Implementation & Partnerships Workgroup
Briefing Report

Facilities Ad Hoc Committee (FAHC)

Meeting: Monday, November 10, 2025, 5:30–7:00 PM

Prepared by: Implementation & Partnerships Co-Chair (Implementation Focus)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose: Provide a clear, actionable implementation framework that marries highest-and-best-use of district real estate with the needs of students, families, and neighborhoods; summarize what is currently in place; present recommendations and rationale; and outline accountability tools (including reversion/clawback and financial safeguards).

Scope: This report covers:

1. Current policies, processes, and partnership infrastructure
2. Integration opportunities and gaps
3. Recommended implementation framework with metrics and partner vetting
4. Accountability and financial safeguards
5. Coordination with other FAHC workgroups and existing departments
6. 30/60/90-day action plan for today's meeting

Key Finding: The district has strong partnership intake infrastructure (Partnership & Development Department) and facilities management systems (FaciliTron, Facilities Department). Our framework enhances these existing systems rather than replacing them by adding:

• Weighted decision criteria (operational + community factors)
• Standardized partner vetting with scoring rubrics
• Financial safeguards (performance bonds, reversion clauses)
• Clear pathways from partnership intake → facility implementation

I. CURRENT SYSTEMS & INTEGRATION OPPORTUNITIES

A. What's Working: Existing Infrastructure

Partnership & Development Department (Chastity, Executive Director)
Purpose: Central hub for ALL partnership communications and initial intake

Website: scsk12.org/opd/?PN=543

Process Flow:

- Step 1: Interest Form Submission (Partnership type, program description, grade band, contact info)
- Step 2: Initial Contact & Vetting (48-72 hours, comprehensive vetting conversation)
- Step 3: Routing & Placement
  • School-Level Partnerships → Shared with principals
  • District-Level Contracts → AOTI review, Board approval for large contracts
  • Vendor Partnerships → Procurement process
- Step 4: Specialized Coordination (field trips, resources, facility use)

Implementation Pathway Flow

Decision Point	Vetting Process	Readiness Gates	Execution Phase	Monitoring Phase	Outcomes Phase
Dual Lens Metrics Applied	Partner Scoring Rubric (0-45 pts)	Title/Enviro Zoning/Utils Code/ADA Security Plan	Contract Executed MOA Signed Funding Lock	Milestone Tracking Reporting Compliance	Success or Reversion Assessment Lessons

Organizational Integration

P&D Department (Chastity)	Facilities Dept (Michelle)	Finance/Legal (District)
Partner Intake **Interest Form** **Initial Vetting** **Scoring Rubric** **Community Fit**	Feasibility Review Site Assessment Code/Zoning Review Readiness Gates Utilities/Safety Cost Analysis	Contract/MOA Development Financial Terms Performance Bonds Reversion Clauses Insurance Requirements Milestone Schedule

Facilities Department (Michelle, Facilities Officer)
Operational Scope: Custodial teams, grounds teams, building engineers, cleaning staff

FaciliTron System: Online platform for building reservations requiring:

• Insurance documentation
• Nonprofit status verification
• Use description
• Rental fee payment (context-dependent)
• Covers after-hours and weekend building use

Governing Policies
Real Estate Policy 7002

• Establishes objectives for acquisition, disposition, repurposing (joint use/adaptive reuse), leasing and rentals
• Requires public involvement for major actions
• Sets process for school closings with Impact Reports, public hearings, and final proposals
• Authorizes sales (public/negotiated), leases, donations, transfers
• Defines facility community use parameters

School Grounds Policy 7004

• Requires written approval for enhancements/alterations to school grounds
• Establishes plan submission and review workflow via Facilities Planning/Maintenance and COO

Historical Displays Policy 7003

• Defines process and governance for permanent or extended historical displays
• Requires planning committee, Superintendent review, Board approval

Tennessee Code §49-13-136 (Charter Facilities)

• Requires annual publication of building data and underutilized/vacant lists
• Provides charter right-of-first-refusal to purchase/lease at or below fair market value
• Sets lease responsibilities and credits for capital repairs
• Defines reciprocal first-refusal conditions upon charter closing

B. Integration Opportunities & Gaps
What the Meeting on 9/11/25 Revealed:

STRENGTHS:

✓ Centralized partnership intake via P&D Department

✓ FaciliTron manages reservations with insurance/nonprofit verification

✓ Facilities Department conducts feasibility assessments

✓ Coordination between Chastity (P&D) and Michelle (Facilities) on beautification projects

