EdGame – Estimation Reasoning v2.0

This document explains the assumptions and calculations behind the quantitative estimates in the EdGame v2.0 Business Model Canvas. All estimates are grounded in competitor benchmarks, real-world EdTech data, and lessons from the top 20 companies in this space.

Executive Summary

EdGame transforms Math and Science assessment through immersive game environments that capture behavioral data traditional assessments miss. Unlike the original plan (which attempted everything at once), this version follows the beachhead strategy every successful EdTech company has used:

Strategic pivot: Start narrow (Math + Science, GCC + US Charter schools), prove value with 3 polished environments, then expand.

Year 5 targets (revised downward for realism):

- **$10.3M ARR** (vs. original $24.8M — 58% reduction)
- **~12,000 paid individual teachers** (vs. original ~35,000)
- **~550 school licenses** (vs. original ~800)
- **~50 districts** (vs. original ~150)
- **~8,000 parent subscribers** (vs. original ~15,000)
- **25+ game environments** (vs. original 50+)
- **18% operating margin** (vs. original 36% — more realistic for growth stage)

---

1. Why the Original Estimates Were Wrong

Problem 1: "Build Everything at Once"

The original plan called for 50+ game environments, multiplayer from Day 1, parent portals, district sales, and OEM APIs — all by Year 5. This is how EdTech startups fail. Every successful EdTech company started narrow:

- **Prodigy**: Math only, one game format, took 8 years to reach $100M ARR
- **Kahoot!**: Quizzes only, no analytics initially
- **Duolingo**: Language only, mobile-first, added features over 10 years

Problem 2: Overestimated Market Penetration

The original claimed ~35,000 paid teachers and ~800 schools by Year 5. This assumed 2-3% market penetration across all subjects globally — unrealistic for a startup with no brand recognition or efficacy data.

Problem 3: Underestimated Cost of Quality

Building 50+ high-quality game environments requires either massive engineering teams or compromised quality. Classcraft took years to build ~10 environments. EdGame's original team of 35 couldn't produce 50 environments at the required fidelity.

Problem 4: Overstated Operating Margins

The original claimed 36% operating margin at Year 5. This is unrealistic for a growth-stage EdTech still investing in content, R&D, and sales. IXL's margins are ~35% at $500M+ revenue; expecting similar margins at $10M is optimistic.

---

2. Market Sizing (Revised)

Total Addressable Market (TAM)

Market	Schools	Teachers	Students	Notes
GCC private/international K-12	~5,000	~150,000	~2M	UAE, KSA, Qatar, Kuwait, Bahrain, Oman
US charter + progressive private	~8,000	~200,000	~3M	Innovation-oriented schools
US public middle/high	~25,000	~800,000	~20M	Math/Science teachers only
UK state + independent	~8,000	~250,000	~6M	Math/Science focus
Total addressable	**~46,000**	**~1.4M**	**~31M**	Math/Science only

Serviceable Addressable Market (SAM)

Segment	Size	% of TAM	Notes
Schools with tech infrastructure + budget	~15,000	33%	Eliminate low-tech and budget-constrained
Teachers willing to adopt new assessment tools	~400,000	29%	Early adopter / early majority
Students in Math/Science courses	~20M	65%	All students take these subjects

Serviceable Obtainable Market (SOM) — Year 5

Metric	Target	% of SAM	Justification
Schools	550	3.7%	Comparable to Classcraft's peak school count
Districts	50	~1% of US districts	Conservative expansion rate
Individual teachers	12,000	3%	Freemium funnel: 100K free → 12K paid
Parent subscribers	8,000	0.04% of parents	Small but growing B2C segment

---

3. Competitive Positioning

Direct Competitors (Game-based Learning)

Competitor	Focus	Strengths	Weaknesses	EdGame Advantage
Prodigy (120M students)	Math K-8	Scale, brand, adaptive	Single format, limited analytics	Behavioral depth, STEM-wide

Classcraft (closed June 2024)	Behavior/engagement	Immersive, multiplayer	Couldn't monetize B2C pivot	Fill the enterprise gap they left
Legends of Learning	Math/Science	Broad game catalog	Low engagement, shallow analytics	Quality over quantity
DragonBox	Math K-6	Conceptual depth	Limited to math, no multiplayer	Expand to science, add collaboration
Adventure Academy	Multi-subject	High production value	Consumer-only, no school tools	Enterprise-first with B2C upside

Indirect Competitors (Assessment/Analytics)

Competitor	Focus	Pricing	EdGame Advantage
IXL	Drill-based practice	$12-20/student/year	Engagement + behavioral depth
Kahoot!	Live quizzes	$10-20/teacher/month	Richer analytics, async play
Formative	Live assessment	$15/student/year	Game-based engagement
Edulastic	Standards-aligned assessment	$8-12/student/year	Behavioral insights beyond correctness

Pricing Rationale

EdGame's $6-10/student/year undercuts IXL ($12-20) while delivering differentiated value (behavioral analytics). This penetration pricing is appropriate for a new entrant without efficacy data. Prices increase 20-30% annually as value is proven and switching costs increase.

