliver, Hello Tractor*

Motivation

END

museums

5.2: CASE 2 | *Brendan Ciecko, Cuseum*

music

4.1: CASE 1 | *Myron Chandran, Afro Soca Love*

mycelium

5.2: CASE 2 | *Joanne Rodriguez, Mycocyte*

Mycocyte

5.2: CASE 2 | *Joanne Rodriguez, Mycocyte*

Mycotoo

3.2: CASE 2 | *Fri Forjindam, Mycotoo*

Myron Chandran

4.1: CASE 1 | *Myron Chandran, Afro Soca Love*

N

natural hair

3.1: CASE 1 | *Monique Little, You Go Natural*

navigation capital

5.4: Review

network

6.3: CASE 3 | *Cameka Smith, The BOSS Network*

networking

5.1: CASE 1 | *Nitin Agrawal, Interstride*

networks

Chapter 4: Building Networks, Platforms, and Ecosystems
Part 3: Building Systems

niche marketing

2.4: Review

nonlethal

1.3: CASE 3 | *Joe Anderson, Reflex Protect*

nonprofit

1.2: CASE 2 | *JoAnn Ajayi-Scott, Essence of a Lady, Inc.*
6.2: CASE 2 | *Brandon Okpalobi, Dibia DREAM*

O

occupational therapy

2.3: CASE 3 | *Jeremy Glauser, eLuma*

online therapy

2.3: CASE 3 | *Jeremy Glauser, eLuma*

operational efficiency

1.3: CASE 3 | *May Al-Karooni, Globechain*
3.4: Review
5.3: CASE 3 | *Laurel Harrop, Laurel Environmental Group*
Chapter 1: Finding Leverage in Broken Systems

operational translation

3.4: Review

operations

3.3: CASE 3 | *Tristan Mackintosh, Safespill Systems*
Chapter 3: Designing Operations That Hold

operations design

Part 3: Building Systems

opportunities

Chapter 1: Seeing Barriers as Opportunities
Part 2: Expanding Opportunity

opportunity recognition

1.4: Review
Chapter 1: Seeing What Others Miss
Part 4: Conclusion

optics

2.1: CASE 1 | *Robert Devlin, Metalenz*

order fulfillment

3.3: CASE 3 | *Abel Horvath, Fulfillment Hub USA*

organizational structure

6.2: CASE 2 | *Brandon Okpalobi, Dibia DREAM*

outdoor gear

1.1: CASE 1 | *Kelli Jones, NoSo Patches*

outdoor industry

1.1: CASE 1 | *Kelli Jones, NoSo Patches*

oversized

3.1: CASE 1 | *Jy Maze, Maze Freight Solutions*

P

parenting

1.1: CASE 1 | *Bree Anderson, Daughters Beyond Incarceration*

participants

4.4: Review

participation

4.3: CASE 3 | *Robert Hoehn, IdeaScale*

pathway

5.4: Review

pathways

Chapter 5: Creating Pathways to Work and Wealth
Part 2: Expanding Opportunity

pattern

4.2: CASE 2 | Elizabeth Sutton, Elizabeth Sutton Collection

performance

2.2: CASE 2 | Rajan Kumar, Ateios Systems
2.3: CASE 3 | Erica Grant, Quantum Lock Technologies
2.4: Review
3.3: CASE 3 | Tristan Mackintosh, Safespill Systems

performance assessment

4.1: CASE 1 | Stella Ashaolu, WeSolv

performance evidence

4.4: Review

personal experience

1.3: CASE 3 | Alexis Black, Redefining Normal

personal finance

4.1: CASE 1 | Tiffany Aliche, The Budgetnista
Chapter 4: Turning Knowledge into Capability

personal finances

6.1: CASE 1 | Pinky Cole, Slutty Vegan

Personal Growth

END

personalized videos

5.3: CASE 3 | FAMOSOS

philanthropy

1.2: CASE 2 | JoAnn Ajayi-Scott, Essence of a Lady, Inc.