GAPS TO ADDRESS:

✗ **Enforcement Challenge: Policies exist but compliance is inconsistent**

→ Some principals accept partnerships directly without central vetting
→ Unauthorized building use discovered during school visits
→ No current quantitative assessment of compliance rates

✗ **Staffing Constraints: Both P&D and Facilities note insufficient human capital for:**

→ Regular compliance monitoring
→ Strategic plan implementation
→ Comprehensive audits of building use

✗ **No Decision Framework: Currently no weighted criteria that balance:**

→ Quantitative factors (utilization, cost, operational fit)
→ Qualitative factors (community value, student impact, equity)

✗ **No Standardized Partner Vetting Beyond Initial Intake:**

→ Interest form captures basics, but no scoring rubric
→ No standardized MOA/MOU templates with performance milestones
→ No reversionary protections outside charter-specific scenarios

✗ **Limited Partnership-Facilities Connection for Reuse:**

→ Strong intake process for traditional partnerships
→ No framework for adaptive reuse or long-term facility conversion
→ Missing: pathways for underutilized buildings → community assets

✗ **Financial Risk Tools Not Embedded:**

→ No performance bonds, letters of credit, or escrowed O&M requirements
→ No contingency funds for transition periods
→ Limited step-in rights for district if partner fails

✗ **Sequencing Guidance Needed:**

→ No alignment of partner readiness, procurement, environmental due diligence, zoning with implementation timelines

II. IMPLEMENTATION PATHWAY FRAMEWORK

A. DUAL-LENS METRICS (Apply at Each Gate)
Every facility decision must be evaluated through BOTH lenses:

QUANTITATIVE LENS:

• Utilization rate (current enrollment ÷ programmatic capacity)
• 5-year enrollment projections
• Lifecycle cost (capital backlog + 10-year maintenance forecast)
• Security infrastructure and ADA compliance gaps
• Instructional program fit (does building support academic model?)
• Funding pathway viability (district, county, city, state, philanthropic)

QUALITATIVE LENS:

• Neighborhood anchor value (does school serve as community hub?)
• Student/family access and stability (travel burden, continuity of relationships)
• Cultural/historic significance (community identity, alumni connection)
• Displacement risk (how many students affected? alternative options?)
• Community morale impact (abandonment risk vs. revitalization opportunity)
• Equity considerations (who benefits? who bears costs? access to services?)

Scoring Framework

Each facility receives a composite score across both dimensions:

DIMENSION	MAX PTS	EVALUATION CRITERIA
OPERATIONAL SCORE	50	
• **Utilization**	10	>90%=10pts; 70-90%=7pts; 50-70%=4pts; <50%=2pts
• **Enrollment Trend**	10	Growing=10pts; Stable=7pts; Declining=3pts
• **Lifecycle Cost**	10	<$1M=10pts; $1-3M=7pts; $3-5M=4pts; >$5M=2pts
• **Safety/ADA**	10	Compliant=10pts; Minor gaps=7pts; Major=3pts
• **Program Fit**	10	Excellent=10pts; Good=7pts; Poor=3pts
COMMUNITY SCORE	50	
• **Neighborhood Hub**	15	Critical anchor=15pts; Important=10pts; Limited=5pts
• **Student Access**	15	Minimal disruption=15pts; Moderate=10pts; High=5pts
• **Cultural Value**	10	High significance=10pts; Moderate=6pts; Low=3pts
• **Equity Impact**	10	Advances equity=10pts; Neutral=6pts; Harms=2pts
TOTAL POSSIBLE	100	

Decision Thresholds:

• Score 80-100: Strong candidate for continued operation or high-value partnership
• Score 60-79: Moderate candidate; requires strategic intervention or partnership
• Score 40-59: Repurposing candidate; explore adaptive reuse options
• Score Below 40: Priority for consolidation, sale, or significant transformation

III. PARTNER VETTING & EVALUATION

Partner Vetting Matrix

Criteria	Weight	Red Flags	Green Lights	Max Points
Mission Alignment	HIGH	Profit-driven only	Education/community focus	10
Financial Capacity	HIGH	No financials	Audited statements	10
Track Record	HIGH	No references	3+ years success	10
Timeline Realism	MEDIUM	Immediate start	Phased approach	5
Staffing Plan	MEDIUM	Undefined roles	Clear org chart	5
Community Support	MEDIUM	No engagement	Letters of support	5

