

TRANSFORMATIVE JUSTICE PROJECT | DOCUMENT 2

The TJP Playbook

Eight Questions That Keep Us Clear

Vision. TJP reframes the narrative of harm, healing, and prevention.

Mission. To implement the principles and practices of Transformative Justice across all sectors of South Carolina.

Governed by: SCDC Division of Programs, Reentry, and Rehabilitative Services (oversight) | Board of Volunteers (direction) | Interdepartmental Committee (supervision)

Prepared September 2026. Print-ready. No internet required.

SUMMARY

What this is. The TJP Playbook is a short, living set of answers to Eight Questions that every TJP resident, staff member, volunteer, and leader should be able to answer the same way. It is built on Patrick Lencioni's "six critical questions" from *The Advantage*, rewritten in plain words, with two questions added for our work.

The Eight Questions. (1) Why are we here? (2) How do we treat each other? (3) What do we actually do? (4) Who are we doing it for? (5) How will we win? (6) What matters most right now? (7) Who does what, by when? (8) How will we know it worked?

Why two more. Lencioni wrote for businesses, where "the customer" is obvious. Ours is not, so we added Question 4: a project that serves "the public" serves no one. Lencioni also leaves proof mostly unspoken. W. Edwards Deming would not, so we added Question 8, which ties every answer to a PROOF line.

How it works. The Playbook is not a binder that sits on a shelf. It is the working product of **The TJP Meeting Rhythm**. Check-Ins read it. Tactical meetings update Question 7 and check Questions 6 and 8 every week. Strategic meetings revise Questions 5 to 8 monthly. The Horizon Review revisits Questions 1 to 4 quarterly. Every ADOPT project gets a one-page **Project Page**. Every change is logged and approved at the right level, and the results flow into **The TJP Monthly Report**.

Who decides. TJP is not resident-led. Residents do the work and propose changes. The **Board of Volunteers** guards Questions 1 and 2. The **Interdepartmental Committee** approves changes to Questions 5 to 7 (and to 3, 4, and 8 as described below). The **SCDC Division of Programs, Reentry, and Rehabilitative Services** is kept informed through the Monthly Report.

What is inside. A draft set of TJP answers ready for leadership to edit, the Project Page with a full example, the Playbook Life Cycle, a Clarity Check quiz, seven photocopy-ready worksheets, dorm signage ideas, and further study.

Part 1: Why a Playbook?

ANALOGY

A football team does not invent plays in the middle of a game. Plays are **designed off the field** by coaches who study film. They are **called in the huddle** in a few words everyone understands. They are **run on the field** by players who each know their own job. And on Monday they are **reviewed on film**, where the team asks, "Did the play work, and if not, was it the play or the execution?" A playbook is what connects those four moments. Without it, eleven talented people run eleven different plays.

TJP is full of talented people. Our risk is not a lack of intelligence or effort. Our risk is that thirty good people pull in thirty slightly different directions, and nobody notices until a pilot fails, a partner gets a confusing message, or a leadership level hears two different stories about what we are doing.

The TJP Playbook solves that problem in the plainest way possible: it writes down, in short sentences, the answers to eight questions, and then it makes sure those answers are read, used, checked, and improved at every meeting.

Here is how the football picture maps onto TJP:

Football	TJP	Where it happens
Plays designed off the field	Playbook answers drafted and revised	Strategic meeting and Horizon Review
Play called in the huddle	Today's One Big Thing and commitments read aloud	Check-In
Play run on the field	Research, build, pilot, deliver	Think Tank and Task Force
Film review	3 Ws debrief, PROOF results, ADOPT verdicts	Tactical meeting
Coaches and league officials	Three levels of leadership	Committee, Board, SCDC Division

ANALOGY

Or picture a busy kitchen at dinner rush. The recipe book says what each dish is and how it is made. The tickets on the rail say what matters right now. The line cooks know their stations. Nobody argues about the recipe at 6:30 p.m. with forty plates going out. The argument about the recipe happens at 2:00 p.m., before the rush, with the head chef in the room. The Playbook is our recipe book, and the Meeting Rhythm is how we keep the arguments in the right hour.

What the Playbook is, and what it is not

The Playbook IS	The Playbook is NOT
Eight short answers everyone can say from memory	A policy manual or a rulebook
The written result of our meetings	Something one person writes alone
Changed on purpose, with a log	Changed quietly by whoever has the file open
Approved at the right leadership level	Voted on by residents alone
A few pages, plus one page per project	A thick binder nobody reads
Posted on the wall in plain words	Locked on a computer

WHY THIS IS HERE

Louis asked for a Playbook that is "the working product of our meetings." That phrase is the design rule for this whole document. Every section below answers one of two questions: what goes in the Playbook, and how the Playbook stays alive in the meetings.

BOTTOM LINE

A team that cannot say the same eight answers will run eight different plays. The Playbook makes the answers short, shared, and checked.

Part 2: Where This Comes From: Lencioni's Six Questions

Patrick Lencioni is a writer and consultant who has spent his career studying why some teams work and others do not. In *The Advantage* (2012), he argues that the biggest advantage any organization can have is not smarts but **health**: less confusion, less politics, higher morale, lower turnover. He says an organization gets healthy through four disciplines:

Discipline	Plain words	TJP version
1. Build a cohesive leadership team	The people in charge trust each other and argue honestly	TRUST rules, the three leadership levels working together
2. Create clarity	Agree on the answers to the big questions	The Eight Questions
3. Overcommunicate clarity	Say the answers again and again	Signage, Check-Ins, the Monthly Report
4. Reinforce clarity	Build the answers into how things run	The Meeting Rhythm, Project Pages, orientation

The heart of "create clarity" is six questions Lencioni says every leadership team must answer together, with no daylight between them:

#	Lencioni's question	What he calls the answer
1	Why do we exist?	Core purpose
2	How do we behave?	Core values
3	What do we do?	Business definition
4	How will we succeed?	Strategy (he uses a few "strategic anchors")
5	What is most important, right now?	Thematic goal (a single rallying cry for a season)
6	Who must do what?	Roles and responsibilities

Lencioni puts the answers on a short document he calls a **playbook**, and he tells leaders to become their organization's "chief reminding officers," repeating the answers until people roll their eyes, and then repeating them again. He is right about that. People do not remember what they heard once. They remember what they hear every week.

What Lencioni gets right for us

- **Clarity beats cleverness.** A room full of brilliant people who disagree about the goal will lose to an average team that agrees.
- **One goal per season.** His "thematic goal" is one rallying cry for a stretch of roughly three to twelve months. Everything else is either supporting that goal or keeping the lights on.

- **Values must be real.** He warns against "values" that are just nice words on a wall. A real value is one you would keep even if it cost you something.
- **Repetition is not weakness.** Saying the same thing forty times is the job, not a failure.

Where Lencioni's language gets in our way

Louis named it: the language is "too business-y." Words like *business definition*, *strategic anchors*, *thematic goal*, *standard operating objectives* are useful to consultants and executives. They are not how intelligent people who never sat in a boardroom talk. And TJP is going to be explaining itself to residents, families, youth, pastors, judges, and legislators. Plain words travel further.

Lencioni's term	TJP plain words
Core purpose	Why we are here
Core values	How we treat each other (core behaviors)
Business definition	What we actually do
Strategic anchors	How we win: our three anchors
Thematic goal	The One Big Thing
Defining objectives	Supporting goals (the three or four pieces of the One Big Thing)
Standard operating objectives	Standing responsibilities (things we always do, every season)
Roles and responsibilities	Who does what, by when

BOTTOM LINE

We keep Lencioni's idea and throw away his vocabulary. Six questions become eight, and every one of them is written so a person reading at a sixth-grade level and a judge reading at a doctoral level get the same meaning.

Part 3: The TJP Translation: Eight Questions

ANALOGY

Think of a car's dashboard. You do not need forty gauges. You need a few you trust: speed, fuel, temperature, warning lights. Lencioni gave us six gauges. We added two that our car cannot run without: one that tells us **who is riding with us**, and one that tells us **whether we actually got anywhere**.