Pinky Cole

6.1: CASE 1 | Pinky Cole, Slutty Vegan

plan

3.1: CASE 1 | Jy Maze, Maze Freight Solutions

platform testing

4.4: Review

platforms

Chapter 4: Building Networks, Platforms, and Ecosystems
Part 3: Building Systems

postpartum life

3.1: CASE 1 | Nathalie Walton, Expectful

practical life skills

4.3: CASE 3 | Kewanta Brooks, Elite Kids TV

pregnancy anxiety

3.1: CASE 1 | Nathalie Walton, Expectful

preparedness

1.3: CASE 3 | Joe Anderson, Reflex Protect

process improvement

Chapter 3: Designing Operations That Hold

process standardization

3.4: Review

product design

Chapter 2: Defining the Customer

product development

1.4: Review
2.2: CASE 2 | Keenan Beasley, Sunday II Sunday
2.3: CASE 3 | Sania Vucetaj, Sania's Brow Bar
3.3: CASE 3 | Dustin Anthony, BloomingTables

product employment

6.4: Review

product failure

Chapter 1: Seeing What Others Miss

product features

2.4: Review

product launch

1.1: CASE 1 | Kelli Jones, NoSo Patches

product offering

Chapter 3: Creating Value People Can Recognize

production

2.1: CASE 1 | Robert Devlin, Metalenz
3.2: CASE 2 | Christina Perla, Makelab

professional development

5.2: CASE 2 | Moni Jefferson, Association of Military Spouse Entrepreneurs

professional networks

5.3: CASE 3 | Brittani Hunter, Mogul Millennial

project management

3.2: CASE 2 | Fri Forjindam, Mycotoo
5.3: CASE 3 | Laurel Harrop, Laurel Environmental Group

project scope

5.1: CASE 1 | Uche Isiugo, Infranergy AI

proof

5.4: Review

proof architecture

3.4: Review

protective style

3.1: CASE 1 | Monique Little, You Go Natural

prototype

Chapter 2: Turning Technical Possibility into Reliable Value

prototypes

3.2: CASE 2 | Christina Perla, Makelab

provider

2.1: CASE 1 | Jessica Chang, Upwards

public relations

4.2: CASE 2 | Brian Balbirnie, ACCESS Newswire

public safety

1.3: CASE 3 | Joe Anderson, Reflex Protect

Q

qualification

Chapter 2: Turning Technical Possibility into Reliable Value

quality

Chapter 3: Building Trust Where the Stakes Are High

quality control

1.1: CASE 1 | Miku Jha, AgShift
3.2: CASE 2 | Christina Perla, Makelab
4.4: Review

quality obligation

2.4: Review

quality standards

6.2: CASE 2 | Derrick Hayes, Big Dave's Cheesesteaks

quantum

2.3: CASE 3 | Erica Grant, Quantum Lock Technologies

queer people of color

6.3: CASE 3 | Alia J. Daniels, Revry

R

radical inclusivity

6.3: CASE 3 | Alia J. Daniels, Revry

reading growth

2.2: CASE 2 | Rubén Arias, BeeReaders

recognition

2.1: CASE 1 | Nicole Brown, Brown Sugar Box

recycling process

5.3: CASE 3 | Laurel Harrop, Laurel Environmental Group

regulated recycling

Chapter 5: Scaling Under Constraint

regulatory compliance

2.4: Review

regulatory design

5.4: Review

reliability

2.1: CASE 1 | Robert Devlin, Metalenz
2.4: Review
Chapter 2: Turning Technical Possibility into Reliable Value

reliable value

Chapter 2: Turning Technical Possibility into Reliable Value
Part 3: Building Systems

remote therapy

2.3: CASE 3 | Jeremy Glauser, eLuma

remote work

5.2: CASE 2 | Moni Jefferson, Association of Military Spouse Entrepreneurs

renewable infrastructure

5.1: CASE 1 | Uche Isiugo, Infranergy AI
Chapter 5: Scaling Under Constraint

repair

1.1: CASE 1 | Kelli Jones, NoSo Patches

repeatability

5.4: Review

reputation

4.3: CASE 3 | Taylor Humphries, Ranked Media and Technologies

resilience

1.3: CASE 3 | Alexis Black, Redefining Normal

restaurant management

6.2: CASE 2 | Derrick Hayes, Big Dave's Cheesesteaks

retention opportunities

2.4: Review

returns

3.3: CASE 3 | Abel Horvath, Fulfillment Hub USA

reuse marketplace

1.3: CASE 3 | May Al-Karooni, Globechain

revenue

4.2: CASE 2 | Brian Balbirnie, ACCESS Newswire
Chapter 6: Making Mission Economically Durable

