



**Building Rigorous Evidence
about How to Improve
Postsecondary Success:**

**Funding Announcement and
Request for Proposals**

December 2018

OVERVIEW

The Laura and John Arnold Foundation’s (LJAF) core objective is to advance solutions that maximize opportunity and minimize injustice. Its investments are focused on criminal justice, education, health care, and several other key areas. LJAF has offices in Houston, New York City, and Washington, D.C.

We believe high-quality education is an engine of social mobility and should be accessible to learners of all ages, leading to lives filled with opportunity. Our work seeks to increase the quality of student outcomes and lower the costs. In higher education, we study promising programs that address barriers to student success, support the development of model policies, and educate public policy-makers to create lasting change.

This Request for Proposals (RFP) is soliciting research and evaluation project proposals to test interventions related to postsecondary success (including but not limited to student learning, persistence, completion, time to completion, job placement, and post-college earnings). We are particularly interested in interventions that promise to improve success among underserved students, such as low-income students, students of color, adult students, and veterans. LJAF has committed **up to \$10 million** for these solicitations.

This RFP is soliciting research and evaluation project proposals of two types:

- **Innovation Tier.** First, recognizing that many innovative ideas will not be ready for larger-scale evaluations of impact until they can be successfully piloted, we are soliciting proposals to faithfully implement and study postsecondary interventions that are supported by compelling logic by performing pilots at small scale (see attachment 1).
- **Validation Tier.** Second, we are seeking proposals to rigorously evaluate interventions that either have highly promising prior evidence or are widely implemented, in order to build policy-important evidence about “what works” to increase postsecondary success in a cost-effective manner. We strongly prefer randomized controlled trials (RCTs) but may consider rigorous quasi-experimental evaluations with strong designs under certain conditions (see attachment 2).

We are interested in interventions across a range of postsecondary settings, including both 2- and 4-year institutions. Although our primary interest is interventions offered within a postsecondary setting, proposals related to other settings (e.g., high school, prisons) with a clear focus on postsecondary success are also welcome.

Why These Projects are Needed:

Postsecondary student success remains a persistent challenge. Although our nation has substantially expanded access to higher education over the past twenty years, particularly among traditionally underserved students, our nation still struggles to help students succeed once they actually enroll in higher education. Persistent, common barriers—such as students’ inability to afford basic living costs or to navigate complicated academic pathways—likely are root causes for many students. In addition, many of the innovative practices that have emerged have not been rigorously evaluated, raising questions about their actual impact and scalability.

Rigorous research can identify interventions with the potential to improve student success at scale.

Over the past several years, high-quality evaluations have identified a handful of interventions with particular promise to increase student success, such as the City University of New York’s Accelerated Study in Associate Programs (see, e.g., <https://www.straighttalkonevidence.org/2018/01/31/programs-that-increase-college-attendance-and-completion-by-low-income-students-recent-rct-findings/>). These programs’ success also suggests that there is a relatively large group of students who could see much greater value from their investment in higher education, if they received the right support at the right time.

We need to broaden the pipeline of potential postsecondary student success interventions.

The current pipeline for developing and adapting such interventions and then rigorously testing them in an array of settings remains too small to dramatically improve student success. At each point in which students interact with the postsecondary education system, we need to support more intentional innovation among practitioners, researchers, and students themselves to address the barriers that students encounter. In addition, we need to provide institutions with an array of vetted choices, including options at various cost points, to enable scalable, sustainable improvement in student success across the nation.

ATTACHMENT 1: REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – INNOVATION TIER

I. Overview: Our Innovation Tier is designed to support feasibility testing for innovative, proof-of-concept projects that are not yet ready for a more rigorous evaluation but, if successful, could be. Along with defining and standardizing relatively untested interventions, the ultimate goal of the Innovation Tier is to prepare such interventions for more rigorous evaluation that can be seamlessly conducted after successful feasibility testing. Interventions that demonstrate success in achieving fidelity to a model in a real-world setting and can measure key outcomes of interest will be good candidates for follow-on evaluation grants from LJAF. Priority will be given to study designs that include a control or comparison group.

II. Application Process and Selection Criteria:

A. The following table shows the requested application materials and timeline. (The timeline is identical to that for Validation Tier submissions.)