#	TJP question (plain words)	What the answer is called	Memory word
1	Why are we here?	Purpose	WHY
2	How do we treat each other?	Core behaviors	HOW
3	What do we actually do?	The work	WHAT
4	Who are we doing it for? [added]	The people we serve	WHOM
5	How will we win?	Our three anchors	WIN
6	What matters most right now?	The One Big Thing	NOW
7	Who does what, by when?	Roles and commitments	WHO
8	How will we know it worked? [added]	Proof	KNOW

The memory chant: *Why, How, What, Whom. Win, Now, Who, Know.* Two lines of four words. The first line is who we are and do not change often. The second line is how we play this season and changes more often.

Why we added Question 4: Who are we doing it for?

In a business, the customer is the one who pays. Everybody knows who that is. In TJP, nobody pays, and almost everybody is a possible audience: residents, officers, families, youth, victims, churches, courts, the legislature, "the community." That sounds generous. In practice it is a trap.

The ADOPT doctrine already says it: **build for one named real person, not "the public."** A project that serves "the public" serves no one, because you cannot test it, you cannot tell if it worked, and you cannot fix it. "The public" cannot tell you the workshop was confusing. A fifteen-year-old named in your plan (with privacy protected) can.

Question 4 forces every level of TJP, from the whole program down to a single ADOPT project, to say out loud who the work is for, and who it is **not** for. The second half matters just as much. Saying "not for victims directly, unless a licensed therapist invites it" is how we keep people safe.

Why we added Question 8: How will we know it worked?

W. Edwards Deming, the quality expert whose ideas rebuilt Japanese manufacturing after World War II and later reshaped American industry and health care, taught that you cannot improve what you have not defined and measured. His Plan, Do, Study, Act cycle only works if the "Study" step has something to study.

Lencioni's six questions assume a business will notice success because money comes in. TJP will not have that signal. We could run for five years, feel good, and have no idea whether a single person was safer. Question 8 makes proof part of clarity, not an afterthought. Every answer to Question 8 points to a **PROOF line**: Problem Number, Result Number, Observer, On this date, Fail Line. Written before we build. Always.

CAUTION

Question 8 is the question most teams will try to skip, because it is the only one that can make you look bad. That is exactly why it is there. A team that will not name its Fail Line will always call a miss a win.

BOTTOM LINE

Six questions tell a business who it is. Eight questions tell TJP who it is, who it serves, and whether it is working. The two additions are the difference between good intentions and good results.

Part 4: The Eight Questions, One at a Time

Each question below follows the same pattern: **plain meaning**, **why it matters**, **how to answer it well**, **a bad answer and a good answer**, **TJP's draft answer**, and **who can change the answer**.

FACILITATOR NOTE

Every "TJP draft answer" in this part is a **first draft** written for leadership to edit. Nothing here is official until it has been reviewed and approved at the level named under "Who can change it." Mark the first approved version v1.0 in the change log (Part 7).

How authority works in the Playbook

Before the questions, one table. TJP is not a resident-led initiative. Three levels of leadership provide oversight, direction, and supervision. Residents do the work and are expected to think hard, speak up, and propose improvements. The levels below decide.

Level	Role in TJP	Role in the Playbook
SCDC Division of Programs, Reentry, and Rehabilitative Services	Oversight	Informed of every approved change through the Monthly Report; any change touching agency policy goes to them first
Board of Volunteers	Direction: trustees of the vision and mission, guardians of program integrity	Guards Q1 and Q2. Approves any change to purpose or core behaviors. Consulted on Q3 and Q4.
Interdepartmental Committee (Associate Warden for Programs, Programs Supervisor, Chaplains, Education Leader)	Supervision	Approves changes to Q5, Q6, Q7. Approves Q3, Q4, and Q8 changes after consulting the Board where noted.
TJP residents	Do the work	Propose changes using the Playbook Change Request (Worksheet 7), draft Project Pages, keep commitments

Question 1: Why are we here? (Purpose)

Plain meaning. The reason TJP exists. Not what we do, but why it is worth doing at all. If TJP disappeared tomorrow, what would South Carolina lose?

Why it matters. Purpose is the anchor when things get hard. When a pilot flops, when a cohort loses members to transfers, when a partner says no, the purpose is what keeps people from quitting or drifting into side projects. It also protects the program from being bent into something it is not. A strong purpose statement lets any person say, "That is a good idea, but it is not why we are here."

How to answer it well.

- Keep it short enough to say in one breath (the LESS filter applies).
- Aim it outward. Purpose is about what changes in the world, not about us.
- Make it true in ten years. Purpose should not change when the season changes.
- Do not stuff it with activities. Activities belong in Question 3.

Bad answer	Good answer
"To provide high-quality, evidence-based, trauma-informed programming that empowers participants to reach their full potential."	"TJP reframes the narrative of harm, healing, and prevention."
<i>Why it fails:</i> It is a list of nice words. It is about us, not the world. Nobody will remember it by lunch.	<i>Why it works:</i> Short, outward, true for decades, and it tells you what we are trying to change: the story South Carolina tells itself about harm.

TJP draft answer (Q1).

Our vision: TJP reframes the narrative of harm, healing, and prevention.

Our mission: To implement the principles and practices of Transformative Justice across all sectors of South Carolina.

In our own words: We are here because the old story says harm is only about punishment. We believe harm can be understood, healed, and prevented, and that people who caused harm can help prevent the next harm. We exist so that fewer people in South Carolina get hurt.

Who can change it. The **Board of Volunteers** only. Residents and staff may propose wording changes through a Change Request, which the Interdepartmental Committee forwards to the Board with its recommendation. The SCDC Division is informed. Expect this answer to change rarely, if ever.

ANALOGY

Purpose is the North Star. You do not reach it. You steer by it.

Question 2: How do we treat each other? (Core behaviors)

Plain meaning. The few ways of acting that are non-negotiable in TJP, whether anyone is watching or not. Lencioni calls these core values. We call them **core behaviors**, because a value you cannot see in behavior is just a slogan.

Why it matters. A transformative justice program that does not practice what it teaches will teach the opposite. Residents, officers, and visitors watch what we do far more closely than they listen to what we say. Core behaviors also make hard moments easier: when a disagreement gets hot, anyone can point to the wall and say, "Rank the idea, not the person," and the room resets.

How to answer it well. Lencioni describes four kinds of values, and knowing the difference prevents a lot of confusion:

Kind	Plain meaning	TJP example
Core	Who we truly are; we would keep it even if it cost us	TRUST behaviors
Permission to play	The minimum to be here at all; not special, just required	Safety, SCDC rules, confidentiality
Aspirational	What we want to become but are not yet	"Every resident teaches someone else"
Accidental	Habits that crept in, good or bad, that nobody chose	"Only the loudest speak in Tactical"

A good Q2 answer names the core behaviors, lists permission-to-play rules separately, and is honest about what is still aspirational. It describes behavior you could **see** on a video.

Bad answer	Good answer
"Respect, integrity, excellence, accountability, compassion."	"Tell it early. Rank the idea, not the person. Unfinished is allowed. Say it in the room. Take the task."
<i>Why it fails:</i> Five abstract nouns. Every organization on earth claims them. Nobody can tell whether you did "integrity" in a meeting on Tuesday.	<i>Why it works:</i> Five actions you could catch on camera. Each one can be kept or broken in a single meeting.

TJP draft answer (Q2): the TRUST behaviors. These come straight from the ADOPT workshop, turned into behaviors we hold for the whole program.

Letter	Core behavior	What it looks like	What breaking it looks like
T	Tell it early	You raise a problem the day you see it, while it is small	"I knew last week the printer was down but didn't want to say"
R	Rank the idea, not the person	You argue about the plan, not about who proposed it	"Of course he'd suggest that"
U	Unfinished is allowed	You bring drafts before they are polished so others can help	Hiding work until it is "perfect," then missing the date

Letter	Core behavior	What it looks like	What breaking it looks like
S	Say it in the room	Disagreement is spoken in the meeting, not in the dayroom afterward	Nodding in the meeting, then running it down at chow
T	Take the task	Every decision ends with a name and a date, and you volunteer	"Somebody should..." with no somebody

Permission-to-play rules (required, not special):

1. Safety and SCDC policy come first, always.
2. What is shared in a session stays in the session, unless safety requires otherwise.
3. Peer facilitators are educators, never therapists. Trauma sessions are always led by staff.
4. No one's story is used without their consent and the proper review.
5. Equipment and space are cared for as if they belonged to the next cohort, because they do.