---

4. Financial Model (5-Year)

Revenue Projections

Year	Teachers (paid)	Schools	Districts	Parents	ARR
Year 1	500	35	0	0	$255K
Year 2	2,500	100	5	500	$1.1M
Year 3	4,000	230	15	3,000	$2.7M
Year 4	8,000	400	35	5,500	$5.8M
Year 5	12,000	550	50	8,000	$10.3M

Year 1 Revenue Breakdown

Stream	Calculation	Revenue
Individual Teacher Pro	500 teachers × $120/year	$60,000
School Standard	35 schools × 500 students × $6	$105,000
School Premium	15 schools (subset) × 600 students × $10	$90,000
Total Year 1		**$255,000**

Year 5 Revenue Breakdown

Stream	Calculation	Revenue
Individual Teacher Pro	12,000 × $180 avg	$2,160,000
School Standard	350 schools × 550 students × $8	$1,540,000
School Premium	200 schools × 650 students × $14	$1,820,000
District packages	50 × 4,000 students × $6	$1,200,000
Parent premium	8,000 × $80	$640,000
After-school programs	400 programs × $400 × 12	$1,920,000
OEM API	4 partners × $120K	$480,000
Custom + data licensing		$500,000
Total Year 5		**$10,260,000**

---

5. Cost Projections (5-Year)

Year 1 Costs (MVP Phase)

Category	Monthly	Annual	Notes
Cloud Infrastructure	$1,500	$18,000	Supabase + Vercel + CDN
Software/Licenses	$500	$6,000	Cursor, Claude API, design tools
Founder salaries	$0	$0	Deferred until seed funding
One contractor (game art)	$3,000	$36,000	Part-time asset creation
Travel (GCC schools)	$800	$10,000	Direct school visits
Conferences	-	$15,000	GESS Dubai + 1 US conference
Marketing/content	$600	$7,000	Teacher community engagement
Misc/buffer	$450	$5,000	Legal, accounting basics
Total Year 1	**$6,850**	**~$97,000**	

Year 1 net margin: $255K revenue - $97K costs = **$158K operating surplus** (reinvested)

Year 5 Costs (Scale Phase)

Category	Annual	% of Revenue
Engineering & R&D (12 FTEs)	$2,100,000	20%
Game Design & Content (9 FTEs)	$1,100,000	11%
Cloud Infrastructure	$1,000,000	10%
Sales & Marketing	$2,200,000	21%
Customer Success (6 FTEs)	$800,000	8%
Research & Curriculum	$300,000	3%
G&A	$900,000	9%
Total Year 5	**$8,400,000**	**82%**

Year 5 operating margin: $10.3M - $8.4M = **$1.9M (18%)**

---

6. Team Growth (5-Year)

Role	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Founders (CEO, CTO)	2	2	2	2	2
Engineering	0	3	6	9	12
Game Design	0	2	4	6	7
Content/Curriculum	0	1	2	3	4
Sales (AEs + BDRs)	0	2	5	8	10
Customer Success	0	1	3	5	6
Marketing	0	1	2	3	4
G&A (ops, finance)	0	0	2	3	4
Total	**2**	**12**	**26**	**39**	**49**

Year 1 reality: 2 founders augmented by AI tools (Cursor, Claude Code) can build the MVP. One part-time contractor for game art. This is how successful EdTech companies start — Prodigy and Kahoot! both began with tiny founding teams.

---

7. Behavioral Metrics (Core 15 for Phase 1)

The original plan listed 40+ metrics. This is overwhelming for teachers and expensive to compute. Phase 1 focuses on 15 core metrics that answer: "What do I do Monday morning?"

Engagement Metrics (5)

Metric	Description	Teacher Action
Time on task	Minutes actively engaged per session	Identify disengaged students
Session frequency	Sessions per week	Track consistency
Completion rate	% of assigned activities finished	Spot procrastinators
Voluntary replay	Games replayed without assignment	Find intrinsic motivation
Drop-off point	Where students quit mid-activity	Identify frustration triggers

Performance Metrics (5)

Metric	Description	Teacher Action
Accuracy by concept	% correct per topic/standard	Target reteaching
Speed vs. accuracy tradeoff	Fast + wrong vs. slow + right	Identify guessing
Error pattern	Common mistake types	Design interventions
Improvement trajectory	Performance change over time	Track growth
Mastery threshold	Concepts meeting proficiency	Curriculum pacing

Behavioral Metrics (5)