revenue stream

6.4: Review

reviews

5.1: CASE 1 | Mandy Bowman, Official Black Wall Street

risk

3.3: CASE 3 | Tristan Mackintosh, Safespill Systems
4.4: Review

risk assessment

1.4: Review

risk management

- 1.3: CASE 3 | Joe Anderson, Reflex Protect
- 3.4: Review
- 3.4: Review
- 6.4: Review

risk transfer

- 5.4: Review

risks

- 2.4: Review

route

- 3.1: CASE 1 | Jy Maze, Maze Freight Solutions

rural health

- 2.3: CASE 3 | Jeremy Glauser, eLuma

S

safety

- 3.3: CASE 3 | Tristan Mackintosh, Safespill Systems
- 5.4: Review

safety protocol

- 1.3: CASE 3 | Joe Anderson, Reflex Protect

salon entrepreneurship

- 2.3: CASE 3 | Sania Vucetaj, Sania's Brow Bar

satin lining

- 3.1: CASE 1 | Monique Little, You Go Natural

saturated color

- 4.2: CASE 2 | Elizabeth Sutton, Elizabeth Sutton Collection

savings

- 4.1: CASE 1 | Tiffany Aliche, The Budgetnista

scalability

- 5.2: CASE 2 | Joanne Rodriguez, Mycocyte

scaling

- Chapter 5: Scaling Under Constraint

scaling risk

- 5.1: CASE 1 | Uche Isiugo, Infranergy AI

scaling under constraints

- Part 3: Building Systems

security

- 2.3: CASE 3 | Erica Grant, Quantum Lock Technologies

semiconductor

- 2.1: CASE 1 | Robert Devlin, Metalenz

semiconductor manufacturing

- Chapter 2: Turning Technical Possibility into Reliable Value

service design

- Chapter 2: Designing for Access

service expansion

- 2.3: CASE 3 | Sania Vucetaj, Sania's Brow Bar

services

- Chapter 4: Building Networks, Platforms, and Ecosystems

Shark Tank

- 3.1: CASE 1 | Monique Little, You Go Natural

shipping

- 3.3: CASE 3 | Abel Horvath, Fulfillment Hub USA

skill development

- Chapter 4: Turning Knowledge into Capability

small space living

- 3.3: CASE 3 | Dustin Anthony, BloomingTables

smallholder farmers

- 1.2: CASE 2 | Jehiel Oliver, Hello Tractor

social barriers

- Chapter 1: Seeing Barriers as Opportunities

social enterprise

- 6.1: CASE 1 | Vanessa Bouché, Savhera

social impact

- 1.3: CASE 3 | May Al-Karooni, Globechain

social media

- 4.3: CASE 3 | Taylor Humphries, Ranked Media and Technologies

software

- 4.2: CASE 2 | Brian Balbirnie, ACCESS Newswire

solar

- 5.1: CASE 1 | Uche Isiugo, Infranergy AI

solutions

- 3.1: CASE 1 | Jy Maze, Maze Freight Solutions

Soul Food

- 1.2: CASE 2 | Deah Berry Mitchell, Nostalgia Black

special education

- 2.3: CASE 3 | Jeremy Glauser, eLuma

speech therapy

- 2.3: CASE 3 | Jeremy Glauser, eLuma

sponsorship

- 5.1: CASE 1 | Nitin Agrawal, Interstride

sports training

- 6.2: CASE 2 | Brandon Okpalobi, Dibia DREAM

spouses

- 5.2: CASE 2 | Moni Jefferson, Association of Military Spouse Entrepreneurs

stakeholder engagement

- 1.4: Review

stakeholders

- 1.1: CASE 1 | Bree Anderson, Daughters Beyond Incarceration

standardization

- Chapter 3: Designing Operations That Hold

standards

- 3.3: CASE 3 | Tristan Mackintosh, Safespill Systems

startup media

- 5.3: CASE 3 | Brittani Hunter, Mogul Millennial

STEM education

- 6.2: CASE 2 | Brandon Okpalobi, Dibia DREAM

Stories

- END

storytelling

- 1.3: CASE 3 | Alexis Black, Redefining Normal
- 3.2: CASE 2 | Fri Forjindam, Mycotoo
- Chapter 3: Creating Value People Can Recognize