Scoring Methodology:

• 35-45 points: Excellent partner - Fast-track approval
• 25-34 points: Good partner - Standard review process
• 15-24 points: Conditional partner - Additional due diligence required
• Below 15 points: Not recommended - Decline or defer

IV. REAL-WORLD APPLICATION EXAMPLES

Implementation Scenarios

Scenario A: After-School Programming Partner
Current Process: Partner submits interest form → Chastity vets → Routes to school

Framework Addition: Also assess facility lifecycle cost, neighborhood need, financial sustainability

Outcome: Partner gets priority access + reduced rate if meeting community need criteria

Scores: *Facility: 62/100 (moderate) | Partner: 38/45 (excellent)*

Scenario B: Building Beautification Project
Current Process: Chastity intake → Michelle facilities assessment

Framework Addition: Apply partner vetting rubric, add performance milestones, reversion clause if not maintained

Outcome: Approved with MOA including 5-year maintenance obligations

Scores: *Facility: 75/100 (good) | Partner: 32/45 (good)*

Scenario C: Adaptive Reuse - Community Learning Center
Current Process: No established pathway

Framework Addition: Full 9-gate readiness assessment, ground lease with performance bonds, quarterly reporting

Outcome: Underutilized elementary becomes adult education hub; charter generates $50K/year

Scores: *Facility: 42/100 (repurpose) | Partner: 40/45 (excellent)*

V. DECISION DASHBOARD TOOL

Example Decision Dashboard
This tool makes the "dual lens" approach tangible and supports data-driven decisions:

Site	Operational Score	Community Score	Financial Score	Partner Score	Total	Decision
Example ES	6/10	9/10	4/10	8/10	27/40	Further Analysis
Sample MS	3/10	8/10	7/10	9/10	27/40	Strong for Adaptive Reuse
Pilot HS	9/10	10/10	5/10	N/A	24/30	Continue Operations
Target K-8	4/10	6/10	3/10	9/10	22/40	Repurpose with Partner

How to Use the Dashboard:

1. Data & Asset Strategy Workgroup provides facility metrics (operational/community scores)
2. Implementation Co-Chair scores potential partners using vetting rubric
3. Finance Workgroup provides financial feasibility analysis
4. Combined scores inform Committee recommendations
5. Dashboard updated quarterly to track progress

VI. FINANCIAL SAFEGUARDS & ACCOUNTABILITY
Complete Partner Vetting Rubric (45 Points Maximum)
MISSION ALIGNMENT & PROGRAM FIT (10 points)

• Education/community mission: 3 pts: Clear alignment | 2 pts: Partial | 1 pt: Minimal | 0 pts: None
• Student-centered programming: 3 pts: Primary focus | 2 pts: Secondary | 1 pt: Tangential | 0 pts: None
• Sustainability model: 2 pts: Strong | 1 pt: Moderate | 0 pts: Weak
• District priorities fit: 2 pts: Perfect fit | 1 pt: Good fit | 0 pts: Poor fit

ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY (10 points)

• Financial health: 3 pts: Audited + reserves | 2 pts: Audited | 1 pt: Financials provided | 0 pts: None
• Staffing plan: 3 pts: Detailed + qualified | 2 pts: Adequate | 1 pt: Basic | 0 pts: Unclear
• Administrative systems: 2 pts: Robust | 1 pt: Adequate | 0 pts: Weak
• Insurance/legal compliance: 2 pts: Full compliance | 1 pt: Partial | 0 pts: Non-compliant

TRACK RECORD & REFERENCES (10 points)

• Years of operation: 3 pts: 5+ years | 2 pts: 3-5 years | 1 pt: 1-3 years | 0 pts: New
• Similar projects: 3 pts: Multiple successful | 2 pts: One successful | 1 pt: Related exp | 0 pts: None
• References quality: 2 pts: Excellent | 1 pt: Good | 0 pts: Poor/none
• Reputation in community: 2 pts: Strong | 1 pt: Moderate | 0 pts: Unknown/negative

IMPLEMENTATION READINESS (10 points)

• Timeline realism: 3 pts: Well-phased | 2 pts: Reasonable | 1 pt: Ambitious | 0 pts: Unrealistic
• Budget completeness: 3 pts: Detailed + contingency | 2 pts: Adequate | 1 pt: Basic | 0 pts: Incomplete
• Risk mitigation: 2 pts: Comprehensive | 1 pt: Basic | 0 pts: None identified
• Facilities understanding: 2 pts: Strong | 1 pt: Adequate | 0 pts: Poor