<u>Stage of application process</u>	<u>Date</u>
All prospective applicants are asked to submit a letter of interest (maximum three pages)	Deadline: January 31, 2019
Applicants will be notified on a rolling basis whether they are invited to submit a full proposal (full proposals must be invited)	By March 15, 2019
Invited applicants submit a full proposal (maximum six to ten pages)	Deadline: April 19, 2019
Applicants will be notified whether they have been selected for award	May 2019
Grants will be awarded	June – July 2019

B. Letters of interest and invited full proposals should address each of the selection criteria below, within three pages (for the letter) and six to ten pages (for the proposal). Applicants may use their own format, with single or double spacing, and a font of 11 or larger. The page limit does not include attached letters or other documents specifically requested in this RFP. Please submit all items via email to PostsecInnovation@arnoldfoundation.org.

C. Selection Criteria:

For the letter of interest: While we ask applicants to address all four selection criteria below, we do not expect applicants to have finalized all aspects of the study design and strategy for a follow-up RCT; therefore, reviewers will focus more on the other two criteria, “importance” and “team”, in determining which applicants to invite to submit a full proposal. We will pay particular attention to the experience of the researchers as we understand that applicants may not have finalized all aspects of the partnership agreements.

For the invited full proposal: Reviewers will consider whether all four criteria are satisfied.

- **PROGRAM FUNDER: Will the study evaluate an intervention whose delivery is primarily paid for by another funder, and does that funder, or do other essential parties, agree to the study?** While LJAF may contribute funds toward intervention delivery, we expect we expect such delivery to be paid for primarily by other funders. To verify that the necessary funding and other commitments are in place, the reviewers will look for attached letters or other communications showing that the funders and/or other necessary parties assent to the study. Such agreement(s) may be tentative at the time the letter of interest is submitted, but should be finalized before submission of the full proposal. We especially encourage agreements in which the necessary parties not only assent to the study, but also provide a credible description of how they or others would use the study findings to inform program or policy decisions.

- **IMPORTANCE: Is the applicant proposing to implement an intervention –**
 - **That targets key recognized outcomes of postsecondary success**, such as student learning, enrollment, persistence, completion, time to completion, job placement, and post-college earnings.
 - **That is supported by compelling logic, which is informed by the most relevant and rigorous evidence available, that the intervention has the potential to produce sizable impacts on key recognized outcomes of postsecondary success.** For example, the applicant might (the following examples are for illustrative purposes only):
 - Review the literature on mentoring’s success in improving student persistence, and propose to test a new program that combines the most promising elements of previous models with new services tailored to address additional barriers to student success;
 - Present evidence that childcare is a major barrier to persistence and completion for student parents, and as well as convincing logic that a proposed intervention can improve outcomes by helping parents identify quality providers and navigate academic pathways; or
 - Present rigorous experimental evidence that an intervention has improved outcomes in one setting (e.g., 2-year institutions), and propose to develop and test an adapted version of that intervention in another setting (e.g., a 4-year institution).

- **STUDY DESIGN: Will the applicant’s proposed feasibility study design –**
 - **Deliver an intervention at a small or modest scale in a real world context** (e.g., through a college’s student services center).
 - **Document the key elements of the intervention** (including the program model, training, supervision, and cost), as well as the predetermined population that will receive the intervention, so that future practitioners and researchers will be able to replicate it.
 - **Collect data to show whether the intervention was successfully delivered, in close adherence to its key elements** (e.g., what tasks were performed to implement the intervention and how closely did those tasks match the model; which people were involved in each intervention task; how widespread/intense was the intervention among the population targeted; who among the target population showed up to participate in intervention; what dosage did they receive; and how many completed the intervention).
 - **Measure proximal outcomes** to assess whether the intervention is affecting the elements of behavior the intervention seeks to change (e.g., percent of students enrolling full-time instead of part-time) – ideally measured against a control or comparison group.

- **Demonstrate the ability to measure ultimate outcomes of interest for those receiving the intervention** (*e.g.*, degree completion) that could be used for a more rigorous evaluation.

For further details on what we consider important in a research proposal in the Innovation Tier that is not an RCT, applicants can consult the following [template](#).

