

Tenet — Case Study Template

FIELD	VALUE
STATUS	V1, template + two pre-filled outlines
LAST REFRESHED	2026-05-24
OWNER	Caleb
AUDIENCE	Anyone writing a Tenet customer case study — founder, future marketing hires, partners co-publishing
LENGTH	~10-minute read for the template; the case studies themselves should land at 800-1,200 words
COMPANION DOCS	GTM Strategy §4 — AR press release · Conversion Playbook · Outreach Sequences

0. TL;DR

A reusable case study template, plus pre-filled outlines for our two anchor districts:

1. **Roger's Arkansas district** — first publicly-announced Basic adopter; the case study lands same day as the press release
2. **The converting paid pilot district** (TBD which of the two converts) — the first paid Pro case study

The template enforces a consistent structure so case studies can be read independently or stacked side-by-side as social proof. Same opening shape, same data block, same quote placement.

Why case studies matter for our motion

- **K-12 procurement decisions are heavily peer-driven.** A CTO weighing Tenet asks "who else uses this?" before they ask anything else.
- **A single case study covers ~30% of the questions a procurement officer will ask.** Reduces our written-response burden across RFPs.
- **The named-district reference is the asset.** Once we have written, photographable, quotable case studies from 3-5 districts, the sales motion compounds — see [GTM §4.4](#) on amplification.

Ground rules for every case study

1. **Explicit written consent before publication.** Sign-off from CTO + superintendent + (if a district quote is included) the named quote-giver. No exceptions.
2. **District communications team approves wording before press.** Most districts have a comms director who must see drafts.

3. **No student PII in any case study, ever.** Aggregated metrics only. No specific student stories. No screenshots showing student names.
4. **No competitor names in negative framing.** "Districts that previously used [competitor]" is fine; "[Competitor] failed to detect X" is not.
5. **Numbers must be defensible.** If we say "X incidents detected," our analytics must back it. Vague numbers are worse than no numbers.
6. **Refresh annually.** A case study from 2024 in a 2026 sales conversation is a liability if the data has shifted.

1. The case study template

1.1 Structure (the seven-section shape)

Every case study follows this structure. Total target: 800-1,200 words.

Section	Word target	What goes here
1. The district at a glance	100	Name, size, state, demographics, tech stack, prior safety tooling
2. The problem they had	150-200	What was happening with AI before Tenet — pain in plain language
3. What they evaluated	100-150	What other options they looked at; framing for "why Tenet"
4. The deployment	150-200	How fast, who did it, what surprised them
5. What they saw in the first [X] days	200-300	The data — anonymized, aggregated, defensible. Mix of quantitative and qualitative
6. A quote that lands the value	50	One sentence or two from the CTO / superintendent / counselor
7. What's next	100	Pro evaluation, expansion, what they want to do next

1.2 Front matter (every case study)

Standard frontmatter block (same pattern as the engineering docs):

```
# [District Name] – [One-line headline]

| Field | Value |
|---|---|
| Customer | [District name, state] |
| Tier | Basic / Pro / Both |
| Deployed | [Month, year] |
| Student count | [Total] / [AI-active in 7-12] |
| Tech stack | [Chromebook / Workspace / roster system] |
| Featured personas | [CTO name, title] · [Superintendent name, title] · [Optional counselor name] |
| Published | [Date] |
| Consent on file | [Date of written consent for publication] |
| Companion press release | [Link, if applicable] |
```

1.3 The seven sections in detail

Section 1 — The district at a glance

A one-paragraph dossier. CTO and superintendent want to see "is this district like ours?" — match enough specifics that adjacent CTOs see themselves.

Include: name, total enrollment, grade range, urban/suburban/rural, geographic region, dominant device platform, current major EdTech vendors (Securly / Clever / etc.), staff size if relevant. Keep it factual; no adjectives.

Example phrasing:

"[District name] is a [size] [urban/suburban/rural] district in [state] serving grades [K-12]. The district runs a fleet of approximately [X] Chromebooks managed through Google Workspace for Education, uses [roster system] for SIS integration, and was previously running [Securly / GoGuardian / Lightspeed] for web filtering."

Section 2 — The problem they had

The pre-Tenet pain. In their words where possible. The job of this section is to make adjacent CTOs say "yes, that's us."