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT (5 points)

• Community support: 2 pts: Strong letters | 1 pt: Some support | 0 pts: None
• Local connections: 2 pts: Deep roots | 1 pt: Some | 0 pts: None
• Communication plan: 1 pt: Clear plan | 0 pts: Unclear

B. Financial Safeguards & Risk Mitigation
1. Performance Bonds

- Description: Required for capital improvement projects or adaptive reuse
- Amount: 10-25% of total project cost
- Triggers: Released upon: Substantial completion, final inspection, 12-month performance period

2. Letters of Credit

- Description: Required for long-term ground leases (5+ years)
- Amount: 6-12 months of rent plus estimated O&M costs
- Triggers: Callable if: Payment default, insurance lapse, unauthorized use, facility neglect

3. Escrow Accounts for Operations & Maintenance

- Description: Required for shared-use agreements with significant facility obligations
- Amount: Minimum $25,000 or 6 months projected O&M, whichever is greater
- Triggers: Replenished quarterly; district draws if partner fails to maintain

4. Facilities Transition Contingency Fund (District-Level)

- Description: NEW: District establishes fund for unexpected transition costs
- Amount: Recommended $500,000 initial capitalization
- Triggers: Use cases: Partner bankruptcy, facility emergency repairs, early lease termination costs

C. Reversion Clauses & Step-In Rights
Standard Reversion Triggers:

- Failure to activate programming within 12 months of agreement execution
- Sustained non-compliance with performance milestones (2 consecutive quarters)
- Material breach of agreement terms with failure to cure within 60 days
- Bankruptcy, receivership, or dissolution of partner organization
- Loss of required licenses, certifications, or insurance
- Unauthorized use or sublease of facility
- Failure to maintain facility in accordance with agreed standards

District Step-In Rights:

If partner fails to cure within notice period, district may:
- Assume operations temporarily (30-90 days) while seeking replacement operator
- Hire contractors to complete capital improvements at partner expense
- Draw on performance bond or letter of credit to cover costs
- Terminate agreement and reclaim facility
- Retain any improvements made to property (no removal rights)

VII. NINE READINESS GATES FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Before any partnership or adaptive reuse can proceed, the site must pass through nine readiness gates:

Gate 1: Title & Survey
Requirements:

- Clear title search
- Current survey (within 2 years)
- All liens and encumbrances identified and cleared

Responsible: Legal Department / Facilities

Typical Timeline: 30-45 days

Gate 2: Environmental Due Diligence
Requirements:

- Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
- Phase II if contamination suspected
- Asbestos/lead survey
- Remediation plan if needed

Responsible: Facilities / Environmental Consultant

Typical Timeline: 45-60 days

Gate 3: Utilities Assessment
Requirements:

- Capacity analysis (water, sewer, electric, gas)
- Separate metering plan
- Cost allocation methodology
- Utility transfer agreements if needed

Responsible: Facilities / Utilities Department

Typical Timeline: 30 days

Gate 4: Code Compliance & ADA
Requirements:

- Building code compliance review
- ADA accessibility assessment
- Fire/life safety inspection
- Cost estimate for any required upgrades

Responsible: Facilities / Code Official

Typical Timeline: 30-45 days

Gate 5: Zoning & Entitlements
Requirements:

- Zoning verification for proposed use
- Conditional use permit if required
- Variance strategy if non-conforming
- Parking/traffic review

Responsible: Planning Department / Zoning

Typical Timeline: 45-90 days (if CUP needed)

Gate 6: Security Plan
Requirements:

- Site security assessment
- Access control plan (who has keys/codes)
- Monitoring plan (cameras, patrols)
- Emergency response protocol

Responsible: Security Department / Facilities

Typical Timeline: 15-30 days

Gate 7: Budget & Funding
Requirements:

- Complete budget (capital + O&M)
- Funding sources identified and committed
- 10-year O&M forecast
- Contingency fund (minimum 10%)

Responsible: Finance / Facilities

Typical Timeline: 30 days

Gate 8: Procurement
Requirements:

- Procurement strategy approved (RFP, negotiated, etc.)
- Documents drafted and legally reviewed
- Timeline aligned with project schedule
- Board approval pathway identified