Aspirational (be honest, we are not there yet): "Every TJP resident can teach one thing they learned to someone who was not in the room."

Who can change it. The **Board of Volunteers** approves any change to the core behaviors. The **Interdepartmental Committee** may add or clarify permission-to-play rules, since those follow institutional policy, and informs the Board. Residents propose.

SIGN FOR THE DORM

TRUST: How We Treat Each Other. Tell it early. Rank the idea, not the person. Unfinished is allowed. Say it in the room. Take the task.

Question 3: What do we actually do? (The work)

Plain meaning. A plain description of our activities, the kind you would give a family member on the phone in thirty seconds. Lencioni calls this the business definition. It is the least exciting question and the one most often answered badly.

Why it matters. If you cannot say what you do, partners cannot help you, leadership cannot defend you, and new residents join expecting something else. It also draws a fence: work outside the fence is not TJP work, even if it is good work.

How to answer it well.

- Use verbs. "We study, build, test, and teach."
- Name the setting and the method, not the dream.
- Draw the fence: say what we do **not** do.

Bad answer	Good answer
"We transform lives through holistic, innovative approaches to justice."	"We study the science of harm and healing, build tools with the ADOPT process, test them with real audiences, and deliver the ones that work."
<i>Why it fails:</i> Nobody could picture a single hour of the day.	<i>Why it works:</i> You can picture it. You can check whether it happened this week.

TJP draft answer (Q3).

TJP residents move together, as a cohort, through **13 ten-week courses** on the science of harm, healing, and prevention (about 2.5 years), after an orientation where each resident writes **The Personal Narrative**.

In each course we **research** in the **Think Tank** (weeks 1 to 6), **build and pilot** a real tool in the **Task Force** (weeks 7 to 9) using the **ADOPT** process, and **deliver and publish** it (week 10).

We deliver through **Four Channels**: training other incarcerated people, written materials, live visitors, and recordings (introduced in that order: 4, 1, 3, 2).

Residents then co-facilitate courses and complete **the Keystone**: a ten-week team project that produces a deployable intervention package for one real, bounded South Carolina harm, scored by an outside panel and tracked for adoption.

What we do not do: We do not provide therapy. We do not contact people harmed by residents except through proper, therapist-guided channels. We do not operate outside SCDC policy or without leadership approval.

Who can change it. The **Interdepartmental Committee** approves changes, after consulting the **Board of Volunteers**, since changes to the work can change the mission. Changes to the course sequence or structure also go to the SCDC Division if they affect agency programming approvals. Revisited at the Horizon Review.

ANALOGY

Question 3 is the menu. You can have the best kitchen in the state, but if the menu is vague, nobody knows what to order.

Question 4: Who are we doing it for? (The people we serve) [added]

Plain meaning. The specific people whose lives should be different because TJP exists. Not "society." Real groups, and, at the project level, one named real person.

Why it matters. This is the question that keeps us honest. A tool built "for everyone" is usually built for the builder. When you name who it is for, you have to go ask them, test with them, and accept their verdict. It also protects people: naming who the work is **not** for (for example, people harmed by a resident's own crime, unless a licensed therapist deems it appropriate) prevents well-meant damage.

How to answer it well.

- List groups in order of priority, and be honest that the first group served is often ourselves.
- For each group, say what should be different for them.
- Name who it is not for, or not yet for.
- At the project level, name one real person (with privacy protected: a first name, a role, or a description the team agrees on).

Bad answer	Good answer
"The community."	"Youth ages 12 to 17 in [named county] referred to a diversion program, and specifically 'Marcus,' age 14, the kid our team member used to be."
<i>Why it fails:</i> You cannot test anything with "the community." You cannot call it on the phone.	<i>Why it works:</i> You can design for Marcus, test with kids like Marcus, and ask Marcus's mentor whether it helped.

TJP draft answer (Q4).

Priority	Who	What should be different for them
1	TJP residents	They understand the harm they caused and experienced, practice new behavior, and become credible teachers
2	The people residents live near now: other residents, officers, staff, and the dorm	Fewer conflicts, safer units, more people learning from peers (Channel 4)
3	Families and children of residents	Better contact, honest repair where appropriate, a different story at home
4	People at the forks in the road: at-risk youth before the juvenile system, young adults, people in early addiction	They meet a credible messenger and a real tool before harm happens
5	People harmed, including those not harmed by our residents	Access to narratives and tools that may support healing, offered only when their own therapist deems it appropriate
6	The people who can adopt our work: schools, churches, courts, reentry and recovery programs, law enforcement, the Department of Mental Health	Ready-to-use, tested tools they can put to work without us in the room

Not for (or not yet): We do not design for "the public" in general. We do not deliver directly to people harmed without a licensed professional deciding it is appropriate. We do not serve audiences outside SCDC approval.

Who can change it. The **Interdepartmental Committee** approves changes after consulting the **Board of Volunteers**. Any change that adds a new group involving minors or people harmed also goes to the **SCDC Division**. Revisited at the Horizon Review.

BOTTOM LINE

If you cannot name who it is for, you cannot tell if it worked. Question 4 makes Question 8 possible.

Question 5: How will we win? (Our three anchors)

Plain meaning. What makes TJP different from every other program, and the few choices we will keep making because of it. Lencioni calls these "strategic anchors": usually about three things that guide every decision. "Win" does not mean beating another program. It means succeeding at our purpose.

Why it matters. Without anchors, every decision starts from zero, and the loudest idea wins. With anchors, you can take a new proposal and ask, "Does this fit our three anchors?" and most decisions make themselves. Anchors also give partners a reason to choose us.

How to answer it well.

- Three anchors is usually right. Two is too thin; six is a wish list.
- Each anchor should be something a competitor could not easily copy.
- Each anchor should help you say **no** to something.

Bad answer	Good answer
"By working hard, staying positive, and being the best."	"Close, Checked, Carried: we are close to the harm, we check our work with numbers, and we build things others can carry out without us."
<i>Why it fails:</i> Every team says this. It helps you say no to nothing.	<i>Why it works:</i> Each anchor rules things out. A tool with no PROOF line fails "Checked." A tool only we can run fails "Carried."

TJP draft answer (Q5): The Three Cs.

Anchor	What it means	What it helps us say no to
CLOSE	Our work is built by people close to harm: residents who have lived it (credible messengers), under professional supervision, grounded in serious science from the 13 courses	Tools designed from a distance with no lived knowledge, and tools with lived knowledge but no science or supervision
CHECKED	Nothing gets built until the numbers are written down. Every project has a PROOF line, a pilot, silent scoring, and a verdict	"It felt good" as evidence. Launching without a Fail Line
CARRIED	We build for adoption: stranger-proof, small enough to carry, with a two-page adoption package, tracked in the Adoption Register	Tools that only work when a TJP resident is in the room. Beautiful binders nobody uses

The one-breath version: *We are close to the harm, we check our work, and we build what others can carry.*

Who can change it. The **Interdepartmental Committee** approves changes, and informs the **Board of Volunteers** (the Board may ask to review any anchor it believes affects the mission). Revised at Strategic meetings when evidence says an anchor is not working.

ANALOGY

Anchors are the guardrails on a mountain road. They do not drive the car. They keep it from going over the edge when the driver is tired.

Question 6: What matters most right now? (The One Big Thing)

Plain meaning. The single most important goal for this season, usually six to twelve months. Lencioni calls it the thematic goal: one rallying cry that everyone shares. We call it **the One Big Thing**.

Why it matters. When everything is a priority, nothing is. A new program especially will be pulled toward a hundred good ideas: a podcast, a youth summit, a book, a partnership with every church in the county. The One Big Thing is permission to say "not this season" to good ideas so the most important idea gets done.