Anchor to one or two specific moments — a roster paste into ChatGPT that was caught after the fact, a teacher request that revealed the policy gap, a board question that exposed the lack of data. Specific beats abstract.

Avoid:

- Generic "AI is everywhere now" framing
- Blaming individual students or teachers
- Catastrophizing ("we narrowly avoided a disaster")

Use:

- The actual sequence of events that led to the evaluation

- The internal stakeholder who first raised the issue
- The constraint that made the existing tools insufficient

Section 3 — What they evaluated

Show the alternative paths considered. Builds credibility — the district did due diligence and chose Tenet for reasons. Also disarms the "did you really evaluate alternatives?" skeptic.

Typical content: "[District] considered three approaches before selecting Tenet: (1) expanding their existing [filter vendor] contract to include AI monitoring; (2) deploying a cloud-based AI gateway; (3) building governance internally. They selected Tenet because [1-2 specific reasons — e.g., 'on-device data flow simplified the data-privacy office's review' or 'classroom-level rule profiles matched their per-period block schedule']."

Section 4 — The deployment

The tactical "how fast and how hard" story. CTOs read this for deployability proof.

Include: time from contract to active install, who did the work, anything that surprised the IT team (good or bad), how teachers and students experienced day 1.

Common pattern for Basic deployments: "The CTO deployed Tenet to the full Chromebook fleet through Google Admin Console in under an hour. No re-imaging, no per-device touch. Coverage reached 92% within 48 hours and 99% within 7 days."

Common pattern for Pro deployments: "Add: roster sync setup (CSV / ClassLink / Clever) took [X] additional time. First classroom rule profile authored by [teacher / curriculum director] in week 1."

Section 5 — What they saw in the first [X] days

The data. This is the section CTOs scrutinize. Must be defensible.

Mix of:

- **Quantitative:** events detected, DLP redactions performed, classifier flags surfaced, top-blocked categories
- **Qualitative:** what surprised them, what the teachers said, what changed in counselor conversations

Anonymization rules:

- No student names, ever
- No teacher names without explicit consent of that teacher
- No specific incident descriptions detailed enough to identify a student
- Aggregated counts and category-level descriptions only

Example block:

"In the first 60 days, Tenet:

- Detected and redacted [X] PII items across student prompts (top categories: student IDs, email addresses, dates of birth)
- Blocked [Y] prompts containing district-defined keywords
- Surfaced the local crisis-resource overlay [Z] times in response to self-harm classifier flags
- Caught [N] roster-paste events across the file-upload pipeline (PDFs and spreadsheets uploaded to AI platforms)
- Generated [M] block events on non-approved AI domains

The district's CTO noted that [specific qualitative observation]."

Section 6 — The quote that lands the value

One sentence, two max. From the most senior stakeholder willing to be named. Authentic.

Strong quote patterns:

- A specific moment of value ("The first time the DLP overlay fired during a teacher's roster paste, it paid for itself.")
- A comparison to alternatives ("We looked at server-side monitoring. Tenet doing this on-device made our DPA review trivial.")
- An admission that something they expected to be hard was easy ("I budgeted three weeks for rollout; it took an afternoon.")

Weak quote patterns to avoid:

- "Tenet is great." (vague)
- "Our students are safer." (unprovable)
- "We're proud to partner with TrueMade AI." (PR-speak)

Section 7 — What's next

Forward-looking close. Names where the relationship is headed without overpromising.

For a Basic case study: their Pro evaluation timeline, what's next on their AI policy roadmap, what their teachers / counselors want.

For a Pro case study: ClassLink/Clever integration plans, scaling to more grades, deeper analytics use.

Always end with a CTA that's appropriate for the publication context — a "learn more" link to truemadeai.com, a "schedule a discovery call" link, or a "read more case studies" link.

