Category 1: 2026 Social Challenges Cards

Societal Challenge Cards document broad social, economic, ecological, and political conditions that create the context within which immersive learning futures will unfold. Each card carries a Circle of Scholars Part I snapshot and a community evidence Part II. The card set reflects the Vision 2035 foresight horizon and is reviewed annually.

SC: Sustainability

PART I — FORESIGHT SNAPSHOT | SC: Sustainability | Fixed Time-Stamped Synthesis

2026 SC: Sustainability

Card Type	Societal Challenge
Series	Immersive Futures Guild — Vision 2035
Layer	1 — Atomic Foresight Object
Status	Active
Confidence	Medium
Workshop	Circle of Scholars — January 2026
Facilitator	Circle of Scholars Workshop Team
Tags	sustainability | ecology | infrastructure | layer1 | sc
Tally.so Form	https://tally.so/r/ilrn-if-sc-sustainability-2026

The convergence of ecological crisis with technology development creates both pressure and opportunity for immersive learning systems. Digital infrastructure carries environmental costs — data centers, device manufacturing, and energy consumption — that must be accounted for in the design of immersive learning ecosystems. Simultaneously, immersive technologies offer capabilities for environmental education, remote collaboration (reducing travel footprint), and simulation of ecological systems otherwise impossible to experience directly.

Key Drivers / Contributing Conditions:

- Climate emergency acceleration and institutional net-zero commitments
- Device lifecycle, e-waste, and hardware supply chain concerns
- Energy costs of cloud-rendered and AI-assisted XR at scale
- Growing learner and institutional demand for sustainability accounting in EdTech

Educational and Design Implications:

- Carbon accounting requirements for virtual campuses and XR deployments
- Pedagogical opportunities in immersive ecological and climate simulation

- Design tension between digital access expansion and digital footprint reduction

Tensions Carried Forward to Part II:

- Can immersive learning claim sustainability benefits without comprehensive lifecycle accounting?
- How should institutions weigh digital footprint against travel-reduction benefits of virtual conferencing?

Linked Scenarios / Strands: See cross-links above

Ways of Knowing: Tree · Garden · Lantern

PART II — COMMUNITY EVIDENCE & DIALOGUE TRACK | SC: Sustainability | H2 2026 — Living

T	COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTION FORM — SC: Sustainability Submit case examples, methodological challenges, cultural perspectives, and proposed evidence criteria via: https://tally.so/r/ilrn-if-sc-sustainability-2026

Part II — Scope and Instructions
This section collects community responses, case examples, and challenges to the Part I foresight snapshot above.
It opens July 1, 2026 and undergoes synthesis review in September 2026, November 2026, and January 2027.
Contributions are submitted via the Tally.so form above and appear in the registers below after editorial review.
The Part I text is not modified in response to Part II contributions; it is versioned at the Annual Handoff review.
Contribution categories: Case Example | Methodological Challenge | Cultural/Community Perspective | Proposed Evidence Criterion
Ways of Knowing accepted: Tree (evidence) | Garden (practice) | Lantern (futures)

Tensions Open for Community Response:

- Can immersive learning claim sustainability benefits without comprehensive lifecycle accounting?
- How should institutions weigh digital footprint against travel-reduction benefits of virtual conferencing?

Contributor / Date	Category	Way of Knowing	Contribution Summary
[Awaiting contributions — form opens July 1, 2026]			

SC: Digital Wellbeing

PART I — FORESIGHT SNAPSHOT | SC: Digital Wellbeing | Fixed Time-Stamped Synthesis

2026 SC: Digital Wellbeing

Card Type	Societal Challenge
Series	Immersive Futures Guild — Vision 2035
Layer	1 — Atomic Foresight Object
Status	Active
Confidence	Medium
Workshop	Circle of Scholars — January 2026
Facilitator	Circle of Scholars Workshop Team
Tags	wellbeing | mental-health | design-ethics | layer1 | sc
Tally.so Form	https://tally.so/r/ilrn-if-sc-dw-2026

The proliferation of screen-mediated, immersive, and always-on digital environments raises significant questions about cognitive load, attention regulation, social development, and mental health — particularly for children, adolescents, and neurodivergent learners. Immersive learning systems must be designed with awareness of these dynamics rather than assuming that engagement metrics are equivalent to wellbeing indicators.