How to answer it well. Lencioni's structure has three layers, and we keep all three:

Layer	Lencioni's term	TJP term	What it is
Top	Thematic goal	One Big Thing	One rallying cry, one season, shared by everyone
Middle	Defining objectives	Supporting goals	Three to five temporary pieces that together make the One Big Thing true
Bottom	Standard operating objectives	Standing responsibilities	Ongoing duties that never go away, whatever the season

Rules for a good One Big Thing:

- **One.** Not two. Not "one with a sub-bullet that is really a second goal."
- **A season.** It has a start and an end date, roughly six to twelve months.
- **Shared.** Everyone, including staff and leadership, can say it.
- **Qualitative, then measured.** The One Big Thing is stated in plain words; its supporting goals carry the numbers through Question 8.

Bad answer	Good answer
"Grow the program, improve outcomes, build partnerships, launch the podcast, and plan the summit."	"Launch Cohort A and prove the model."
<i>Why it fails:</i> Five goals. Everyone will pick their favorite.	<i>Why it works:</i> One sentence. Everyone knows what winning this season looks like.

TJP draft answer (Q6): First season.

ONE BIG THING (Season 1, roughly the first 9 to 12 months):
Launch Cohort A and prove the model.

Supporting goal	What done looks like	Ties to Q8
1. Welcome Cohort A well	12 to 15 residents complete orientation; every resident finishes a Personal Narrative draft reviewed through the proper process	Orientation completion; baseline instruments given in week 1

Supporting goal	What done looks like	Ties to Q8
2. Run the first courses cleanly	Courses 11 and 9 (and Course 1 if the calendar allows) run all ten weeks, in the order set by the Cohort Rotation Plan, with every Task Force build using ADOPT	Attendance, session fidelity checks, ADOPT verdicts recorded
3. Prove one channel works	At least one Channel 4 delivery (residents teaching other residents) is piloted with a PROOF line and a verdict	PROOF line result vs Fail Line
4. Stand up the backbone	The Meeting Rhythm runs on schedule; the TJP Evidence Workbook is set up; every Monthly Report goes out on time	Meetings held, reports delivered, data entered

Standing responsibilities (every season):

- Keep every activity inside SCDC policy and institutional security requirements.
- Protect confidentiality and clinical boundaries.
- Deliver the TJP Monthly Report on time to all three leadership levels.
- Enter evidence into the TJP Evidence Workbook weekly.
- Care for the Think Tank, the Task Force, and all equipment.
- Keep the Playbook current and posted.

Who can change it. The **Interdepartmental Committee** approves the One Big Thing, its supporting goals, and any mid-season change, and informs the **Board of Volunteers**. The **SCDC Division** sees it in every Monthly Report. Residents draft proposals for the next season's One Big Thing at the last Strategic meeting of the season.

SIGN FOR THE DORM

THIS SEASON'S ONE BIG THING: Launch Cohort A and prove the model. (A banner above the Task Force door. Change it only when the season changes.)

Question 7: Who does what, by when? (Roles and commitments)

Plain meaning. Who is responsible for each piece of work, and the date it is due. Lencioni's version is "Who must do what?" We add "by when" because a task without a date is a wish.

Why it matters. Most failures inside good teams are not failures of effort. They are failures of ownership: two people each thought the other had it, or nobody did. Question 7 is where the TRUST behavior "Take the task" becomes real.

How to answer it well. Question 7 has two parts:

1. **Standing roles** that stay the same for a season (who facilitates Tactical, who keeps the Decision Log, who manages the Evidence Workbook).
2. **Commitments** that come out of each meeting: one task, one owner, one date, one way to tell it is done.

A good commitment passes the **one-name, one-date, one-proof** test.

Bad answer	Good answer
"The Task Force team will handle outreach materials soon."	"D. Jones drafts the one-page youth handout and brings it to Tactical on Oct 14. Done = printed draft on the table."
<i>Why it fails:</i> Nobody owns it. "Soon" never arrives.	<i>Why it works:</i> One name, one date, one thing you can hold in your hand.

TJP draft answer (Q7): Standing roles for Season 1. Names are filled in by the Interdepartmental Committee. Roles marked "staff" must be held by staff or leadership, not residents.

Role	Held by	Main duties
Program lead (staff)	Named by the Interdepartmental Committee	Final say on daily operations; signs off on Monthly Report
Playbook keeper	A resident, supervised by the Programs Supervisor	Keeps the master Playbook file and posted copies current; runs the change log
Decision Log keeper	A resident, rotates each season	Records every decision and commitment in Tactical and Strategic meetings
Meeting facilitators	Trained residents and staff	Run Check-Ins, Tacticals, and Strategics using the Meeting Rhythm
Evidence Workbook lead	A resident, supervised by staff	Enters and checks data weekly; prepares numbers for the Monthly Report
Course facilitators	Half peer, half staff; trauma sessions always staff	Teach each course; peer facilitators are educators, never therapists
Project leads	One resident per ADOPT project	Owens the Project Page and the PROOF line
Clinical and safety reviewer (staff)	Licensed or designated staff	Reviews any trauma-adjacent content, Personal Narrative use, and outside audiences

Commitments are tracked on Worksheet 4 (Who Does What by When) and reviewed at every Tactical.

Who can change it. The **Interdepartmental Committee** approves standing roles. Commitments are set in Tactical meetings by the people doing the work, with the staff facilitator confirming. Changes that affect staff duties are decided by the Committee alone.

ANALOGY

In a kitchen, every station has one cook. If two cooks share the grill, the steak burns while each thinks the other is watching it.

Question 8: How will we know it worked? (Proof) [added]

Plain meaning. The evidence that tells us whether we are succeeding, written down **before** we start, including the number that would tell us we failed.

Why it matters. Deming spent his life showing that good people inside a bad system produce bad results, and that you cannot tell a good system from a bad one without measuring it. TJP will be judged by people who have seen many programs promise change. Honest proof, including honest failures, is what will earn their trust. It is also how we get better: Tactical meetings can only fix what they can see.

How to answer it well.

- **Write it first.** Nobody builds until the numbers are written down.
- **Use the PROOF line** for every project and every supporting goal.
- **Use the three measurement layers** for the program as a whole.
- **Pass the two-counter test:** if two people counted, would they get the same number?
- **Name the Fail Line** and mean it.

The PROOF line (reminder):

Letter	Part	Question it answers
P	Problem Number	What is the number now? (baseline, go count it)
R	Result Number	What number counts as a win?
O	Observer	Who checks, from outside the team?
O	On this date	When do we count?
F	Fail Line	What number means this did not work?

Bad answer	Good answer
"We'll know it worked when we see lives changed."	"Problem: 3 of 15 residents can name the four parts of an NVC request. Result: 11 of 15. Observer: Education Leader. On: week 10. Fail Line: fewer than 7."
<i>Why it fails:</i> Nobody can count "lives changed." Any result can be called a success.	<i>Why it works:</i> Two people counting would get the same number, and a miss is visible.

TJP draft answer (Q8).

We will know TJP is working through **three layers of evidence**, kept in the **TJP Evidence Workbook** and reported monthly:

1. **Validated instruments:** given at baseline (week 1), post (week 10), and a 6-month retention check.
2. **Behavioral markers:** attendance, disciplinary trends, peer teaching, and other observable behavior, defined with the TJP Evidence System.
3. **Product artifacts:** every tool built, every PROOF line, every ADOPT verdict, and every adoption tracked in the Adoption Register at 6, 12, 24, and 36 months.

Season 1 proof: each supporting goal of the One Big Thing carries its own PROOF line, drafted at the first Strategic meeting of the season and approved by the Interdepartmental Committee.

Honesty rule: a documented ABANDON verdict is a success of the process. We report misses as plainly as wins.

Who can change it. The **Interdepartmental Committee** approves program-level measures, after consulting the **Board of Volunteers** and, where research partners are involved, following their review requirements. Project-level PROOF lines are drafted by residents and approved by the staff facilitator before the build begins. **Once a PROOF line is approved, the Result Number and Fail Line are not changed after the pilot.** Changing the target after you see the score is not measurement; it is storytelling.

CAUTION

Measures involving residents' personal data, instruments, or research partners require proper consent and institutional approval. Verify locally before collecting anything beyond routine program records.

BOTTOM LINE

Question 8 turns hope into evidence. It is the question that will make TJP credible to every partner in the Partner Prospectus.