➤ **TEAM: Does the applicant’s team include all parties needed to conduct a feasibility study that can transition to an RCT? Such parties include:**

- An experienced practitioner or institutional leader who has successfully implemented an innovative intervention in a real world setting, with documented adherence to the intervention’s key elements.
- One or more researchers who have previously conducted implementation studies and documented key elements of a program model for use in replication studies, and a consultant/advisor who has carried out a well-conducted quasi-experimental design (QED) or RCT, and who will help the team to design the feasibility study so it can flow seamlessly into a more rigorous evaluation.
- Personnel familiar with necessary administrative data who can assist researchers in accessing and understanding the data, if such data will ultimately be needed to measure RCT outcomes.

Note: To verify the existence of such a team, the review panel will look for attached letters or other communication showing, for example, that (a) an appropriate practitioner or institutional leader has agreed to participate in the study; and (b) a data source has agreed to provide the researcher(s) with access to the administrative data needed to measure study outcomes.

➤ **STRATEGY FOR FOLLOW-UP RCT: Does the applicant’s proposal describe a strategy for transitioning to an RCT**, including a statement of approval from the parties mentioned above that an RCT is possible given successful implementation?

D. Other items to include in the letter of interest and invited full proposal:

1. Applicants should specify the amount of funding requested, and, for the full proposal only, attach a one-page project budget that is consistent with LJAF’s indirect cost policy (see attachment 3). To reduce study costs, we encourage the use of administrative data to measure study outcomes. If additional funding from other sources is needed to carry out the study, we request that the applicant’s budget show (i) the total study cost, and (ii) the portion of that cost to be covered by LJAF; and include an attached letter or other communication showing that the additional funding will be in place prior to LJAF’s grant award.

2. Applicants should specify the proposed recipient of the grant award, which we generally expect to be a tax-exempt organization (*e.g.*, nonprofit organization, university, or governmental unit). If an organization is not a tax-exempt organization and is interested in applying, please contact Chase Sackett (see contact information below).

3. Applicants should briefly address how their study meets recognized ethical standards for research with human subjects.

III. What To Expect in the Grant Agreement: We will ask awardees, as a condition of their award,, to –

- **Pre-register the study on the Open Science Framework (OSF) website (<https://osf.io/>)** and, prior to the commencement of the study, upload a copy of the research and analysis plan in their proposal.
- **Provide us with brief phone or email updates on the study's progress on a periodic basis, and before making any key decisions that could materially affect the study's design or implementation.**
- **Submit concise reports on the findings at appropriate intervals.** These reports should make it easy for readers to see the study's main results and gauge their credibility.

- and -

- **Make their datasets and related materials (e.g., survey instruments, code used to clean and analyze datasets) publicly available on the OSF site.** Applicants will be asked to do this within one year of the last data collection, and only to the extent allowed under any confidentiality/privacy protections. If anonymization/de-identification would make data sharing possible, please add a brief section discussing whether extra time and/or funding is needed.

[Note: This list previews the main research-related requirements that will be included in the grant agreement but is not an exhaustive list of the conditions of the award.]

IV. Questions? Please email Chase Sackett, Policy and Advocacy Manager (csackett@arnoldfoundation.org), 202-854-2862.

ATTACHMENT 2: REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – VALIDATION TIER

Overview: Our Validation Tier is designed to fund randomized controlled trials (RCTs) of postsecondary interventions in which:

- (i) LJAF will fund the RCT, and government or another entity will fund most or all costs of intervention delivery; and
- (ii) The RCT meets the additional selection criteria set out below.

Our goal in funding such RCTs is to build the body of postsecondary interventions rigorously shown to produce sizable, sustained effects on important postsecondary education outcomes (such as student learning, college completion, and post-college earnings), and to do so in a cost-effective manner. While the Validation Tier focuses on RCTs, we may also consider certain rigorous quasi-experimental designs when random assignment is not feasible, as discussed under “study design” below.

II. Application Process and Selection Criteria:

A. The following table shows the requested application materials and timeline. (The timeline is identical to that for Innovation Tier submissions.)