Key Drivers / Contributing Conditions:

- Youth mental health research documenting screen-time effects
- Attention economy critique applied to educational technology
- Emerging evidence on XR-specific side effects including cybersickness and social isolation
- Institutional and parental demand for digital wellness frameworks

Educational and Design Implications:

- Design requirements for attention-safe and load-aware XR
- Research needs in XR-specific wellbeing and recovery
- Risk of engagement optimization displacing wellbeing considerations

Tensions Carried Forward to Part II:

- Where is the design boundary between productive immersive challenge and harmful cognitive overload?
- Can wellbeing be meaningfully measured in immersive learning contexts with current tools?

Linked Scenarios / Strands: See cross-links above

Ways of Knowing: Tree · Garden · Lantern

PART II — COMMUNITY EVIDENCE & DIALOGUE TRACK | SC: Digital Wellbeing | H2 2026 — Living

T	COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTION FORM — SC: Digital Wellbeing Submit case examples, methodological challenges, cultural perspectives, and proposed evidence criteria via: https://tally.so/r/ilrn-if-sc-dw-2026

Part II — Scope and Instructions
This section collects community responses, case examples, and challenges to the Part I foresight snapshot above.
It opens July 1, 2026 and undergoes synthesis review in September 2026, November 2026, and January 2027.
Contributions are submitted via the Tally.so form above and appear in the registers below after editorial review.
The Part I text is not modified in response to Part II contributions; it is versioned at the Annual Handoff review.
Contribution categories: Case Example | Methodological Challenge | Cultural/Community Perspective | Proposed Evidence Criterion
Ways of Knowing accepted: Tree (evidence) | Garden (practice) | Lantern (futures)

Tensions Open for Community Response:

- Where is the design boundary between productive immersive challenge and harmful cognitive overload?
- Can wellbeing be meaningfully measured in immersive learning contexts with current tools?

Contributor / Date	Category	Way of Knowing	Contribution Summary
[Awaiting contributions — form opens July 1, 2026]			

SC: Equity

PART I — FORESIGHT SNAPSHOT | SC: Equity | Fixed Time-Stamped Synthesis

SC: Equity

Card Type	Societal Challenge
Series	Immersive Futures Guild — Vision 2035
Layer	1 — Atomic Foresight Object
Status	Active
Confidence	Medium
Workshop	Circle of Scholars — January 2026
Facilitator	Circle of Scholars Workshop Team
Tags	equity | access | justice | layer1 | sc
Tally.so Form	https://tally.so/r/ilrn-if-sc-equity-2026

Access to immersive learning technologies is unevenly distributed across geographic, economic, racial, and linguistic lines. The benefits of XR, AI, and spatial computing are not automatically democratizing — without deliberate design and policy intervention, they risk reinforcing existing educational inequalities or creating new ones. Equity in the Guild Codex is treated as a structural condition, not a value to be balanced against other considerations.

Key Drivers / Contributing Conditions:

- Hardware cost and availability disparities across regions and income groups
- Bandwidth and infrastructure inequality in rural and Global South contexts
- Cultural and linguistic content gaps in commercial XR platforms
- Teacher capacity inequalities as an equity multiplier

Educational and Design Implications:

- Mandatory equity impact assessment for Guild-affiliated immersive projects
- Low-cost and offline-capable design as a first-class requirement
- Geographic Chapters as organizational equity mechanism

Tensions Carried Forward to Part II:

- How should iLRN weigh conference XR investments against equity implications for under-resourced members?
- When does 'accessible design' satisfy equity requirements versus perpetuating a two-tier system?

Linked Scenarios / Strands: See cross-links above

Ways of Knowing: Tree · Garden · Lantern

PART II — COMMUNITY EVIDENCE & DIALOGUE TRACK | SC: Equity | H2 2026 — Living

T	COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTION FORM — SC: Equity Submit case examples, methodological challenges, cultural perspectives, and proposed evidence criteria via: https://tally.so/r/ilrn-if-sc-equity-2026

Part II — Scope and Instructions
This section collects community responses, case examples, and challenges to the Part I foresight snapshot above.
It opens July 1, 2026 and undergoes synthesis review in September 2026, November 2026, and January 2027.
Contributions are submitted via the Tally.so form above and appear in the registers below after editorial review.
The Part I text is not modified in response to Part II contributions; it is versioned at the Annual Handoff review.
Contribution categories: Case Example | Methodological Challenge | Cultural/Community Perspective | Proposed Evidence Criterion
Ways of Knowing accepted: Tree (evidence) | Garden (practice) | Lantern (futures)

Tensions Open for Community Response:

- How should iLRN weigh conference XR investments against equity implications for under-resourced members?
- When does 'accessible design' satisfy equity requirements versus perpetuating a two-tier system?