Part 5: Project Pages: The Playbook in Miniature

ANALOGY

If the Playbook is the whole cookbook, a Project Page is a single recipe card taped above the stove. It is small enough to read in one minute and complete enough that a stranger could cook the dish.

Every ADOPT project, from a three-week Task Force build inside a course to a ten-week Keystone, gets **one page** in the Playbook. The Project Page answers a project-sized version of the Eight Questions, holds the PROOF line, and shows where the project is in the ADOPT steps and what the verdict was.

Why one page

- **It forces clarity.** If you cannot fit it on one page, you do not yet know what you are doing.
- **It travels.** One page can be read in a Tactical, attached to a Monthly Report, and handed to a partner.
- **It builds a library.** After 13 courses, Cohort A alone will have produced a shelf of Project Pages. Cohort B starts on the shoulders of Cohort A.

The eight questions at project size

Program question	Project-size version
1. Why are we here?	Why does this project exist? What harm or need does it address?
2. How do we treat each other?	Our team's TRUST charter signed? Any extra team rules?
3. What do we actually do?	What exactly are we building? (one sentence)
4. Who are we doing it for?	One named real person, and who it is not for
5. How will we win?	Which of the Three Cs does this project show most strongly?
6. What matters most right now?	The current ADOPT step and the one thing due next
7. Who does what, by when?	Team members, roles, and the next three commitments
8. How will we know it worked?	The PROOF line, the pilot result, and the verdict

The blank template is **Worksheet 5**. Below is a fully filled example.

Example Project Page: "Say It as a Request"

This is a training example. The team, numbers, and dates are illustrative, not real results.

Field	Entry
Project name	Say It as a Request: a live NVC workshop for a visiting youth group
Course	Course 11, Acts of Violence Are Failed Requests (Rosenberg, NVC)
Space and phase	Task Force, weeks 7 to 9; delivered week 10
Channel	Channel 3: Live visitors
Project lead	Resident "R.M."
Staff sponsor	Course staff facilitator; Chaplain for visitor coordination
Playbook version	Written under Playbook v1.0

Q1. Why does this project exist?

Many fights between teenagers start as a need nobody could name: respect, safety, belonging. The youth hear demands and threats where there was a request underneath. We want them to hear the request.

Q2. How will we treat each other?

TRUST charter signed by all four team members on week 7. Extra team rule: nobody tells their own case story to the youth unless staff approved it in advance.

Q3. What exactly are we building?

A 45-minute live workshop where four residents teach the four NVC steps (observation, feeling, need, request) using three role-plays drawn from school situations, plus a pocket card the youth keep.

Q4. Who is it for?

One named real person: "**Jay**," **15**, a composite built from the team's own memories of who they were at that age and checked with the visiting group's youth leader. Jay is quick to anger, smart, and hates being lectured.

Not for: youth in crisis, or as a substitute for counseling. The visiting group's own adult leaders remain responsible for their youth at all times.

Q5. Which anchor does it show?

CLOSE most strongly (credible messengers who were once Jay), with **CARRIED** built in: the pocket card and a two-page leader guide let the youth leader repeat the lesson without us.

Q6. Current step and next thing due.

ADOPT step: **T (Try, Test, Tune): complete**. Verdict recorded. Next thing due: submit revised leader guide to staff sponsor by week 10, day 3.

Q7. Team and commitments.

Who	Role	Commitment	By when
R.M.	Project lead, opener	Revised pocket card (one change only)	Week 10, Mon
T.B.	Role-play lead	Rewrite role-play 2 per 3 Ws	Week 10, Mon
D.W.	Recorder	Enter scores into the Evidence Workbook	Week 9, Fri
K.L.	Leader-guide writer	Two-page leader guide to staff sponsor	Week 10, Wed

Q8. PROOF line (written week 7, before building).

Part	Entry
Problem Number	On a 4-item "turn it into a request" card given at the start, the group averages 1 of 4 correct (counted by the youth leader during the pre-visit session)
Result Number	Group average of 3 of 4 correct on the same card at the end of the workshop
Observer	The visiting group's youth leader, with the staff facilitator as second counter
On this date	The day of the workshop, scored the same afternoon
Fail Line	Group average below 2 of 4 means the workshop did not work

ADOPT step status

Step	Status	Note
A: Agree on the problem	Done, week 7	Four Cuts: WHO (youth 13 to 16 in the visiting group), WHERE (school hallways and buses), WHEN (after a public insult), HOW (a demand heard as disrespect)
D: Diverge wide	Done, week 7	31 idea cards
O: One path	Done, week 8	Two Doors plus LESS; said back by all four members
P: Prototype small	Done, week 8	45-minute paper prototype; Stranger Test run with residents from another course
T: Try, Test, Tune	Done, week 9 to 10	Pilot with resident audience week 9; live delivery week 10

Result and 3 Ws

Item	Entry
Result	Group average 2.6 of 4 . Above the Fail Line, below the Result Number.

Item	Entry
What Worked	Role-play 1 (the bus seat) had every youth laughing and then quiet. Pocket card was kept by all.
What Wobbled	Role-play 2 used prison language the youth did not know; the "need" step lost them.
What's Next (one change)	Rewrite role-play 2 in school language, checked with the youth leader.

Verdict: ADJUST. Deliver again with the one change; same PROOF line; next visit per the Chaplain's schedule.

Limits (honest): One small group. The card measures understanding in the room, not behavior next week. The youth leader has offered to use the card again in 30 days; if approved, that becomes a retention check.

Approvals: Staff sponsor signature and date. Clinical and safety reviewer signature and date (required for any outside youth audience).

FACILITATOR NOTE

Any Channel 3 project with minors requires advance approval through the institution's visitor procedures and the Interdepartmental Committee. Build the approval time into the plan. Never promise a visiting group a date before the approval is in hand.

BOTTOM LINE

A Project Page is the Playbook shrunk to one project. If every project has one, the Monthly Report almost writes itself.

Part 6: How the Playbook Lives in the Meeting Rhythm

ANALOGY

A thermostat does not set the temperature once and walk away. It checks the room every few minutes and adjusts a little. The Meeting Rhythm is the Playbook's thermostat: small checks often, bigger adjustments rarely, and a full reset only when the season changes.

The TJP Meeting Rhythm has four meetings. Each one has a job to do with the Playbook. The rule of thumb: **the faster the meeting, the smaller the change it can make.**

Meeting	How often, how long	Playbook job	Questions touched
Check-In	Daily or per work block, 10 minutes, standing	Reads the Playbook. Reads the One Big Thing aloud; each person says today's commitment	Reads Q6 and Q7
Tactical	Weekly, 60 minutes	Updates Q7 commitments; checks progress on Q6 and Q8; reviews Project Pages	Updates Q7; checks Q6, Q8
Strategic	Monthly, 2 hours, one big topic	Revises the season's plan and anchors when evidence says so; drafts Change Requests for leadership	Revises Q5 to Q8
Horizon Review	Quarterly, half day	Revisits the foundation; asks whether purpose, behaviors, work, and people served still hold; prepares Board recommendations	Revisits Q1 to Q4

What each meeting does with the Playbook, in detail

Question	Check-In	Tactical	Strategic	Horizon Review
Q1 Why are we here?				Revisit; recommend to Board
Q2 How do we treat each other?	Name one TRUST behavior	Quick TRUST check at close		Revisit; recommend to Board
Q3 What do we actually do?				Revisit; recommend to Committee and Board
Q4 Who are we doing it for?		Check Project Pages name a real person		Revisit; recommend to Committee and Board
Q5 How will we win?			Revise if evidence says so	Review
Q6 One Big Thing	Read aloud	Check progress on supporting goals	Revise supporting goals; propose next season	Review season

Question	Check-In	Tactical	Strategic	Horizon Review
Q7 Who does what, by when?	Say today's task	Update all commitments	Revise standing roles	Review
Q8 How will we know it worked?		Check PROOF line results	Revise program measures	Review whole-program evidence

FACILITATOR NOTE

A Tactical meeting may **never** change Questions 1 to 4. If a Tactical discussion starts drifting toward "maybe our purpose is wrong," the facilitator writes it on the parking-lot sheet and it goes to the next Horizon Review. This is how Lencioni's advice to keep tactical and strategic topics apart shows up in our Playbook.