Responsible: Procurement / Implementation Co-Chair

Typical Timeline: 30-60 days

Gate 9: Mobilization
Requirements:

- Contractor/partner selected
- All permits obtained
- Schedule finalized
- Communication plan for stakeholders
- Ribbon-cutting event planned

Responsible: Facilities / Project Manager / P&D

Typical Timeline: 15-30 days

Status Tracking System:

- 🟢 Green Light: Gate complete, ready to proceed
- 🟡 Yellow Light: In progress, minor issues to resolve
- 🔴 Red Light: Blocked, requires immediate attention

Readiness Gates Decision Assurance Matrix
These readiness gates ensure that decisions regarding modernization, shared-use, adaptive reuse, right-sizing, or closure are grounded in both community well-being and operational feasibility. Each gate reflects care for students, families, and neighborhood stability.

Readiness Gate	Purpose (Why It Matters to Students & Communities)	Source / Practice Basis
Title & Ownership Verified	Ensures decisions respect public ownership and prevent private dispossession of community assets.	Real Estate Policy 7002
Environmental Safety Review (Phase I/II)	Protects children, staff, partners, and neighbors from unsafe site conditions and environmental hazards.	Implementation Workgroup Discussion
Utilities & Life Safety Systems Confirmed Functional	Buildings must be physically safe and operational before reopening or reuse.	School Grounds Policy 7004 + Facilities SOP
Accessibility & ADA Equity Review	Guarantees all students and families can access learning, services, and gathering spaces.	Facilities Planning + Code Requirements
Zoning / Land Use Alignment	Prevents long delays or conflicts that could leave buildings inactive and neighborhoods destabilized.	Implementation Workgroup Analysis
Safety, Security & Student Belonging Plan	Schools are community anchors—this ensures emotional safety, dignity, and stability.	Community Engagement & Equity Workgroup
Program & Community Service Alignment	Facilities must remain spaces of learning, connection, and resource access—not emptiness or exclusion.	FAHC Community-Driven Priorities
Capital + Operating Funding Plan Established	Prevents stalled projects that leave buildings unused in neighborhoods already facing strain.	Finance, Funding & Partnerships Workgroup Scope
Procurement & Activation Pathway Ready	Ensures timely delivery and confidence that the transition will actually occur.	Facilities Planning Practice

VIII. COORDINATION WITH OTHER FAHC WORKGROUPS

Coordination with Data & Asset Strategy Workgroup
What Implementation & Partnerships Needs:

- Building-level data (enrollment, capacity, utilization rates)
- Capital needs assessment and deferred maintenance backlog
- Demographic projections (5-10 year enrollment forecasts)
- Site characteristics (acreage, square footage, condition ratings)

What Implementation & Partnerships Provides:

- Partner readiness assessments
- Implementation timelines and sequencing
- Partnership opportunity pipeline
- Site-specific implementation constraints

Coordination with Finance Workgroup
What Implementation & Partnerships Needs:

- Financial modeling for different scenarios (operate, lease, sell, repurpose)
- Lifecycle cost analyses
- Revenue potential from partnerships/leases
- Contingency fund recommendations

What Implementation & Partnerships Provides:

- Partner financial vetting (scoring rubric results)
- Risk mitigation strategies (bonds, LOCs, escrows)
- Contract terms that protect district financial interests
- Performance milestone structures

Coordination with Community Engagement Workgroup
What Implementation & Partnerships Needs:

- Stakeholder sentiment (neighborhood priorities, concerns)
- Community facility needs assessment
- Input on qualitative factors (cultural value, equity impact)
- Communication strategies for facility transitions

What Implementation & Partnerships Provides:

- Partner community engagement plans
- Implementation communication templates
- Stakeholder notification processes
- Success stories and case studies for community sharing

IX. 30/60/90-DAY ACTION PLAN

30-DAY ACTIONS (Due by December 10, 2025)
1. INTEGRATE FRAMEWORK WITH P&D DEPARTMENT

→ Implementation Co-Chair meets with Chastity (P&D Executive Director)
→ Present partner vetting rubric; request integration into intake workflow
→ Identify 1-2 recent partnership applications to pilot scoring rubric
→ Deliverable: P&D agrees to pilot rubric with next 5 partnership applications

2. INTEGRATE FRAMEWORK WITH FACILITIES DEPARTMENT

→ Implementation Co-Chair meets with Michelle (Facilities Officer)
→ Present readiness gates; discuss how to streamline feasibility assessments
→ Identify facilities staff capacity and training needs
→ Deliverable: Facilities commits to piloting 9-gate checklist on 1-2 sites