Contributor / Date	Category	Way of Knowing	Contribution Summary
[Awaiting contributions — form opens July 1, 2026]			

SC: Care, Culture, & Community

SC: Care, Culture, & Community

Card Type	Societal Challenge
Series	Immersive Futures Guild — Vision 2035
Layer	1 — Atomic Foresight Object
Status	Active
Confidence	Medium
Workshop	Circle of Scholars — January 14, 2026
Facilitator	Fridolin Wild
Tags	care | culture | community | indigenous | layer1 | sc
Tally.so Form	https://tally.so/r/ilrn-if-sc-ccc-2026

Education is embedded in cultural and community contexts that resist reduction to scalable digital solutions. Immersive learning systems designed without attention to local culture, community relationships, and care infrastructures risk producing technically sophisticated but socially harmful interventions. This card documents the Circle of Scholars position — from the January 14, 2026 workshop facilitated by Fridolin Wild — that care, cultural grounding, and community stewardship are first-order design and governance requirements, not optional ethical additions. The care-as-attentional-responsibility framing developed in that workshop holds that immersive technologies shape how people attend to one another, how cultures are represented or transformed, and how communities are formed or fragmented.

Key Drivers / Contributing Conditions:

- Communal learning traditions in non-Western and Indigenous contexts
- Cultural protocol requirements for representation and knowledge sovereignty
- Social isolation risks of individualized immersive experiences
- Community governance gaps in persistent immersive environments

Educational and Design Implications:

- Community co-design as a prerequisite rather than enhancement
- Cultural competence requirements for avatar, environment, and narrative design
- Stewardship models for immersive environments beyond single deployments

Tensions Carried Forward to Part II:

- Can care be meaningfully designed into a system, or does it only emerge through sustained relational practice?
- When does 'community engagement' become performative rather than substantive?
- How should responsibility be allocated when emergent community use transforms designed intent?

Linked Scenarios / Strands: See cross-links above

Ways of Knowing: Tree · Garden · Lantern

PART II — COMMUNITY EVIDENCE & DIALOGUE TRACK | SC: Care, Culture, & Community | H2 2026 — Living

T	COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTION FORM — SC: Care, Culture, & Community Submit case examples, methodological challenges, cultural perspectives, and proposed evidence criteria via: https://tally.so/r/ilrn-if-sc-ccc-2026

Part II — Scope and Instructions
This section collects community responses, case examples, and challenges to the Part I foresight snapshot above.
It opens July 1, 2026 and undergoes synthesis review in September 2026, November 2026, and January 2027.
Contributions are submitted via the Tally.so form above and appear in the registers below after editorial review.
The Part I text is not modified in response to Part II contributions; it is versioned at the Annual Handoff review.
Contribution categories: Case Example | Methodological Challenge | Cultural/Community Perspective | Proposed Evidence Criterion
Ways of Knowing accepted: Tree (evidence) | Garden (practice) | Lantern (futures)

Tensions Open for Community Response:

- Can care be meaningfully designed into a system, or does it only emerge through sustained relational practice?
- When does 'community engagement' become performative rather than substantive?
- How should responsibility be allocated when emergent community use transforms designed intent?

Contributor / Date	Category	Way of Knowing	Contribution Summary
[Awaiting contributions — form opens July 1, 2026]			

SC: Research Integrity Under Pressure

PART I — FORESIGHT SNAPSHOT | SC: Research Integrity Under Pressure | Fixed Time-Stamped Synthesis

SC: Research Integrity Under Pressure

Card Type	Societal Challenge
Series	Immersive Futures Guild — Vision 2035
Layer	1 — Atomic Foresight Object
Status	Active
Confidence	Medium
Workshop	Circle of Scholars — January 2026
Facilitator	Circle of Scholars Workshop Team
Tags	research-integrity | evidence | methodology | layer1 | sc
Tally.so Form	https://tally.so/r/ilrn-if-sc-ri-2026

The combination of commercial incentive, rapid technology cycles, and publication pressure creates conditions in which research quality in immersive learning is under significant and documented strain. Underpowered studies, outcome measure inconsistency, publication bias toward positive findings, and vendor-funded research all contribute to an evidence base that is thinner and more contested than is typically acknowledged in introductory claims. The iLRN Knowledge Tree is, in part, a direct infrastructure response to this challenge.