How Playbook changes are logged

Every change to the Playbook, however small, gets a line in the **Playbook Change Log**, kept by the Playbook keeper at the front of the master Playbook. The version number tells anyone at a glance how big the change was.

Version numbers:

Change	Version jump	Example	Approved by
Q1 to Q4 (foundation)	Whole number	v1.4 to v2.0	Board of Volunteers (Q1, Q2); Committee after consulting Board (Q3, Q4)
Q5 to Q8 (season plan)	Decimal	v1.3 to v1.4	Interdepartmental Committee
New or closed Project Page, typo fixes	No version change; noted in log	v1.4 (log entry only)	Staff facilitator

Sample change log:

Version	Date	What changed	Proposed by	Approved by
v1.0	(launch date)	First approved Playbook	Drafting team	Board (Q1, Q2); Committee (Q3 to Q8)
v1.1	(date)	Q7: Decision Log keeper role rotated	Tactical	Interdepartmental Committee
v1.2	(date)	Q6: Supporting goal 3 narrowed to one dorm	Strategic	Interdepartmental Committee
v2.0	(date)	Q4: added a new group served	Horizon Review	Committee after consulting Board; SCDC Division informed

Rules for changes:

1. Every change starts as a **Playbook Change Request** (Worksheet 7). Anyone can write one.
2. The request goes to the right meeting: Tactical for Q7, Strategic for Q5 to Q8, Horizon Review for Q1 to Q4.
3. The meeting recommends; the right leadership level approves.
4. Once approved, the Playbook keeper updates the master copy, the posted copies, and the change log **within one week**.
5. Every approved change appears in the next Monthly Report.
6. Old versions are kept, never thrown away. A dated, printed copy of each version goes in the Playbook binder.

The Playbook Life Cycle

This is the loop that ties meetings, the Playbook, and leadership together. It runs every month.

Step	What happens	Who	Output
1. Meeting	Check-Ins, Tacticals, and Strategics do their work	Residents and staff facilitators	Decisions and commitments spoken aloud
2. Decision Log	Every decision and commitment written down with a name and date	Decision Log keeper	A dated log, read back at the end of each meeting
3. Playbook update	Commitments update Q7; approved Change Requests update other questions; Project Pages updated	Playbook keeper, with approval at the right level	Current Playbook with a change log entry
4. Monthly Report	Playbook sections feed the report (see next table)	Program lead (staff) signs off	The TJP Monthly Report to all three levels
5. Leadership feedback	Leadership reads, asks questions, approves or declines requests	SCDC Division, Board, Committee	Written or spoken feedback, approvals
6. Next Strategic meeting	Feedback is the first agenda item; the loop starts again	Strategic facilitator	Revised plans, new Change Requests

ANALOGY

This is a seed and soil. The meeting plants the seed (a decision). The log waters it. The Playbook is the soil where it takes root. The Monthly Report is the harvest leadership sees. Leadership's feedback is next season's seed.

How the Playbook feeds The TJP Monthly Report

The Monthly Report should not require anyone to invent anything. If the Playbook is current, most of the report is already written.

Monthly Report section	Comes from	Playbook question
Who we are (one line, repeated every month)	Vision and mission	Q1
The One Big Thing: progress this month	Supporting goals, status	Q6
Commitments kept and missed	Tactical Decision Log, Worksheet 4	Q7
Proof this month	PROOF line results, Evidence Workbook	Q8
Projects this month	Project Pages opened, piloted, closed, with verdicts	Q3, Q4, Q8

Monthly Report section	Comes from	Playbook question
Changes to the Playbook	Change log	Any
Requests for leadership	Pending Change Requests	Any

WHY THIS IS HERE

Leadership levels are busy. The Monthly Report earns their attention when it is predictable, honest, and short. Tying it to the Playbook means every month they see the same eight questions answered with new evidence. That consistency is what builds confidence.

BOTTOM LINE

Meetings produce decisions. Decisions update the Playbook. The Playbook writes most of the Monthly Report. Leadership's feedback starts the next month. That loop is the whole system.

Part 7: The Clarity Check

ANALOGY

A choir can sound fine from the back of the room and still have three people singing the wrong words. The only way to find out is to have each person sing their part alone. The Clarity Check is that test.

The Clarity Check tells you whether the Playbook is living in people's heads or only on the wall. It takes about 25 minutes. Use it at orientation, at every Horizon Review, and any time a team feels confused.

How to run it

1. **Hand out blank Clarity Check sheets** (Worksheet 6). No Playbook on the table. Cover the posters if you need to.
2. **Each person answers all Eight Questions in one sentence, from memory.** Eight minutes. Silent. No looking at a neighbor.
3. **Uncover the Playbook.** Each person scores their own sheet against the current Playbook answers using the scale below. Five minutes.
4. **Compare.** Go around the room, question by question. Read a few answers aloud (voluntary). Where are we saying the same thing? Where are we far apart? Ten minutes.
5. **Record the team score** and pick **one** question the team will work on before the next check.

Scoring scale (per question)

Score	Meaning
2	Same meaning as the Playbook, in your own words
1	Close, but missing a key part or adding something that is not there
0	Blank, or a different answer

Maximum per person: **16**.

What the scores mean

Individual score	Reading
14 to 16	Clear. You could explain TJP to a judge or a new resident today.
10 to 13	Mostly clear. Review the questions you missed.
6 to 9	Foggy. Pair up with someone who scored high and walk through the Playbook.
0 to 5	Not yet. Normal for the first week of orientation; not normal after a season.

Team reading: Add up the scores for each question across the room and divide by the number of people. Any question with a team average **below 1.5** is a clarity gap. The fix is almost never "people should study harder." Per Deming, **blame the process, not the person:** the answer may be too long, the poster may be in the wrong place, or the Check-In may have stopped reading it. Fix the process.

CAUTION

The Clarity Check is never used to grade, rank, or discipline anyone. It checks the **Playbook and the Meeting Rhythm**, not the people. If people fear their score, they will copy, and the check becomes useless.

FACILITATOR NOTE

For residents who prefer not to write, run the check aloud one on one, or let people answer by drawing or by pointing to a set of printed answer cards. The goal is to learn what people understand, not to test their handwriting.

BOTTOM LINE

If people cannot say it from memory, it is not clear yet. Measure clarity the same way we measure everything else: honestly, and with a way to fix it.

Part 8: What Could Go Wrong

Every good tool can be misused. Here are the most likely ways the Playbook fails, and what to do about each.

What could go wrong	What it looks like	What to do
The binder problem	The Playbook is written once and never opened	Check-In reads Q6 aloud every day; Tactical updates Q7 every week. If a meeting did not touch the Playbook, it did not follow the Rhythm.
Word drift	Posters say one thing, the master file another	Playbook keeper updates posted copies within one week of any change; version number printed on every poster
Too many "One Big Things"	The season has three rallying cries	Committee approves exactly one. Everything else is a supporting goal, a standing responsibility, or "not this season."
Moving the goalposts	A PROOF line target changes after the pilot	Approved Result Numbers and Fail Lines are locked. Log any attempt to change them.
Confusion about authority	Residents believe a Tactical vote changed the purpose	Post the authority table (Part 4) next to the Playbook. Tactical never changes Q1 to Q4.
Slogans instead of behavior	TRUST is recited but not practiced	Close every Tactical with a one-minute TRUST check: "Which behavior did we do well? Which did we miss?"
Overload	The Playbook grows to 40 pages	Program-level Playbook stays under about 6 pages. Everything else goes on Project Pages or in other TJP documents.
Clinical boundary creep	A project starts drifting into therapy or into contact with people harmed	Q4 "not for" lines and the clinical and safety reviewer's signature on every Project Page with trauma-adjacent content

BOTTOM LINE

Most Playbook failures are silent. The Meeting Rhythm is what makes them loud enough to fix.

Part 9: Why TJP Must Exist

WHY TJP MUST EXIST

South Carolina, like every state, releases the great majority of the people it incarcerates back into its communities. They come home to the same neighborhoods, the same families, and the same forks in the road that shaped them. The only question is **who they will be when they come home**, and what they will carry with them.