Metric	Description	Teacher Action
Help-seeking	How often hints/resources used	Find struggling students
Persistence	Retry count after failure	Measure grit
Strategy variation	Different approaches tried	Assess problem-solving
Response to feedback	Behavior after corrections	Gauge receptiveness
Collaboration style (Phase 2)	Leader/follower/independent	Team formation

Phase 2 Expansion (15 additional)

- Communication frequency and quality in multiplayer
- Peer assistance patterns
- Competition response (motivation vs. anxiety)
- Subject-specific metrics (calculation precision, scientific reasoning)
- Social dynamics and team role classification

---

8. Technical Milestones

Phase 1 Milestones (Year 1)

Milestone	Month	Deliverable

MVP Launch	3	1 game environment (Math Challenge), basic teacher dashboard, Supabase + Vercel
School Pilots	4	10 school pilots launched in GCC
Second Environment	6	Virtual Chemistry Lab deployed
Analytics v1.0	6	15 core metrics with "top 3 insights" teacher summary
Third Environment	9	Physics Simulation deployed
Mobile-Responsive	10	All environments work on tablets (Chromebook-ready)
Google Classroom	12	LTI integration for frictionless assignment
Efficacy Study	12	IRB-approved study with university partner

Phase 2 Milestones (Year 2)

Milestone	Quarter	Deliverable
Multiplayer v1	Q1	Cooperative modes in 2 environments
Mobile Apps	Q2	iOS and Android native apps
Parent Portal	Q2	Basic behavioral insights for parents
Environments 4-8	Q2-Q3	5 new Math/Science environments
Analytics v2.0	Q3	30+ metrics, ML-powered insights
Clever Integration	Q4	US school distribution channel

Phase 3 Milestones (Year 3-5)

Milestone	Year	Deliverable
Environments 9-15	Y3	Expand to Language Arts
District Analytics	Y3	Cross-school benchmarking
Competitive Multiplayer	Y3	Ranked modes, tournaments
Environments 16-25+	Y4-5	Social Studies, expansion subjects
OEM API	Y4	Embed analytics in partner LMS
SDK	Y5	External developers can create environments

---

9. Risk Analysis

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation

School sales cycles too long	High	High	Start with GCC private (fast procurement), use PLG for teacher acquisition
Game quality not compelling	Medium	High	Co-design with pilot teachers, iterate rapidly on engagement metrics
Behavioral data doesn't drive action	Medium	High	Focus on "top 3 insights" not data overload; measure teacher behavior change
Competition from Prodigy/IXL	Medium	Medium	Differentiate on behavioral depth, not breadth; own the enterprise gap Classcraft left
COPPA/FERPA compliance issues	Low	High	Partner with Ed-Fi or privacy-focused infrastructure from Day 1
Multiplayer scaling issues	Medium	Medium	Defer multiplayer to Phase 2; start single-player for reliability
Team burnout (2 founders)	High	Medium	Aggressive AI tool usage; hire first engineer by Month 6 if funded

---

10. Funding Strategy

Pre-Seed (Current)

- **Raise**: $0 (bootstrapped MVP)
- **Use**: 3 game environments, basic analytics, 50+ school pilots
- **Milestone**: $20K MRR, 10 paid schools

Seed (Month 12-15)

- **Raise**: $1.5M-2.5M
- **Use**: First 10 hires (engineering, sales, content), multiplayer infrastructure, mobile apps
- **Milestone**: $80K MRR, 100+ paid schools, efficacy study published

Series A (Year 2-3)

- **Raise**: $8M-12M
- **Use**: Scale to 30+ team, US market expansion, district sales motion
- **Milestone**: $200K+ MRR, 200+ schools, 10+ districts

Series B (Year 4-5)

- **Raise**: $25M-40M
- **Use**: 50+ team, OEM partnerships, international expansion beyond GCC/US
- **Milestone**: $800K+ MRR, 500+ schools, pathway to $50M ARR

---

11. Success Metrics by Phase

Phase 1 Success (End of Year 1)

Metric	Target	Stretch
ARR	$255K	$350K

Paid schools	35	50
Paid teachers	500	800
Free teachers	5,000	8,000
Active students	25,000	40,000
Game environments	3	4
NPS (teachers)	40+	50+
Daily active rate	30%	40%

Phase 2 Success (End of Year 3)

Metric	Target	Stretch
ARR	$2.7M	$3.5M
Schools	230	300
Districts	15	25
Parent subscribers	3,000	5,000
Game environments	12	15
Efficacy studies published	2	3

Phase 3 Success (End of Year 5)

Metric	Target	Stretch
ARR	$10.3M	$15M
Schools + Districts	600	800
Operating margin	18%	22%
OEM partners	4	6

This document reflects a fundamental recalibration of the EdGame strategy based on what actually works in EdTech. The core thesis — behavioral analytics through game-based learning — is preserved and remains differentiated. The path to getting there is now realistic, phased, and grounded in competitive benchmarks.