Key Drivers / Contributing Conditions:

- Vendor-academic entanglement and conflict of interest normalization
- Publication bias and replication crisis in educational technology research
- Outcome measure fragmentation preventing cumulative synthesis
- Pressure to demonstrate impact on short institutional timescales

Educational and Design Implications:

- Pre-registration norms and conflict of interest disclosure standards
- Investment in replication studies and null-result publication
- Knowledge Tree methodology as corrective infrastructure for the field

Tensions Carried Forward to Part II:

- How should practitioners use evidence when the evidence base is known to be unreliable?
- What level of methodological scrutiny is appropriate before making design recommendations?

Linked Scenarios / Strands: See cross-links above

Ways of Knowing: Tree · Garden · Lantern

PART II — COMMUNITY EVIDENCE & DIALOGUE TRACK | SC: Research Integrity Under Pressure | H2 2026 — Living

T	COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTION FORM — SC: Research Integrity Under Pressure Submit case examples, methodological challenges, cultural perspectives, and proposed evidence criteria via: https://tally.so/r/ilrn-if-sc-ri-2026

Part II — Scope and Instructions
This section collects community responses, case examples, and challenges to the Part I foresight snapshot above.
It opens July 1, 2026 and undergoes synthesis review in September 2026, November 2026, and January 2027.
Contributions are submitted via the Tally.so form above and appear in the registers below after editorial review.
The Part I text is not modified in response to Part II contributions; it is versioned at the Annual Handoff review.
Contribution categories: Case Example | Methodological Challenge | Cultural/Community Perspective | Proposed Evidence Criterion
Ways of Knowing accepted: Tree (evidence) | Garden (practice) | Lantern (futures)

Tensions Open for Community Response:

- How should practitioners use evidence when the evidence base is known to be unreliable?

- What level of methodological scrutiny is appropriate before making design recommendations?

Contributor / Date	Category	Way of Knowing	Contribution Summary
[Awaiting contributions — form opens July 1, 2026]			

SC: Global Inequality

PART I — FORESIGHT SNAPSHOT | SC: Global Inequality | Fixed Time-Stamped Synthesis

2026 SC: Global Inequality

Card Type	Societal Challenge
Series	Immersive Futures Guild — Vision 2035
Layer	1 — Atomic Foresight Object
Status	Active
Confidence	Medium
Workshop	Circle of Scholars — January 2026
Facilitator	Circle of Scholars Workshop Team
Tags	global-inequality | geopolitics | access | layer1 | sc
Tally.so Form	https://tally.so/r/ilrn-if-sc-gi-2026

The geopolitical distribution of XR and AI research capacity, infrastructure investment, technology manufacturing, and platform governance is heavily concentrated in a small number of countries and regions. This creates structural inequalities in who shapes immersive learning futures — whose pedagogical traditions are encoded into global platforms, whose researchers can access cutting-edge tools, and whose communities bear the costs of extractive technology deployment without capturing equivalent benefits.

Key Drivers / Contributing Conditions:

- Technology manufacturing concentration in a small number of economies
- Research funding inequality across regions
- English-language and Western epistemological dominance in XR content and research
- Global South infrastructure deficits compounded by climate vulnerability

Educational and Design Implications:

- iLRN Geographic Chapters as structural equity mechanism
- Multilingual and multicultural Codex contribution as a governance requirement

- Research partnership models that transfer capacity rather than extract data

Tensions Carried Forward to Part II:

- How can a global foresight program avoid reproducing the inequalities it documents?
- When do 'global standards' impose uniformity that erases legitimate local variation?

Linked Scenarios / Strands: See cross-links above

Ways of Knowing: Tree · Garden · Lantern

PART II — COMMUNITY EVIDENCE & DIALOGUE TRACK | SC: Global Inequality | H2 2026 — Living

T	COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTION FORM — SC: Global Inequality Submit case examples, methodological challenges, cultural perspectives, and proposed evidence criteria via: https://tally.so/r/ilrn-if-sc-gi-2026

Part II — Scope and Instructions
This section collects community responses, case examples, and challenges to the Part I foresight snapshot above.
It opens July 1, 2026 and undergoes synthesis review in September 2026, November 2026, and January 2027.
Contributions are submitted via the Tally.so form above and appear in the registers below after editorial review.
The Part I text is not modified in response to Part II contributions; it is versioned at the Annual Handoff review.
Contribution categories: Case Example | Methodological Challenge | Cultural/Community Perspective | Proposed Evidence Criterion
Ways of Knowing accepted: Tree (evidence) | Garden (practice) | Lantern (futures)

Tensions Open for Community Response:

- How can a global foresight program avoid reproducing the inequalities it documents?
- When do 'global standards' impose uniformity that erases legitimate local variation?