The old story about harm has two characters: the offender and the punishment. It leaves out the person harmed, whose healing is too often an afterthought. It leaves out the conditions that made the harm likely: trauma, shame, addiction, neighborhoods without safe adults. And it leaves out the most underused resource in prevention: people who have caused harm, understood it, and want the next harm never to happen.

TJP reframes that narrative. It takes people who know harm from the inside, gives them serious science (Siegel, van der Kolk, Rosenberg, Meadows, Freire, and others), holds them to a rigorous process, and puts them under three levels of accountable leadership. What comes out is not just changed residents, though that matters enormously. What comes out is **tested tools that other people can use**: in schools, churches, courts, recovery programs, and reentry programs across South Carolina.

That is why the mission says "all sectors." Harm does not stay in one sector. A child who witnesses violence at home shows up in a school, a clinic, a juvenile court, and, too often, years later, in a prison dorm. Prevention has to show up in all of those places too.

Why this Playbook, specifically, is part of the case

A skeptic will ask a fair question: "Isn't this just another prison program with good intentions?" The Playbook is our answer, and it is a strong one:

A skeptic asks	The Playbook answers
"Do they even know what they're trying to do?"	Every resident can say the Eight Questions from memory, and we check (the Clarity Check).
"Who is running this?"	Three levels of leadership, written into every question's approval rule. Not resident-led.
"How do we know it works?"	Question 8. PROOF lines written before building, Fail Lines honored, verdicts reported, including ABANDON.
"Won't it just stay inside the fence?"	Question 4 names real people outside the fence. The CARRIED anchor demands tools others can use without us.
"Will it last past the founders?"	The Playbook, Project Pages, and change log are a written memory. Cohort B inherits Cohort A's library.

ANALOGY

A prison without a program like TJP is a waiting room: people sit, the clock runs, and they leave the same or worse. TJP turns the waiting room into a workshop. The Playbook is the sign on the workshop door that tells everyone what we are building and how we will know it is good.

BOTTOM LINE

South Carolina will get these residents back. TJP makes sure it gets back teachers, builders, and credible messengers, and a library of tested tools. The Playbook is how we prove we are serious.

Part 10: Signage for the Dorm, the Think Tank, and the Task Force

WHY THIS IS HERE

Lencioni's third discipline is "overcommunicate clarity." In a place with zero internet and a lot of empty wall, signs are our most powerful way to repeat the answers. Print on the LAN printers, laminate, and label. Put the Playbook version number in the bottom corner of every sign so old signs get noticed and replaced.

Sign	Where	What it says	Size and notes
The Eight Questions	Dorm common area, Think Tank, Task Force	The eight questions with the memory chant: <i>Why, How, What, Whom. Win, Now, Who, Know.</i>	Two letter sheets side by side, or one sheet in large type
Our Answers	Think Tank wall	The current one-line answer to each of the Eight Questions	Updated with each version; version number printed
The One Big Thing banner	Above the Task Force door	THIS SEASON'S ONE BIG THING: Launch Cohort A and prove the model	Several sheets taped in a row; changes only when the season changes
Supporting Goals scoreboard	Task Force wall	The 3 or 4 supporting goals with a simple status: Not started / Moving / Done	Laminated; status written in dry-erase marker at Tactical
TRUST	Every meeting space	The five core behaviors	One per table if possible
Close, Checked, Carried	Task Force	The Three Cs with one line each	Put near the prototype table
No Numbers, No Build	Task Force, by the supply shelf	"Nobody builds until the PROOF line is written."	Small and blunt
Project Wall	Task Force	Current Project Pages pinned up, one per project	Retire closed pages into the binder
Who Decides	Next to the Playbook binder	The authority table in short form: Residents propose. Committee approves Q3 to Q8. Board guards Q1 and Q2. SCDC Division is informed.	Prevents confusion about authority
Rhythm card	Meeting table	"Check-In reads. Tactical updates. Strategic revises. Horizon Review revisits."	Label-maker strip on each table edge

SIGN FOR THE DORM

THE EIGHT QUESTIONS

1. Why are we here?
2. How do we treat each other?
3. What do we actually do?
4. Who are we doing it for?
5. How will we win?
6. What matters most right now?
7. Who does what, by when?
8. How will we know it worked?

Why, How, What, Whom. Win, Now, Who, Know.

SIGN FOR THE DORM

NO NUMBERS, NO BUILD. Write the PROOF line first. Problem Number. Result Number. Observer. On this date. Fail Line.

SIGN FOR THE DORM

CHECK-IN READS. TACTICAL UPDATES. STRATEGIC REVISES. HORIZON REVIEW REVISITS.

CAUTION

All signage must follow institutional rules on what can be posted and where. Get approval from the Interdepartmental Committee before hanging anything.

Part 11: Getting Started: The First 30 Days

A Playbook starts as a draft and becomes real through use. Here is a simple path from this document to a living Playbook.

When	What	Who
Week 1	Drafting team (residents and a staff facilitator) reads this document and marks up the draft answers in Part 4	Drafting team
Week 1	Interdepartmental Committee reviews the draft answers to Q3 to Q8	Committee
Week 2	Board of Volunteers reviews Q1 and Q2 and comments on Q3 and Q4	Board
Week 2	First Clarity Check with the drafting team (expect low scores; that is the baseline)	Facilitator
Week 3	Approved answers become Playbook v1.0; change log started; signs printed and approved	Playbook keeper
Week 3	Check-Ins begin reading the One Big Thing aloud	All facilitators
Week 4	First Tactical updates Q7 commitments on Worksheet 4	Tactical facilitator
Week 4	First Project Pages opened for any ADOPT projects underway	Project leads
End of month	First Monthly Report includes the Playbook v1.0 summary	Program lead (staff)

BOTTOM LINE

Do not wait for a perfect Playbook. Unfinished is allowed. Approve v1.0, use it, and let the Meeting Rhythm improve it.

Worksheet 1: The Eight Questions Master Sheet

Playbook version: v_____ Date: _____ Approved by: _____

Write each answer in one or two sentences. If you cannot fit it, it is not clear yet.

#	Question	Our answer (plain words)	Guarded or approved by
1	Why are we here?		Board of Volunteers
2	How do we treat each other?		Board of Volunteers
3	What do we actually do?		Committee, Board consulted
4	Who are we doing it for?		Committee, Board consulted
5	How will we win?		Interdepartmental Committee
6	What matters most right now?		Interdepartmental Committee
7	Who does what, by when?		Interdepartmental Committee
8	How will we know it worked?		Committee, Board consulted

Say-it-back check: Can every person in the room say the One Big Thing from memory? Yes _____ No _____

One-breath test: Read your Q1 answer aloud. Did it take more than one breath? Yes _____ No _____

Signatures (drafting team):

Worksheet 2: Core Behaviors

Use this to review TRUST, sort values into the four kinds, and check whether we live what we say.

Part A: Sort our values. List everything people say we value. Put each in one column.

Core (who we truly are)	Permission to play (required)	Aspirational (not yet)	Accidental (crept in)
-------------------------	-------------------------------	------------------------	-----------------------

Part B: Behavior check. For each TRUST behavior, write one example from the past two weeks where we did it, and one where we missed it.

Behavior	We did it when...	We missed it when...
----------	-------------------	----------------------

Tell it early

Unfinished is allowed

Take the task

Part C: The cost test. Which core behavior would we keep even if it cost us something (time, comfort, looking good)? Explain.

Part D: Proposed change (if any). Use Worksheet 7 to send it to the Board of Volunteers through the Interdepartmental Committee.



Worksheet 3: The One Big Thing

Lencioni's thematic goal in plain words: one rallying cry for one season (six to twelve months), three to five supporting goals, and the standing responsibilities that never go away.

Season: from _____ to _____

THE ONE BIG THING (one sentence):

Test it: Is it one thing? ____ Has an end date? ____ Could every resident and staff member say it? ____

Supporting goals (temporary pieces that make the One Big Thing true):

#	Supporting goal	What "done" looks like	PROOF line attached?	Owner
1			Yes / No	
2			Yes / No	
3			Yes / No	
4			Yes / No	
5			Yes / No	

Standing responsibilities (every season, no matter what):

#	Standing responsibility	Owner	How we check it
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			

"Not this season" list (good ideas we are choosing to wait on):

Approved by Interdepartmental Committee: _____ Date: _____

Worksheet 4: Who Does What by When

Filled in during Tactical meetings. Read back at the end of every meeting. One name, one date, one proof.