<u>Stage of application process</u>	<u>Date</u>
All prospective applicants are asked to submit a letter of interest (maximum three pages)	Deadline: January 31, 2019
Applicants will be notified on a rolling basis whether they are invited to submit a full proposal (full proposals must be invited)	By March 15, 2019
Invited applicants submit a full proposal (maximum six to ten pages)	Deadline: April 19, 2019
Applicants will be notified whether they have been selected for award	May 2019
Grants will be awarded	June - July 2019

B. Letters of interest and invited full proposals should address each of the selection criteria below, within three pages (for the letter) and six to ten pages (for the invited full proposal). Applicants may use their own format, with single or double spacing, and an 11-point font or larger. The page limit does not include attached letters or other documents specifically requested in this RFP. Please submit all items via email to PostsecRCT@arnoldfoundation.org.

C. Selection Criteria:

We ask applicants to address the following four criteria in both the letter of interest and the full proposal. The full proposal should provide more detail (*e.g.*, on the study design) than the letter of interest, and also address any questions or issues identified by LJAF in its invitation to submit a full proposal.

- **PROGRAM FUNDER: Will the RCT evaluate an intervention whose delivery is primarily paid for by another funder, and does that funder, or do other essential parties, agree to the study?** While LJAF may contribute funds toward intervention delivery, we expect such delivery to be paid for primarily by other funders. To verify that the necessary funding and other commitments are in place, the reviewers will look for attached letters or other communications showing that the funders and/or other necessary parties assent to the study, including random assignment. Such agreement(s) may be tentative at the time the letter of interest is submitted, but should be finalized before submission of the full proposal. We especially encourage agreements in which the necessary parties not only assent to the study, but also provide a credible description of how they or others would use the study findings to inform program or policy decisions.

- **IMPORTANCE: Is the applicant proposing to evaluate an intervention in postsecondary education –**
 - **That is backed by highly-promising prior evidence, suggesting it could produce sizable impacts on outcomes of recognized policy importance** – such as student learning, enrollment and persistence in college, degree completion, and post-graduation earnings – and do so in a cost-effective manner. For example, we specifically encourage applications seeking to replicate findings from prior rigorous evaluations that are especially promising but not yet conclusive (*e.g.*, due to only short-term follow-up, a single-site study design, or well-matched comparison groups but not randomization). As a threshold condition for “highly promising” evidence, applicants should show that the intervention can be or (preferably) has been successfully delivered under real-world implementation conditions.
 - or -
 - **For which there are other compelling reasons to evaluate its effectiveness – *e.g.*, it is, or soon will be, widely implemented with significant taxpayer investment, and its impact on its targeted outcomes is currently unknown.**

Please note that, to meet this criterion, it is not sufficient to establish that the study addresses an important problem; applicants must also present compelling reasons to evaluate the specific intervention.

- **EXPERIENCED RESEARCHER: Does the applicant’s team include at least one researcher in a key substantive role who has previously carried out a well-conducted RCT?** A well-conducted RCT is characterized, for example, by low sample attrition, sufficient sample size, close adherence to random assignment, and valid outcome measures and statistical analyses. To address this criterion, applicants should submit reports from prior RCTs that the researcher has conducted (please send the full study reports as email attachments to the letter of interest – no more than two reports in all). Reviewers will rely primarily on these reports in assessing this selection criterion.

- **STUDY DESIGN: Is the applicant’s proposed RCT design valid?** In other words, does it have a sufficiently large sample (as shown through a power analysis) and other elements needed to generate credible evidence about the program’s impact on one or more targeted outcomes of high policy importance? We strongly encourage designs that measure such outcomes in both the short and medium term (*e.g.*, college enrollment and persistence) and the longer-term (*e.g.*, degree or certificate completion and, if positive effects are found, workforce earnings), to determine whether the effects endure long enough to constitute meaningful improvement in participants’ lives. We also encourage designs that will generate at least a basic estimate of program cost relative to the control group, so as to enable a rudimentary cost-effectiveness analysis. Reviewers, in assessing an

applicant's proposed design, will use [Key Items to Get Right When Conducting RCTs of Social Programs](#) as a reference.

Applicants, as part of their discussion of this criterion, should specify the study's primary outcome(s) of interest; how they will measure the outcome(s) and over what length of time; and what analyses they plan to conduct (*e.g.*, any subgroups to be examined, regression methods to be used).

While our Validation Tier generally seeks to fund RCT evaluations, we may consider submissions for rigorous quasi-experimental evaluations if the applicant can make a convincing case that a RCT is not feasible. In such cases, we ask applicants – in addition to addressing the design elements above (*e.g.*, sizable sample, important outcomes, extended follow-up) – to show that the proposed study adheres closely to the design features empirically shown to increase the likelihood of a valid quasi-experimental finding, as described in this [overview document](#).