Contributor / Date	Category	Way of Knowing	Contribution Summary

[Awaiting contributions — form opens July 1, 2026]			

SC: Truth & Epistemic Trust

PART I — FORESIGHT SNAPSHOT | SC: Truth & Epistemic Trust | Fixed Time-Stamped Synthesis

2026 SC: Truth & Epistemic Trust

Card Type	Societal Challenge
Series	Immersive Futures Guild — Vision 2035
Layer	1 — Atomic Foresight Object
Status	Active
Confidence	Medium
Workshop	Circle of Scholars — January 2026
Facilitator	Circle of Scholars Workshop Team
Tags	epistemic-trust | misinformation | media-literacy | layer1 | sc
Tally.so Form	https://tally.so/r/ilrn-if-sc-etrust-2026

The rise of synthetic media, AI-generated content, and high-fidelity simulation creates new challenges for epistemic trust — the foundational social agreement that shared reality is knowable and communicable. For immersive learning, this raises questions about the boundaries between authentic experience and simulation, the pedagogical implications of photorealistic synthetic environments, and the social responsibilities of immersive content creators working in an era of widespread epistemic uncertainty.

Key Drivers / Contributing Conditions:

- Synthetic media and deepfake technology at consumer scale
- Platform misinformation dynamics affecting educational authority
- Declining institutional trust in knowledge authorities
- XR's capacity to create experiences that feel indistinguishable from authentic events

Educational and Design Implications:

- Provenance standards for immersive educational content

- Media literacy — including spatial and immersive media literacy — as a prerequisite
- Research on epistemic effects of sustained engagement with high-fidelity simulation

Tensions Carried Forward to Part II:

- How should immersive educators navigate the boundary between productive simulation and epistemically harmful fabrication?
- Can provenance standards be technically enforced or do they require social and institutional mechanisms?

Linked Scenarios / Strands: See cross-links above

Ways of Knowing: Tree · Garden · Lantern

PART II — COMMUNITY EVIDENCE & DIALOGUE TRACK | SC: Truth & Epistemic Trust | H2 2026 — Living

T	COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTION FORM — SC: Truth & Epistemic Trust Submit case examples, methodological challenges, cultural perspectives, and proposed evidence criteria via: https://tally.so/r/ilrn-if-sc-etrust-2026

Part II — Scope and Instructions
This section collects community responses, case examples, and challenges to the Part I foresight snapshot above.
It opens July 1, 2026 and undergoes synthesis review in September 2026, November 2026, and January 2027.
Contributions are submitted via the Tally.so form above and appear in the registers below after editorial review.
The Part I text is not modified in response to Part II contributions; it is versioned at the Annual Handoff review.
Contribution categories: Case Example | Methodological Challenge | Cultural/Community Perspective | Proposed Evidence Criterion
Ways of Knowing accepted: Tree (evidence) | Garden (practice) | Lantern (futures)

Tensions Open for Community Response:

- How should immersive educators navigate the boundary between productive simulation and epistemically harmful fabrication?

- Can provenance standards be technically enforced or do they require social and institutional mechanisms?

Contributor / Date	Category	Way of Knowing	Contribution Summary
[Awaiting contributions — form opens July 1, 2026]			

SC: Responsible AI

PART I — FORESIGHT SNAPSHOT | SC: Responsible AI | Fixed Time-Stamped Synthesis

2026 SC: Responsible AI

Card Type	Societal Challenge
Series	Immersive Futures Guild — Vision 2035
Layer	1 — Atomic Foresight Object
Status	Active
Confidence	Medium
Workshop	Circle of Scholars — January 2026
Facilitator	Circle of Scholars Workshop Team
Tags	responsible-AI | bias | governance | transparency | layer1 | sc
Tally.so Form	https://tally.so/r/ilrn-if-sc-rai-2026

AI systems are rapidly becoming embedded in immersive learning environments as adaptive tutoring engines, content generators, assessment systems, virtual facilitators, and behavioral monitors. The responsible development and deployment of AI in these contexts requires explicit frameworks for bias, transparency, data governance, consent, and learner agency preservation. This card tracks the evolving regulatory landscape, risk frameworks, and design standards relevant to AI integration in immersive learning.