Team or meeting: _____ Week of: _____ Facilitator: _____

#	Task (one thing)	Who (one name)	By when	Done = (how we can tell)
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				

Last week's commitments review:

#	Task	Done / Not done	If not done: what got in the way (blame the process)

#	Task	Done / Not done	If not done: what got in the way (blame the process)
---	------	-----------------	--

Commitments kept this week: _____ of _____

Staff facilitator initials: _____

Worksheet 5: Project Page Template

Project name: _____ Playbook version: v _____

Course or Keystone: _____ Channel (1, 2, 3, or 4): _____ Space: Think Tank / Task Force

Project lead: _____ Staff sponsor: _____

Question (project size)

Our answer

1. Why does this project exist?

2. TRUST charter signed? Extra rules?

3. What exactly are we building? (one sentence)

4. One named real person it is for. Who is it NOT for?

5. Which anchor does it show most? (Close, Checked, Carried)

6. Current ADOPT step and next thing due

7. Team, roles, next three commitments

8. PROOF line (written BEFORE building):

Part

Entry

Problem Number (baseline)

Result Number (win)

Observer (outside the team)

On this date

Fail Line

ADOPT status: A ____ D ____ O ____ P ____ T ____ (write the date each step was completed)

Result: _____ What Worked: _____

What Wobbled: _____ What's Next (one change): _____

Verdict (circle one): ADOPT / ADJUST / ABANDON

Honest limits: _____

Staff sponsor signature and date: _____

Clinical and safety reviewer (required for trauma-adjacent content or outside audiences):

Worksheet 6: The Clarity Check

Name (optional): _____ Date: _____ Playbook version: v_____

Answer each question in one sentence, from memory. Do not look at the posters. Then score yourself: 2 = same meaning, 1 = close, 0 = blank or different.

#	Question	My one-sentence answer	Score
1	Why are we here?		
2	How do we treat each other?		
3	What do we actually do?		
4	Who are we doing it for?		
5	How will we win?		
6	What matters most right now?		
7	Who does what, by when? (name your own role)		
8	How will we know it worked?		

My total: _____ of 16

Team tally (facilitator):

Question	Team total	Number of people	Team average (below 1.5 = gap)
Q1			
Q2			
Q3			
Q4			
Q5			

Question	Team total	Number of people	Team average (below 1.5 = gap)
Q6			
Q7			
Q8			

The one question we will work on before the next check: _____ Process fix: _____

Worksheet 7: Playbook Change Request

Anyone can propose a change. The right leadership level decides. Attach extra pages if needed.

Proposed by: _____ Date: _____ Current version: v _____

Which question? (circle) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 or Project Page: _____

Current answer (copy it exactly):

Proposed new answer:

Why change it? What evidence do we have? (a PROOF result, a 3 Ws debrief, a Clarity Check gap, leadership feedback)

Which TRUST behavior or anchor does this protect or strengthen? _____

Routing (facilitator completes):

Step	Meeting or level	Date	Result
Discussed at	Tactical (Q7) / Strategic (Q5 to Q8) / Horizon Review (Q1 to Q4)		Recommend / Do not recommend
Approved by	Interdepartmental Committee		Approved / Declined / Returned
Approved by (Q1, Q2 required; Q3, Q4, Q8 consulted)	Board of Volunteers		Approved / Declined / Comment
Informed	SCDC Division (via Monthly Report)		Month reported:

New version number: v _____ Change log updated by: _____ Posted copies updated on:

Further Study

FURTHER STUDY

Start with *The Advantage* chapters on creating clarity, then read the ADOPT workshop materials again with the Eight Questions beside you. You will see that every ADOPT tool answers one of the questions at project size.

- **Patrick Lencioni, *The Advantage: Why Organizational Health Trumps Everything Else in Business* (Jossey-Bass, 2012).** The source of the six critical questions, the four kinds of values, strategic anchors, the thematic goal, and the "playbook." Read the section on creating clarity closely; skim the business examples. Ask for it through the institutional library or a partner donation.
- **Patrick Lencioni, *The Five Dysfunctions of a Team* (Jossey-Bass, 2002).** A short story about a leadership team that cannot trust each other. The foundation for our TRUST behaviors. Excellent for group reading; the story format works well for any reading level.
- **Patrick Lencioni, *Death by Meeting* (Jossey-Bass, 2004).** The source of the meeting types behind the TJP Meeting Rhythm. Read alongside the TJP Meeting Rhythm document.
- **W. Edwards Deming, *Out of the Crisis* (MIT Press).** Deming's case that most problems come from the system, not the worker. The idea behind "blame the process, not the person." Dense; read chapter summaries first.
- **W. Edwards Deming, *The New Economics for Industry, Government, Education* (MIT Press).** Includes the Plan, Do, Study, Act cycle, the thinking behind Question 8 and the One Change Rule.
- **Mary Walton, *The Deming Management Method* (Perigee).** The friendliest introduction to Deming. Start here before *Out of the Crisis*.
- **Gerald Langley and colleagues, *The Improvement Guide* (Jossey-Bass).** Built around three questions that sit close to our Question 8: What are we trying to accomplish? How will we know a change is an improvement? What change can we make that will result in improvement?
- **Atul Gawande, *The Checklist Manifesto* (Metropolitan Books, 2009).** Why short written tools save lives in complex work. A good argument for keeping the Playbook short.
- **Amy Edmondson, *The Fearless Organization* (Wiley, 2018).** On psychological safety: why people speak up or stay silent. Supports "Tell it early" and "Say it in the room."
- **Chip Heath and Dan Heath, *Made to Stick* (Random House, 2007).** Why some ideas are remembered and others are forgotten. Use it when writing Playbook answers and signs.
- **Sam Kaner and colleagues, *Facilitator's Guide to Participatory Decision-Making* (Jossey-Bass).** The best practical book for anyone facilitating Tactical and Strategic meetings.
- **Marshall Rosenberg, *Nonviolent Communication: A Language of Life* (PuddleDancer Press).** Background for the Course 11 example Project Page.
- **The Table Group (Lencioni's firm), tablegroup.com.** Free summaries and tools on organizational health. Staff or partners can print relevant pages; residents have no internet access.

Sources

- Lencioni, Patrick. *The Advantage: Why Organizational Health Trumps Everything Else in Business*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2012. (Six critical questions, four disciplines, value types, strategic anchors, thematic goal, playbook.)
- Lencioni, Patrick. *The Five Dysfunctions of a Team: A Leadership Fable*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2002.
- Lencioni, Patrick. *Death by Meeting: A Leadership Fable*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004.
- Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center, "Lencioni Thematic Goal Model" (summary of thematic goal, defining objectives, standard operating objectives): <https://www.ttuhsc.edu/president/documents/lencioni/lencioni-thematic-goal-model.pdf>
- Consult Clarity, "Thematic Goal: Lencioni Guide" (summary noting a three-to-twelve-month thematic goal window): <https://www.consultclarity.org/post/thematic-goal-lencioni-guide>
- Deming, W. Edwards. *Out of the Crisis*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press (originally MIT Center for Advanced Engineering Study, 1982/1986).
- Deming, W. Edwards. *The New Economics for Industry, Government, Education*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1993.
- Walton, Mary. *The Deming Management Method*. New York: Perigee, 1986.
- Langley, Gerald J., et al. *The Improvement Guide: A Practical Approach to Enhancing Organizational Performance*. 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2009.
- Gawande, Atul. *The Checklist Manifesto*. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2009.
- Edmondson, Amy C. *The Fearless Organization*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2018.
- Heath, Chip, and Dan Heath. *Made to Stick*. New York: Random House, 2007.
- TJP, *The ADOPT Model: Task Force Workshop Series* (internal). Source of ADOPT, TRUST, PROOF, LESS, the 3 Ws, and the doctrine quoted throughout.