D. Other items to include in the letter of interest and invited full proposal:

1. **Applicants should specify the amount of funding requested**, and, for the full proposal only, attach a one-page project budget that is consistent with LJAF's indirect cost policy (see attachment 3). To reduce study costs, we encourage the use of administrative data (*e.g.*, National Student Clearinghouse data, state wage records) to measure key study outcomes, wherever feasible, in lieu of more expensive original data collection. In addition, if the applicant proposes any implementation research to complement the RCT, we suggest streamlined approaches that do not greatly increase the overall study cost. If additional funding from other sources is needed to carry out the study, we request that the applicant's budget show (i) the total study cost, and (ii) the portion of that cost to be covered by LJAF; and include an attached letter or other communication showing that the additional funding will be in place prior to LJAF's grant award.
2. **Applicants should specify the proposed recipient of the grant award, which we generally expect to be a tax-exempt organization** (*e.g.*, nonprofit organization, university, or governmental unit). If an organization is not tax-exempt and wishes to apply, please contact Erin Crossett, Evidence-Based Policy Manager (see contact information below).
3. **Applicants should briefly address how their study meets recognized ethical standards for research with human subjects.**

III. What To Expect in the Grant Agreement: We will ask awardees, as a condition of their award, to –

- **Pre-register the study on the Open Science Framework (OSF) [website](https://osf.io/)** (<https://osf.io/>) and, prior to commencement of the study, upload a copy of the research and analysis plan described in their proposal.
- **Provide us with brief phone or email updates on the study's progress on a periodic basis, and before making any key decisions that could materially affect the study's design or implementation.**
- **Submit concise reports on the impact findings at appropriate intervals.** These reports should make it easy for readers to see the study's main results and gauge their credibility (*e.g.*, by showing the similarity of the treatment and control groups in pre-program characteristics, the amount of sample attrition, and the statistical significance of the impact findings).

- and -

- **Make their datasets and related materials (e.g., survey instruments, code used to clean and analyze datasets) publicly available on the OSF site.** We ask applicants to do this within one year of the last data collection, and only to the extent allowed under any confidentiality/privacy protections.

[Note: The above list previews the main items in the grant agreement, but is not an exhaustive list of the conditions of the award.]

IV. Questions? Please contact Erin Crossett, Evidence-Based Policy Manager at ECrossett@arnoldfoundation.org, 202-655-2022.

ATTACHMENT 3: INDIRECT COST POLICY

Effective February 1, 2018

Policy Purpose

The Laura and John Arnold Foundation (“LJAF”) requires that any resources awarded by LJAF to an organization be dedicated to the costs necessary to accomplish the charitable, educational, or scientific purpose of a grant.

Direct & Indirect Cost Definitions

LJAF permits grantees to request funding for all of the direct costs associated with a project, including salaries and federally required benefits for employees, travel, meetings and conferences, data access fees, and payments to third-party consultants and sub-grantees that are directly attributable to or created specifically for the purpose supported by a particular grant. Moreover, LJAF also recognizes that in order to successfully accomplish the purpose of a grant, grantees often need additional financial support to cover a portion of their indirect costs. LJAF’s Indirect Cost Policy (the “Policy”) defines indirect costs as organizational costs incurred for a common or joint purpose benefitting more than one project and not exclusively attributable to or created for the project supported by a particular LJAF grant. Please see Appendix A for examples of indirect costs covered under this Policy.

Allowable Indirect Cost Rates

The Policy permits **institutions of higher education**, including community colleges, **to receive an indirect cost rate of 15 percent (15%)** of total direct project costs; **all other organizations (e.g., non-profit, governmental, for-profit, etc.) may receive an indirect cost rate of 20 percent (20%)** of total direct project costs.^{1,2}

Requirements

For each grant proposal, grantees must provide: (i) a project budget, (ii) a corresponding budget narrative that clearly outlines and defines³ the total direct project costs, and (iii) fringe rate calculation detail for all personnel allocated to the project within the project budget.

Each new grant request received by LJAF will be independently reviewed and approved subject to the provisions set forth in this Policy. LJAF maintains the sole discretion to determine the approved classification of direct and indirect costs for each grant.