strategic choice

- Chapter 2: Defining the Customer

strategic decisions

- 2.4: Review

strategic_management

- 4.3: CASE 3 | Robert Hoehn, IdeaScale

strategy

- 4.2: CASE 2 | Brian Balbirnie, ACCESS Newswire
- 6.4: Review

streaming network

- 6.3: CASE 3 | Alia J. Daniels, Revry

structured participation

- 4.1: CASE 1 | Stella Ashaolu, WeSolv

student engagement

- 2.2: CASE 2 | Rubén Arias, BeeReaders
- Chapter 4: Turning Knowledge into Capability

subscription app

- 6.3: CASE 3 | Alia J. Daniels, Revry

subscription model

- 2.1: CASE 1 | Nicole Brown, Brown Sugar Box

subscription revenue

- 1.2: CASE 2 | Jehiel Oliver, Hello Tractor

Success

- END

succulents

- 3.3: CASE 3 | Dustin Anthony, BloomingTables

supplier

- 2.1: CASE 1 | Jessica Chang, Upwards

supply chain

- 3.3: CASE 3 | Abel Horvath, Fulfillment Hub USA
- 3.4: Review
- Chapter 3: Designing Operations That Hold

support

- 1.1: CASE 1 | Bree Anderson, Daughters Beyond Incarceration
- 2.1: CASE 1 | Jessica Chang, Upwards
- 5.2: CASE 2 | Moni Jefferson, Association of Military Spouse Entrepreneurs

support systems

- 3.2: CASE 2 | Jenna Ahn, Millie

surplus furniture

- 1.3: CASE 3 | May Al-Karooni, Globechain

survivor employment

- 6.1: CASE 1 | Vanessa Bouché, Savhera

survivor empowerment

- 6.1: CASE 1 | Vanessa Bouché, Savhera

survivor leadership

- 6.4: Review

sustainability

- 1.1: CASE 1 | Kelli Jones, NoSo Patches
- 1.3: CASE 3 | May Al-Karooni, Globechain
- 5.2: CASE 2 | Joanne Rodriguez, Mycocyte
- Chapter 1: Finding Leverage in Broken Systems
- Chapter 6: Growing Without Losing the Market

synthetic fabric

- 1.1: CASE 1 | Kelli Jones, NoSo Patches

system

- 2.1: CASE 1 | Robert Devlin, Metalenz

system failures

- 1.4: Review

systems

- Chapter 1: Finding Leverage in Broken Systems

systems work

- 6.4: Review

T

talent acquisition

- 4.1: CASE 1 | Stella Ashaolu, WeSolv

targeted marketing

- Chapter 2: Defining the Customer

teaching strategies

- Chapter 4: Turning Knowledge into Capability

technical possibility

- Chapter 2: Turning Technical Possibility into Reliable Value
- Part 3: Building Systems

technical repair

- 1.1: CASE 1 | Kelli Jones, NoSo Patches

technology

- 2.2: CASE 2 | *Rajan Kumar, Ateios Systems*
- 2.3: CASE 3 | *Erica Grant, Quantum Lock Technologies*
- 2.4: Review
- 5.4: Review

technology in education

- Chapter 2: *Designing for Access*

telepractice

- 2.3: CASE 3 | *Jeremy Glauser, eLuma*

teletherapy

- 2.4: Review
- Chapter 2: *Designing for Access*

testimonials

- Chapter 3: *Building Trust Where the Stakes Are High*

testing

- 3.3: CASE 3 | *Tristan Mackintosh, Safespill Systems*

textured hair

- 2.2: CASE 2 | *Keenan Beasley, Sunday II Sunday*

themed entertainment

- 3.2: CASE 2 | *Fri Forjindam, Mycotoo*

tractor service

- 1.2: CASE 2 | *Jehiel Oliver, Hello Tractor*

training

- 1.3: CASE 3 | *Joe Anderson, Reflex Protect*

transition challenges

- Chapter 5: *Creating Pathways to Work and Wealth*

transition failure

- 5.4: Review

translation mechanism

- 3.4: Review

transparency

- 4.4: Review

transportation

- 3.1: CASE 1 | *Jy Maze, Maze Freight Solutions*

trauma

- 1.3: CASE 3 | *Alexis Black, Redefining Normal*
- 1.4: Review

trust

- 3.4: Review
- 4.4: Review
- Chapter 3: *Building Trust Where the Stakes Are High*
- Chapter 4: *Earning Attention, Identity, and Trust*
- Part 2: *Expanding Opportunity*