Key Drivers / Contributing Conditions:

- AI capability acceleration outpacing governance framework development
- Regulatory landscape development across EU, US, and other jurisdictions
- Demonstrated bias in training data and AI output across cultural contexts
- Black-box decision-making in adaptive systems resisting interpretability

Educational and Design Implications:

- Explainability requirements for AI-driven adaptive XR systems

- Learner data governance standards and consent protocols
- Bias auditing as a deployment requirement for AI-assisted immersive learning

Tensions Carried Forward to Part II:

- How can algorithmic transparency be operationalized in complex AI-XR systems?
- Who bears accountability when an AI system causes harm to a learner in an immersive context?

Linked Scenarios / Strands: See cross-links above

Ways of Knowing: Tree · Garden · Lantern

PART II — COMMUNITY EVIDENCE & DIALOGUE TRACK | SC: Responsible AI | H2 2026 — Living

T	COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTION FORM — SC: Responsible AI Submit case examples, methodological challenges, cultural perspectives, and proposed evidence criteria via: https://tally.so/r/ilrn-if-sc-rai-2026

Part II — Scope and Instructions
This section collects community responses, case examples, and challenges to the Part I foresight snapshot above.
It opens July 1, 2026 and undergoes synthesis review in September 2026, November 2026, and January 2027.
Contributions are submitted via the Tally.so form above and appear in the registers below after editorial review.
The Part I text is not modified in response to Part II contributions; it is versioned at the Annual Handoff review.
Contribution categories: Case Example | Methodological Challenge | Cultural/Community Perspective | Proposed Evidence Criterion
Ways of Knowing accepted: Tree (evidence) | Garden (practice) | Lantern (futures)

Tensions Open for Community Response:

- How can algorithmic transparency be operationalized in complex AI-XR systems?
- Who bears accountability when an AI system causes harm to a learner in an immersive context?

Contributor / Date	Category	Way of Knowing	Contribution Summary
[Awaiting contributions — form opens July 1, 2026]			

SC: Resilience

PART I — FORESIGHT SNAPSHOT | SC: Resilience | Fixed Time-Stamped Synthesis

2026 SC: Resilience

Card Type	Societal Challenge
Series	Immersive Futures Guild — Vision 2035
Layer	1 — Atomic Foresight Object
Status	Active
Confidence	Medium
Workshop	Circle of Scholars — January 2026
Facilitator	Circle of Scholars Workshop Team
Tags	resilience | continuity | crisis | layer1 | sc
Tally.so Form	https://tally.so/r/ilrn-if-sc-resilience-2026

Educational systems globally face disruption from climate events, pandemics, geopolitical conflict, and economic instability. Immersive learning technologies present both opportunities and risks: opportunities to maintain learning continuity when physical infrastructure is unavailable, and risks of creating single points of failure when digital infrastructure itself is disrupted or when resilient design has been sacrificed for efficiency.

Key Drivers / Contributing Conditions:

- COVID-19 legacy and ongoing epidemic risk
- Climate-driven school and university disruption
- Infrastructure fragility in conflict and crisis zones
- Power and connectivity inequality intensified during disruption events

Educational and Design Implications:

- Offline-capable and low-bandwidth immersive learning design
- Redundant infrastructure planning for virtual campuses
- Research on XR for crisis education and emergency learning continuity

Tensions Carried Forward to Part II:

- How should iLRN balance digital-first immersive learning with the resilience requirements of offline access?
- When does virtual continuity substitute adequately for physical presence and when does it fail?

Linked Scenarios / Strands: See cross-links above

Ways of Knowing: Tree · Garden · Lantern

PART II — COMMUNITY EVIDENCE & DIALOGUE TRACK | SC: Resilience | H2 2026 — Living

T	COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTION FORM — SC: Resilience Submit case examples, methodological challenges, cultural perspectives, and proposed evidence criteria via: https://tally.so/r/ilrn-if-sc-resilience-2026

Part II — Scope and Instructions
This section collects community responses, case examples, and challenges to the Part I foresight snapshot above.
It opens July 1, 2026 and undergoes synthesis review in September 2026, November 2026, and January 2027.
Contributions are submitted via the Tally.so form above and appear in the registers below after editorial review.
The Part I text is not modified in response to Part II contributions; it is versioned at the Annual Handoff review.
Contribution categories: Case Example | Methodological Challenge | Cultural/Community Perspective | Proposed Evidence Criterion
Ways of Knowing accepted: Tree (evidence) | Garden (practice) | Lantern (futures)

Tensions Open for Community Response:

- How should iLRN balance digital-first immersive learning with the resilience requirements of offline access?
- When does virtual continuity substitute adequately for physical presence and when does it fail?