2. Pre-filled outline — Arkansas flagship case study

Working title: "[AR district name] — How a [size] Arkansas district deployed AI governance for free in 30 minutes"

Target publish date: Same day as the press release (target: late Aug / early Sep 2026 — back-to-school news cycle per [GTM §4.2](#))

Section 1 — At a glance (TODO: fill from Roger)

Field	Value
District name	TBD — confirm with Roger
State	Arkansas
Student count	TBD
Tech stack	Chromebooks + Google Workspace (confirm)
Roster system	TBD (Clever / ClassLink / CSV?)
Prior safety tooling	TBD
Tier	Basic
Deployment date	TBD

Section 2 — The problem (draft framing to develop with Roger)

The AR district's AI policy conversation likely started around [grades / which platforms were observed in use / specific incident]. Frame around:

- The lack of a deployable AI governance tool that didn't require server-side data flow
- Concerns about FERPA compliance when students paste rosters or grades into AI tools
- The gap between "block AI entirely" (impractical) and "allow AI with no controls" (liability)

Develop with Roger: what specifically triggered the evaluation? Was there an incident, a teacher request, a board question?

Section 3 — What they evaluated (draft)

The AR district considered:

1. Continuing with [their existing web filter]'s upcoming AI features
2. Cloud-based AI monitoring tools
3. Building a district-level policy without technical enforcement

They selected Tenet Basic because:

- On-device architecture means no new data flow to a vendor's servers

- Free at the Basic tier — no procurement cycle needed
- Deployable in 30 minutes through Google Admin Console
- (Add reasons Roger and his team give)

Section 4 — The deployment (target framing)

"The district's CTO deployed Tenet Basic to the full Chromebook fleet on [date]. The install was a single managed-policy push from Google Admin Console; no re-imaging, no per-device touch, no teacher action required. Coverage reached [X]% within 48 hours."

Add: what surprised them (good or bad), how their teachers experienced day 1, any unexpected configuration questions.

Section 5 — What they saw (data — TBD, collect at 30/60/90 day marks)

This section won't be written until we have actual deployment data. Plan to write at the 30-day mark, refresh at 60, finalize at 90 — before publication.

Categories to populate:

- DLP redactions performed (count + top PII categories)
- Block events (count + top reasons)
- Classifier flags (count + breakdown by category: self-harm / jailbreak / illicit)
- Self-harm overlay surfacings (count, with clear note that this is anonymized and aggregated)
- Top AI platforms by usage
- File upload scans performed and any roster-paste catches

Section 6 — The quote (TBD — coordinate with Roger and superintendent)

Two quote slots:

- One from the CTO (technical / deployment angle)
- One from the superintendent or board chair (policy / leadership angle)

Draft to bring to Roger:

"We were looking for AI governance that didn't require us to add another vendor data flow to our DPA. Tenet runs entirely in the browser — the data never leaves the device. That made our privacy review trivial."
— [CTO name], [title]

"This is what district-level AI policy looks like when it works — invisible to most students, immediately useful to teachers and counselors when something matters." — [Superintendent name], [title]

Both need explicit written consent for publication.

Section 7 — What's next

"[District] is currently evaluating Tenet Pro to extend AI governance with classroom-level rule profiles for teachers and counselor alert dispatch for incident response. The district has also offered to participate in Tenet's joint deployment work with [partner organizations] as a regional reference site."

Update based on actual conversation with Roger on what they want to do next.

Press-release coupling

This case study publishes alongside the press release — they should be visible-from-each-other:

- Press release links to "read the full case study"
- Case study links to "read the press release announcement"
- Both link to the AR district's website where the announcement is co-posted

3. Pre-filled outline — first converting paid-pilot district case study

Working title: "[Pilot district name] — From paid pilot to Tenet Pro in 30 days"

Target publish date: ~30-45 days after contract signing (enough Pro data accumulated to populate Section 5)

Status: Awaiting pilot conversion outcome. Per Conversion Playbook §1.1, realistic expectation is 1 of 2 pilots converts. This outline is the template for whichever one does.

Section 1 — At a glance (TODO: fill on conversion)

Field	Value
District name	TBD
State	TBD
Student count	Total: TBD / AI-active in grades 7-12: TBD
Tech stack	TBD
Prior safety tooling	TBD
Tier	Pro (formerly paid pilot)
Pilot start date	~April 2026
Pilot end date	~May 24, 2026
Pro contract signed	TBD

Section 2 — The problem (draft framing — develop on conversion)

What made them choose the paid-pilot path rather than going straight to Basic or to a direct Pro contract?