trust in education

- 3.2: CASE 2 | *Jenna Ahn, Millie*

trust transfers

- 4.3: CASE 3 | *Taylor Humphries, Ranked Media and Technologies*

trusted messengers

- 4.3: CASE 3 | *Taylor Humphries, Ranked Media and Technologies*

tweezing specialist

- 2.3: CASE 3 | *Sania Vucetaj, Sania's Brow Bar*

U

Uche Isiugo

- 5.1: CASE 1 | *Uche Isiugo, Infranergy AI*

unboxing gatherings

- 2.1: CASE 1 | *Nicole Brown, Brown Sugar Box*

uncertainties

- 2.4: Review

unit economics

- 5.4: Review

unity

- 4.1: CASE 1 | *Myron Chandran, Afro Soca Love*

universities

- 5.1: CASE 1 | *Nitin Agrawal, Interstride*

university guidance

- 3.2: CASE 2 | *Jenna Ahn, Millie*

user experience

- 2.4: Review

users

- Chapter 4: *Building Networks, Platforms, and Ecosystems*

V

validation

- 3.4: Review

value

- 6.3: CASE 3 | *Cameka Smith, The BOSS Network*
- Chapter 4: *Building Networks, Platforms, and Ecosystems*

value proposition

- Chapter 3: *Creating Value People Can Recognize*

vegan food

- 6.1: CASE 1 | *Pinky Cole, Slutty Vegan*

venture

- Chapter 6: *Growing Without Losing the Market*

venture development

- Chapter 2: *Defining the Customer*

venture growth

- Chapter 5: *Scaling Under Constraint*

Ventures

- Chapter 4: *Earning Attention, Identity, and Trust*

verification

- Chapter 3: *Building Trust Where the Stakes Are High*

violence prevention

- 1.3: CASE 3 | *Joe Anderson, Reflex Protect*

visibility

- 5.1: CASE 1 | *Mandy Bowman, Official Black Wall Street*
- Chapter 5: *Reaching the Customer*

visitor service

- 5.2: CASE 2 | *Brendan Ciecko, Cuseum*

visual inspection

- 1.1: CASE 1 | *Miku Jha, AgShift*

visual language

- 4.2: CASE 2 | *Elizabeth Sutton, Elizabeth Sutton Collection*

vulnerabilities

- 2.3: CASE 3 | *Erica Grant, Quantum Lock Technologies*

W

warehousing

- 3.3: CASE 3 | *Abel Horvath, Fulfillment Hub USA*

waste management

- 5.2: CASE 2 | *Joanne Rodriguez, Mycocyte*
- 5.3: CASE 3 | *Laurel Harrop, Laurel Environmental Group*

waste reduction

- 1.3: CASE 3 | *May Al-Karooni, Globechain*

wealth

- Part 2: *Expanding Opportunity*

wellness products

- 6.1: CASE 1 | *Vanessa Bouché, Savhera*

women

- 6.3: CASE 3 | *Cameka Smith, The BOSS Network*

women empowerment

- 4.1: CASE 1 | *Tiffany Alliche, The Budgetnista*

women of color

- 2.2: CASE 2 | *Keenan Beasley, Sunday II Sunday*

women's health

- 3.1: CASE 1 | *Nathalie Walton, Expectful*

work

- Part 2: *Expanding Opportunity*

work portability

- Chapter 5: *Creating Pathways to Work and Wealth*

worker safety

- 5.3: CASE 3 | *Laurel Harrop, Laurel Environmental Group*

workflow

- 3.2: CASE 2 | *Christina Perla, Makelab*

workplace safety

- 1.3: CASE 3 | *Joe Anderson, Reflex Protect*

Y

You Go Natural

- 3.1: CASE 1 | *Monique Little, You Go Natural*

youth development

- 1.4: Review
- 6.2: CASE 2 | *Brandon Okpalobi, Dibia DREAM*
- Chapter 6: *Making Mission Economically Durable*

youth empowerment

- Chapter 1: *Seeing Barriers as Opportunities*

youth support

- 1.2: CASE 2 | *JoAnn Ajayi-Scott, Essence of a Lady, Inc.*

GLOSSARY

S

Sample Word 1 | Sample Definition 1

This page titled [Glossary](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.