Contributor / Date	Category	Way of Knowing	Contribution Summary
[Awaiting contributions — form opens July 1, 2026]			

SC: Employment Upheaval

PART I — FORESIGHT SNAPSHOT | SC: Employment Upheaval | Fixed Time-Stamped Synthesis

2026 SC: Employment Upheaval

Card Type	Societal Challenge
Series	Immersive Futures Guild — Vision 2035
Layer	1 — Atomic Foresight Object
Status	Active
Confidence	Medium
Workshop	Circle of Scholars — January 2026
Facilitator	Circle of Scholars Workshop Team
Tags	employment | reskilling | workforce | layer1 | sc
Tally.so Form	https://tally.so/r/ilrn-if-sc-employment-2026

AI and automation are restructuring labor markets in ways that have direct implications for education and training systems. Immersive learning technologies are simultaneously positioned as responses to reskilling demands — enabling rapid, high-fidelity vocational and professional training — and as potential contributors to job displacement in educational and training sectors. The research evidence on XR-based skill transfer to real workplace performance remains limited and contested.

Key Drivers / Contributing Conditions:

- AI-driven job displacement projections across multiple sectors
- Demand for rapid, scalable reskilling infrastructure
- Vocational and professional training transformation needs
- Growth of non-traditional career pathways and gig economy contexts

Educational and Design Implications:

- Demand signal for immersive vocational and professional training investment
- Research urgency for transfer studies connecting XR training to work performance

- Policy coordination between EdTech systems and labor market institutions

Tensions Carried Forward to Part II:

- Does immersive training address structural employment displacement or obscure its systemic causes?
- Who should bear the cost of XR-based reskilling — individuals, employers, or public institutions?

Linked Scenarios / Strands: See cross-links above

Ways of Knowing: Tree · Garden · Lantern

PART II — COMMUNITY EVIDENCE & DIALOGUE TRACK | SC: Employment Upheaval | H2 2026 — Living

T	COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTION FORM — SC: Employment Upheaval Submit case examples, methodological challenges, cultural perspectives, and proposed evidence criteria via: https://tally.so/r/ilrn-if-sc-employment-2026

Part II — Scope and Instructions
This section collects community responses, case examples, and challenges to the Part I foresight snapshot above.
It opens July 1, 2026 and undergoes synthesis review in September 2026, November 2026, and January 2027.
Contributions are submitted via the Tally.so form above and appear in the registers below after editorial review.
The Part I text is not modified in response to Part II contributions; it is versioned at the Annual Handoff review.
Contribution categories: Case Example | Methodological Challenge | Cultural/Community Perspective | Proposed Evidence Criterion
Ways of Knowing accepted: Tree (evidence) | Garden (practice) | Lantern (futures)

Tensions Open for Community Response:

- Does immersive training address structural employment displacement or obscure its systemic causes?
- Who should bear the cost of XR-based reskilling — individuals, employers, or public institutions?

Contributor / Date	Category	Way of Knowing	Contribution Summary
[Awaiting contributions — form opens July 1, 2026]			

SC: Ethics, Privacy, & Bodily Autonomy

2026 SC: Ethics, Privacy, & Bodily Autonomy

Card Type	Societal Challenge
Series	Immersive Futures Guild — Vision 2035
Layer	1 — Atomic Foresight Object
Status	Active
Confidence	Medium
Workshop	Circle of Scholars — January 2026
Facilitator	Circle of Scholars Workshop Team
Tags	privacy | ethics | biometrics | consent | layer1 | sc
Tally.so Form	https://tally.so/r/ilrn-if-sc-ep-2026

Immersive technologies — particularly those involving biometric sensing, eye-tracking, full-body motion capture, affect recognition, and persistent digital identity — collect data at a level of intimacy that exceeds prior educational technologies by a significant margin. This creates ethical and legal questions about consent, bodily autonomy, data sovereignty, and the limits of institutional surveillance in learning contexts that existing frameworks are not yet adequate to address.

Key Drivers / Contributing Conditions:

- Biometric data collection normalized in consumer XR hardware
- Eye-tracking and attention surveillance capacity built into standard headsets
- Affect and emotion recognition entering educational deployment
- Regulatory gaps in immersive educational data governance across jurisdictions

Educational and Design Implications:

- Explicit consent frameworks for biometric educational data as a deployment prerequisite
- Data minimization as a first-class design requirement, not a compliance afterthought
- Research on learner awareness of and responses to immersive surveillance

Tensions Carried Forward to Part II:

- Can biometric data collection be justified for educational purposes under any consent framework?
- How should bodily autonomy be operationalized in mandatory educational contexts using immersive technology?