Usually:

- A specific use case (teacher classroom rules / counselor alerting / roster-aware DLP) they wanted to validate
- Internal political need to "see it working" before committing to a full year
- A specific incident or board pressure that wanted demonstrated answer within 60-90 days

Section 3 — Why a paid pilot (draft)

"Most Tenet evaluations start on the free Basic tier. [District] chose a 30-day paid pilot at \$2/student to evaluate Pro-only features — specifically [their specific use case — e.g., 'classroom rule profiles' or 'real-time counselor alert dispatch']. The paid pilot model gave them a concrete commitment timeline and gave us the engineering bandwidth to do hands-on configuration."

Explain the \$2 pricing as a concrete commitment-to-evaluate, not as recurring revenue.

Section 4 — The pilot itself (TBD: fill from pilot data)

What got configured, what they tested, what worked, what didn't. Be honest about anything that needed adjustment.

Section 5 — What they saw in 30 days (data — TBD)

The pilot generated real data; use it. Same categories as the AR case study above.

Add specifically:

- Counselor alerts dispatched (count, response time, any qualitative feedback from counselors)
- Classroom rules authored by teachers (count, distribution of rule types)
- DLP catches that mattered (aggregated, anonymized)

Section 6 — The quote (TBD)

The quote that lands well after a paid-pilot conversion is usually one of these patterns:

- "We knew what we wanted to validate; in 30 days we had the answer."
- "The Pro features that mattered most weren't the ones we initially focused on."
- "[Specific moment of value during the pilot]."

Solicit at the conversion conversation. Get written consent.

Section 7 — What's next

The Pro contract. Any expansion plans. Reference customer offer.

4. Distribution checklist for any published case study

When a case study is ready to publish, walk this checklist:

- Written consent on file (CTO + superintendent + any named quote-giver)
 - District comms team has approved the wording
 - All data points reconciled with our analytics
 - No student or teacher names without consent
 - District logo usage approved (if displaying logo)
 - Linked from [truemadeai.com](https://truemadeai.com/case-studies) case-studies page
 - Linked from [docs/README](#) under "Customer references"
 - PDF rendered for procurement packages (same render script pattern as marketing assets — see [render-pdf.js](#))
 - Featured in next monthly Basic admin digest
 - Referenced in [outreach sequences](#) where appropriate
 - LinkedIn post drafted (Caleb + tag district contact if they want to be tagged)
 - Press release update sent to original announcement-day reporter list (if applicable)
 - District contact confirmed willing to take reference calls (Y/N + max frequency)
 - Annual refresh reminder set on calendar (12 months from publish date)
-

5. What we explicitly do NOT do in case studies

- **No fake or composite case studies.** Every case study is one real district with their explicit consent.
 - **No claims of metrics we can't show in our analytics.** "Reduced incidents 40%" requires data we can produce on request.
 - **No before/after charts unless we have the actual before data.** Most districts didn't have measurement before Tenet; that's a fact, not a chart.
 - **No "endorsement" framing.** A case study describes a real deployment; it is not a paid endorsement. The line is important for our integrity and theirs.
 - **No publishing without district communications team sign-off** even when the CTO has individually consented.
 - **No quoting a single anonymous "district leader."** Either named with consent or not in the study.
 - **No publishing during the district's bad news cycle.** If the district is in the middle of an unrelated controversy or incident, defer until the news settles.
-

6. Triggers to revisit this template

Trigger	What we'd revisit
3+ published case studies	Verify the structure still produces good outputs; refine if patterns emerge
First district pushes back on the data section	Refine anonymization standards
First district's case study leveraged in an RFP	Capture which sections did the lift; expand those
Press / media reporter requests a case study	Verify the template produces something a reporter can use without re-writing
Hiring first marketing writer	This template becomes their style guide
Annual review (2027-05-24 default)	Full refresh

7. Companion reading

- [GTM Strategy §4 — Arkansas press release](#) — operational playbook for the AR case study launch
- [Conversion Playbook](#) — the conversion data that feeds the paid-pilot case study
- [Outreach Sequences §3 — Arkansas press release leverage](#) — how the case study gets used in outbound
- [Pro Value One-Pager](#) — case studies should consistently reinforce the same value claims
- [Briefing 01 — Executive Summary](#) — for consistent positioning language