DETAILED LICENSING

Overview

Title: Everyday Entrepreneurs: 54 Stories of Opportunity, Risk, and Execution

Webpages: 106

All licenses found:

- [CC BY 4.0](#): 92.5% (98 pages)
- [Undeclared](#): 4.7% (5 pages)
- [Public Domain](#): 2.8% (3 pages)

By Page

- Everyday Entrepreneurs: 54 Stories of Opportunity, Risk, and Execution - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - Front Matter - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - TitlePage - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - InfoPage - [Public Domain](#)
 - Table of Contents - [Public Domain](#)
 - Licensing - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - Acknowledgements - [Undeclared](#)
 - About the Book - [Undeclared](#)
 - About the Authors - [Undeclared](#)
 - Forward - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - Preface - [Undeclared](#)
 - Introduction - [Undeclared](#)
 - Part 1: Creating Markets - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - Chapter 1: Seeing What Others Miss - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - 1.1: CASE 1 | Kelli Jones, NoSo Patches - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - 1.2: CASE 2 | Deah Berry Mitchell, Nostalgia Black - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - 1.3: CASE 3 | Joe Anderson, Reflex Protect - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - 1.4: Review - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - Chapter 2: Defining the Customer - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - 2.1: CASE 1 | Nicole Brown, Brown Sugar Box - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - 2.2: CASE 2 | Keenan Beasley, Sunday II Sunday - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - 2.3: CASE 3 | Sania Vucetaj, Sania's Brow Bar - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - 2.4: Review - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - Chapter 3: Creating Value People Can Recognize - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - 3.1: CASE 1 | Monique Little, You Go Natural - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - 3.2: CASE 2 | Fri Forjindam, Mycotoo - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - 3.3: CASE 3 | Dustin Anthony, BloomingTables - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - 3.4: Review - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - Chapter 4: Earning Attention, Identity, and Trust - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - 4.1: CASE 1 | Myron Chandran, Afro Soca Love - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - 4.2: CASE 2 | Elizabeth Sutton, Elizabeth Sutton Collection - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - 4.3: CASE 3 | Taylor Humphries, Ranked Media and Technologies - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - 4.4: Review - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - Chapter 5: Reaching the Customer - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - 5.1: CASE 1 | Mandy Bowman, Official Black Wall Street - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - 5.2: CASE 2 | Brendan Ciecko, Cuseum - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - 5.3: CASE 3 | FAMOSOS - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - 5.4: Review - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - Chapter 6: Growing Without Losing the Market - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - 6.1: CASE 1 | Pinky Cole, Slutty Vegan - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - 6.2: CASE 2 | Derrick Hayes, Big Dave's Cheesesteaks - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - 6.3: CASE 3 | Alia J. Daniels, Revry - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - 6.4: Review - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - Part 2: Expanding Opportunity - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - Chapter 1: Seeing Barriers as Opportunities - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - 1.1: CASE 1 | Bree Anderson, Daughters Beyond Incarceration - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - 1.2: CASE 2 | JoAnn Ajayi-Scott, Essence of a Lady, Inc. - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - 1.3: CASE 3 | Alexis Black, Redefining Normal - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - 1.4: Review - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - Chapter 2: Designing for Access - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - 2.1: CASE 1 | Jessica Chang, Upwards - [CC BY 4.0](#)
 - 2.2: CASE 2 | Rubén Arias, BeeReaders - [CC BY 4.0](#)