3. DRAFT MOA/MOU TEMPLATES

→ Implementation Co-Chair drafts 3 templates (after-school, beautification, adaptive reuse)
→ Incorporate reversion clauses, performance milestones, financial safeguards
→ Submit to Legal for review
→ Deliverable: Legal review initiated; templates in draft form

4. DEVELOP SITE PROFILE TEMPLATE

→ Work with Data & Asset Strategy to create one-page site profile format
→ Include: utilization, lifecycle cost, enrollment trend, community score, partnership readiness
→ Pilot with 3 buildings
→ Deliverable: Template finalized and piloted

5. PILOT SITE SELECTION

→ Full FAHC identifies 1-2 pilot sites for framework application
→ Option A: Underutilized building for shared use/adaptive reuse
→ Option B: Strong partner proposal awaiting formalization
→ Criteria: Clear community need; willing partner; manageable complexity

60-DAY ACTIONS (Due by January 10, 2026)
6. PARTNER VETTING RUBRIC OPERATIONALIZED

→ Rubric integrated into P&D intake workflow
→ Training session for P&D staff on scoring methodology
→ Implementation Co-Chair shadows first 3 partnership vetting calls to calibrate scoring

7. TEMPLATE FINALIZATION

→ Legal review completed; templates approved
→ Templates posted on district website (P&D page)
→ Shared with principals and school leaders via memo

8. FACILITIES TRANSITION CONTINGENCY FUND ESTABLISHED

→ Finance Workgroup recommends funding level and governance
→ Board approves fund and initial allocation
→ Finance develops simple request/approval process

9. PILOT SITE READINESS ASSESSMENT

→ Complete 9-gate readiness assessment for pilot site(s)
→ Identify and address any red/yellow lights
→ Develop site-specific implementation plan

10. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ON PILOT

→ Coordinate with Community Engagement Workgroup
→ Host neighborhood meeting on pilot site reuse
→ Incorporate feedback into RFP (if applicable)

11. DASHBOARD DEVELOPMENT (appears to be in place)

→ Work with Data & Asset Strategy to develop decision dashboard
→ Identify data sources and update frequency
→ Create simple spreadsheet or database for tracking

90-DAY ACTIONS (Due by February 10, 2026)
12. PILOT PARTNERSHIP LAUNCHED

→ If adaptive reuse: RFP released and proposals received
→ If shared use: MOA executed with partner
→ If beautification: Project initiated with community partner
→ Activation timeline established

13. LESSONS LEARNED - ROUND 1

→ Debrief on pilot experience
→ What worked? What didn't?
→ Adjust framework, templates, or rubric as needed
→ Document for scaling

14. REPORT TO FULL FAHC

→ Implementation & Partnerships Workgroup presents:
  • Pilot results
  • Lessons learned
  • Recommendations for scaling
  • Staffing needs assessment
→ Request feedback and direction

15. SCALE PREPARATION

→ Based on pilot success, identify next 3-5 sites for framework application
→ Prioritize based on: Community need, Partner readiness, District capacity
→ Develop 6-month rollout plan

16. STAFFING RECOMMENDATION

→ Based on pilot workload, refine recommendation for Facilities Implementation Coordinator
→ Develop job description and budget request
→ Present to Board for consideration in next fiscal year

CONCLUSION

This Implementation Framework provides the structure, accountability, and financial safeguards necessary to transform district facilities from liabilities into community assets. By integrating with existing Partnership & Development and Facilities Department workflows, we leverage what's working while addressing critical gaps.

The framework is realistic about capacity constraints and phases implementation through pilots before scaling. It protects district interests through performance bonds, reversion clauses, and a contingency fund while enabling innovative partnerships that serve students and communities.

Success requires:

✓ Committee adoption of the framework today
✓ Integration with P&D and Facilities within 30 days
✓ Template development and pilot site selection within 60 days
✓ Pilot partnership launched within 90 days
✓ Lessons learned and scaling plan within 6 months

Most importantly, success requires keeping students at the center. Every facility decision, whether to modernize, consolidate, repurpose, or close, must answer the question: "How does this serve our students and their communities?"

We are ready to move forward.

Respectfully submitted,

Rasheedah Jones

Implementation & Partnerships Workgroup Co-Chair (Implementation Focus)

November 10, 2025