Linked Scenarios / Strands: See cross-links above

Ways of Knowing: Tree · Garden · Lantern

PART II — COMMUNITY EVIDENCE & DIALOGUE TRACK | SC: Ethics, Privacy, & Bodily Autonomy | H2 2026 — Living

T	COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTION FORM — SC: Ethics, Privacy, & Bodily Autonomy Submit case examples, methodological challenges, cultural perspectives, and proposed evidence criteria via: https://tally.so/r/ilrn-if-sc-ep-2026

Part II — Scope and Instructions
This section collects community responses, case examples, and challenges to the Part I foresight snapshot above.
It opens July 1, 2026 and undergoes synthesis review in September 2026, November 2026, and January 2027.
Contributions are submitted via the Tally.so form above and appear in the registers below after editorial review.
The Part I text is not modified in response to Part II contributions; it is versioned at the Annual Handoff review.
Contribution categories: Case Example | Methodological Challenge | Cultural/Community Perspective | Proposed Evidence Criterion
Ways of Knowing accepted: Tree (evidence) | Garden (practice) | Lantern (futures)

Tensions Open for Community Response:

- Can biometric data collection be justified for educational purposes under any consent framework?
- How should bodily autonomy be operationalized in mandatory educational contexts using immersive technology?

Contributor / Date	Category	Way of Knowing	Contribution Summary
[Awaiting contributions — form opens July 1, 2026]			

SC: Accessibility

PART I — FORESIGHT SNAPSHOT | SC: Accessibility | Fixed Time-Stamped Synthesis

2026 SC: Accessibility

Card Type	Societal Challenge
Series	Immersive Futures Guild — Vision 2035
Layer	1 — Atomic Foresight Object
Status	Active
Confidence	Medium
Workshop	Circle of Scholars — January 2026
Facilitator	Circle of Scholars Workshop Team
Tags	accessibility | UDL | disability | inclusion | layer1 | sc
Tally.so Form	https://tally.so/r/ilrn-if-sc-access-2026

Accessibility in immersive learning encompasses physical, cognitive, sensory, linguistic, and socioeconomic dimensions. Standard XR hardware and software has historically been developed without adequate attention to users with disabilities, older learners, or those with limited prior technology exposure. This card tracks the state of accessibility research, design standards, and policy requirements, and holds the position — emerging from Guild foresight work — that accessibility-first design is both a moral requirement and a market opportunity.

Key Drivers / Contributing Conditions:

- Disability rights frameworks applied to digital and immersive education
- Aging populations entering learning contexts with immersive technology
- Universal Design for Learning (UDL) mandate and policy pressure
- Hardware design exclusions for sensory and motor disabilities in mainstream headsets

Educational and Design Implications:

- Accessibility auditing protocols as a required step in XR learning environment deployment

- Co-design with disability communities as a governance requirement for iLRN-affiliated projects
- Research on XR for learners with diverse abilities as a Guild foresight priority

Tensions Carried Forward to Part II:

- How should the cost of accessibility retrofitting be allocated when it was not designed-in from the start?
- Can universal design goals be reconciled with the specialized needs of specific disability communities?

Linked Scenarios / Strands: See cross-links above

Ways of Knowing: Tree · Garden · Lantern

PART II — COMMUNITY EVIDENCE & DIALOGUE TRACK | SC: Accessibility | H2 2026 — Living

T	COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTION FORM — SC: Accessibility Submit case examples, methodological challenges, cultural perspectives, and proposed evidence criteria via: https://tally.so/r/ilrn-if-sc-access-2026

Part II — Scope and Instructions
This section collects community responses, case examples, and challenges to the Part I foresight snapshot above.
It opens July 1, 2026 and undergoes synthesis review in September 2026, November 2026, and January 2027.
Contributions are submitted via the Tally.so form above and appear in the registers below after editorial review.
The Part I text is not modified in response to Part II contributions; it is versioned at the Annual Handoff review.
Contribution categories: Case Example | Methodological Challenge | Cultural/Community Perspective | Proposed Evidence Criterion
Ways of Knowing accepted: Tree (evidence) | Garden (practice) | Lantern (futures)

Tensions Open for Community Response:

- How should the cost of accessibility retrofitting be allocated when it was not designed-in from the start?

- Can universal design goals be reconciled with the specialized needs of specific disability communities?

Contributor / Date	Category	Way of Knowing	Contribution Summary
[Awaiting contributions — form opens July 1, 2026]			