- BY 4.0
- 2.3: CASE 3 | Jeremy Glauser, eLuma - CC BY 4.0
- 2.4: Review - CC BY 4.0
- Chapter 3: Building Trust Where the Stakes Are High - CC BY 4.0
 - 3.1: CASE 1 | Nathalie Walton, Expectful - CC BY 4.0
 - 3.2: CASE 2 | Jenna Ahn, Millie - CC BY 4.0
 - 3.3: CASE 3 | Tristan Mackintosh, Safespill Systems - CC BY 4.0
 - 3.4: Review - CC BY 4.0
- Chapter 4: Turning Knowledge into Capability - CC BY 4.0
 - 4.1: CASE 1 | Tiffany Aliche, The Budgetnista - CC BY 4.0
 - 4.2: CASE 2 | Eva Drago, Beelinguapp - CC BY 4.0
 - 4.3: CASE 3 | Kewanta Brooks, Elite Kids TV - CC BY 4.0
 - 4.4: Review - CC BY 4.0
- Chapter 5: Creating Pathways to Work and Wealth - CC BY 4.0
 - 5.1: CASE 1 | Nitin Agrawal, Interstride - CC BY 4.0
 - 5.2: CASE 2 | Moni Jefferson, Association of Military Spouse Entrepreneurs - CC BY 4.0
 - 5.3: CASE 3 | Brittani Hunter, Mogul Millennial - CC BY 4.0
 - 5.4: Review - CC BY 4.0
- Chapter 6: Making Mission Economically Durable - CC BY 4.0
 - 6.1: CASE 1 | Vanessa Bouché, Savhera - CC BY 4.0
 - 6.2: CASE 2 | Brandon Okpalobi, Dibia DREAM - CC BY 4.0
 - 6.3: CASE 3 | Cameka Smith, The BOSS Network - CC BY 4.0
 - 6.4: Review - CC BY 4.0
- Part 3: Building Systems - CC BY 4.0
 - Chapter 1: Finding Leverage in Broken Systems - CC BY 4.0
 - 1.1: CASE 1 | Miku Jha, AgShift - CC BY 4.0
 - 1.2: CASE 2 | Jehiel Oliver, Hello Tractor - CC BY 4.0
 - 1.3: CASE 3 | May Al-Karooni, Globechain - CC BY 4.0
 - 1.4: Review - CC BY 4.0
- Chapter 2: Turning Technical Possibility into Reliable Value - CC BY 4.0
 - 2.1: CASE 1 | Robert Devlin, Metalenz - CC BY 4.0
 - 2.2: CASE 2 | Rajan Kumar, Ateios Systems - CC BY 4.0
 - 2.3: CASE 3 | Erica Grant, Quantum Lock Technologies - CC BY 4.0
 - 2.4: Review - CC BY 4.0
- Chapter 3: Designing Operations That Hold - CC BY 4.0
 - 3.1: CASE 1 | Jy Maze, Maze Freight Solutions - CC BY 4.0
 - 3.2: CASE 2 | Christina Perla, Makelab - CC BY 4.0
 - 3.3: CASE 3 | Abel Horvath, Fulfillment Hub USA - CC BY 4.0
 - 3.4: Review - CC BY 4.0
- Chapter 4: Building Networks, Platforms, and Ecosystems - CC BY 4.0
 - 4.1: CASE 1 | Stella Ashaolu, WeSolv - CC BY 4.0
 - 4.2: CASE 2 | Brian Balbirnie, ACCESS Newswire - CC BY 4.0
 - 4.3: CASE 3 | Robert Hoehn, IdeaScale - CC BY 4.0
 - 4.4: Review - CC BY 4.0
- Chapter 5: Scaling Under Constraint - CC BY 4.0
 - 5.1: CASE 1 | Uche Isiugo, Infranergy AI - CC BY 4.0
 - 5.2: CASE 2 | Joanne Rodriguez, Mycocycle - CC BY 4.0
 - 5.3: CASE 3 | Laurel Harrop, Laurel Environmental Group - CC BY 4.0
 - 5.4: Review - CC BY 4.0
- Part 4: Conclusion - CC BY 4.0
 - END - CC BY 4.0
- Back Matter - CC BY 4.0
 - Index - *Public Domain*
 - Glossary - CC BY 4.0
 - Detailed Licensing - CC BY 4.0

This page titled [Everyday Entrepreneurs: 54 Stories of Opportunity, Risk, and Execution](#) is shared under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license and was authored, remixed, and/or curated by Allan J. Graves, Miguel Colón, and Kathrina Q. Miranda.