Please contact Bridget Williamson, LJAF’s Grants Budget Manager, at BWilliamson@arnoldfoundation.org with any questions regarding this Policy.

¹ Grants with the primary purpose of providing general operating support are not subject to this Policy.

² Third-party consulting or subcontract expenses, sub-awards, and tuition (if applicable) shall not be included as part of the total direct project cost base for the indirect cost calculation.

³ Please review LJAF’s Budget Template for additional guidelines.

Appendix A
Examples of Indirect Costs

The examples listed in this Appendix A are for general guidance. The list is not exhaustive, and LJAF, in its sole discretion, will make the final determination on the approved classification of direct and indirect costs for each grant.

Expense Type	Indirect Expense Examples
Personnel	Executive Management (e.g., CEO, COO, CFO, etc.) and Central Operational Functions (e.g., Accounting, HR, IT, Legal, etc.) ⁴
Consultants	Contracted work for general operational functions (e.g., legal work or audits)
Travel and Accommodations	Any travel not required to achieve the grant’s purpose; accommodation costs over and above the market rate for a specific area
Equipment	Equipment that can be used by an institution for other purposes or projects (e.g., computers, telephones, office furniture)
Rent	Office space rental, utilities, and communications associated with Central Operational Functions (i.e., rent expenses incurred whether or not the subject grant is awarded)
Other	All materials and supplies used for more than one purpose or project, printing and postage costs, memberships and subscriptions, hardware and software programs for general operational functions, organizational insurance, etc.

Note: Direct and indirect costs awarded to grantees may only be used for charitable, educational, and/or scientific purposes as such purposes are generally defined by those authorities interpreting the provisions of Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code, and may not be used to carry on propaganda, influence legislation, fund any political campaign, influence the outcome of any election, carry on any voter registration drives, or violate any applicable local, state, federal, or foreign law.

⁴ To the extent members of an executive management team are contributing to the project beyond their normal role as an organizational leader, a grantee may request a direct allocation with a corresponding justification explaining the additional contributions of such individuals.

ATTACHMENT 4: FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

How many awards will be given out through this RFP? What is the total available funding?

LJAF will award up to \$10 million under this RFP, depending on the availability of high-quality projects. We do not have a firm limit on the amount of awards.

What is the maximum allowable budget for each grant award?

We do not have a maximum allowable budget for each grant award, but encourage applicants to conduct studies at low or modest cost whenever feasible. Applicants should propose a budget that adequately addresses the needs of the research project. If you are invited to submit a full proposal based on your LOI, we will send a template that outlines LJAF's standard budget requirements.

Does LJAF require matched funding?

No, LJAF will fund all budget items related to the study that meet the criteria of the RFP. You may list alternative funding streams as indicators of the feasibility, success, and sustainability of the project. In general, applicants are expected to secure other funds to pay for delivery of the intervention, but in some cases LJAF may contribute funding toward such delivery as described under both the Innovation and Validation Tiers.

Is there a limit on the grant performance period or study timeline?

Format requirements for the LOI are specified on pages 4 (Innovation Tier) and 8 (Validation Tier). Although LJAF does not have a template for LOIs, we recommend that applicants use headings and subheadings that reflect the four criteria outlined in the RFP. If you are invited to submit a full proposal, LJAF will circulate a template for the line-item budget.

Can a single organization and/or department submit more than one LOI?

Yes.

Can universities serve as research partners?

Yes.

Does LJAF require institutional review board (IRB) clearance for all studies?

All studies should adhere to the appropriate compliance and ethical standards. If it is relevant to your proposed study, please include references to any IRB considerations and timelines in the LOI or invited full proposal.

Should applications include letters of support in the LOIs?

Letters of support are not required for the LOI. However, if you have received letters or other indications of support from key partners before the January 31 deadline, please submit them as appendices, which do not count toward the page limit. For full proposals, we highly recommend letters of support that demonstrate a commitment from partners.

Will this RFP or a similar RFP be released again, or is this a one-time call?

We will continue to support work in this area and expect that there could be additional funding opportunities, including the release of a similar RFP, in the future. LJAF also issues other RFPs to fund rigorous research, both periodically and on a rolling basis. To learn more about these opportunities, please sign up for [our email distribution list here](#).