



Activation Strategies & Recommendations

Summary

There's an immense opportunity for LPSCC to leverage the core-strategy groups' work beyond the specific goals and actions they select. Designing the process for group engagement is the next step. Done intentionally, participants will have the opportunity to build strong relationships within and between their groups. The three launch options outlined below are not necessarily linear, but exist along a spectrum that begins with the lowest-effort/lowest relationship-building opportunities and builds to the last option, a commitment to a networked approach.

Developing a networked approach will encourage relationship building and unique collaborations, amplify influence, and coordinate actions. These relationships between individuals and organizations, likely and unlikely allies, are the bedrock for creating systemic change and will build resiliency in the movement to transform the criminal legal system. Ultimately, as the network grows in strength and cohesion, the dependence on a convener will wane and the resilience against election cycles will grow.

We believe that LPSCC is uniquely positioned to launch the planning canvas work. There still are decisions to make on HOW to launch, and WHO to center in that process. Below are a few options to consider.

Options for Launch

Option 1: Self-directed planning

Through existing relationships, LPSCC invites individuals to participate in a self-directed planning process utilizing the Planning Canvas and Guidebook. It will be critical to identify for each strategy group a leader or coordinator who is at the very least ensuring the canvas is complete and monthly check-ins are updated in the planning hub and at most are driving participation in the planning process.

Pros: This route is a lighter lift that could get started quickly. LPSCC has strong relationships that could be utilized in the invitation process. We know there is no perfect way to start this work, and this option encourages groups to focus on what can be done to move forward with coordinated and collaborative action.

Cons: Moving too quickly may not center the community in the way the project was intended to. Without funding, certain organizations/voices may not be able to participate and the value proposition may not be strong enough to drive engagement.

How to get started: Utilize the [Potential Participants List](#) and the tools on [Invitation](#) in the guidebook. Identify and invite champions for each strategy group, being clear about what group they are invited to and what core strategies they hold.

Deliver [strategy group slide decks](#) to each group and offer a simple timeline for reporting back. Participants directly access and use the tools in the Planning Canvas and Guidebook themselves.



Option 2: Facilitated Support

Through a more robust outreach process, brainstorm and invite critical voices to participate in a semi-supported planning process. Support groups with an external facilitator(s) that manages logistics, facilitation, and accountability or check-in measures for each group.

Pros: This option focuses on intentional invitation and supportive facilitation. Facilitation will allow participants to show up fully to provide their perspective and ideas, unencumbered by the logistics of getting to work. It will also ensure that the groups' goals, actions, and progress are documented and centralized in a single location. Having all the groups' work in one place will give Multnomah County leaders and decision makers greater visibility into the work and opportunities to publicly celebrate successes.

Cons: This option requires resources to be allocated for additional people power. Facilitators have the ability to make (or break) a planning process. Finding the right facilitator(s) will be important.

How to get started: Answer questions like: What voices need to be integrated into the planning process at this stage of the project? How can LPSCC (or another convening body) support the work so it happens in a coordinated and timely fashion? Consider collaborative funding models to support this work.

Facilitators provide direction and coach-like support in using the Planning Canvas and Guidebook.

Option 3: Formalize the Transforming Justice Network

"Network leadership is rooted in trusting relationships, collaboration, and shared power: it is adaptive, facilitative, and grounded in the wisdom of living systems"

- David Ehrlichman (network builder, author)

"I think of movements as intentional worlds ... not as an unfolding accident of random occurrences, but rather as a massive weaving of intention. You can be tossed about, you can follow someone else's pattern, or you can intentionally begin to weave and shape existence."

- Adrienne Maree Brown (author, doula, activist)

The Transforming Justice Project has built an informal network through its shared work over the past few years, and formalizing the network is a natural progression. While some networks are static and do not need to mature or change to reach their objectives, others need to move through stages of maturity to serve the shared purpose of their members. The Transforming Justice network could move through the following 3 stages to maturity:

Stage 1: Scattered Fragments

This is where we are now. Different groups of individuals/organizations collaborate in an ad-hoc fashion through project-based work. Collaboration is inconsistent, vulnerable to environmental changes, and ultimately unsustainable.

Stage 2: Hub and Spoke Network

LPSCC (or other convening body at the center) catalyzes and activates a network focused first on planning efforts but could have additional objectives in the future such as shared learning, shared resourcing, or collective action.

Stage 3: Multi-Hub Network

Through relationship building and planning work, new collaborations and networks are launched. No one group is centered. As leadership disperses, overall resilience grows.

Pros: Formalizing the network continues to build important relationships and trust that will help ensure that the vision of this project outlasts election cycles. This approach also shifts and distributes power back to folks most impacted or energized by this work. Concurrently, this frees LPSCC or any convening body to not be depended upon directly for forward movement. There may be unique, collaborative funding opportunities for a network.



Cons: Launching a network is no small feat, and having individuals and organizations that are fully bought in and in specific roles will be necessary to get started. If there is limited funding and capacity within LPSCC, another catalyst to the network would need to be identified.

How to get started: Ask the questions, what is happening and what is wanting to emerge? Clarify the purpose and principles of the network. This could include the core pillars (or the next iteration of them).

Convene early-adopters who are already engaged and develop a Transforming Justice [Network Charter](#) through a facilitated process. Clarify the target audience, considering if the network is for individuals inspired by the vision of TJ or organizations that are committed to collective impact (i.e., What altitude of influence and collaboration is required?). Utilize the planning process to identify founding members of the network who can then become champions to recruit others into the collaboration and group work.

After the first few months working together, convene all the core strategy groups (virtually or in person) to share their work to-date and uncover opportunities for collaboration. and group work.

Recommendations for any or all options

- Set-up a Google group, or other form of listserv, for all strategy group members.
- Identify and secure funding for adequate compensation for participants.
- Strategy groups composition:
 - Ideally none of the groups should go forward without the leaders in the Multnomah justice system. That is what makes this different from other groups already working together. LPSCC has the unique power to convene those leaders.
 - Some of the strategy groups have dozens of suggested participants. Core strategy groups can be larger, but 4-6 people is the recommended action group size.
 - If people cannot be a part of team formation (convening, agreeing on governance), they could show up and weigh in on the brainstorming of goals only. This might be a moment when strategy groups expand in size but then contract to continue the planning process.
 - Group D "Wellness as a key strategy" focuses on law enforcement, but it would also benefit from service providers and community members being part of that group.
 - Group E "Human Centered Design" also doesn't include service providers as suggested participants. Including them could broaden the reach of the county's HCD approach.
- Schedule and host semi-regular (annual?) convenings for participants to connect across groups (could be hosted by network member organizations)
- Create a mechanism for sharing stories of success—once action groups have had success using this guidebook and the tools, celebrate the good work and spread awareness for the Transforming Justice (project/network, etc).
- When someone/a group isn't showing up/participating, first ask, as LPSCC, "How are we not providing clear enough value that they want to participate?" Assuming there is trust between the participant/group and LPSCC, work with them to understand their needs and find ways to modify the process to work for them and the broader group. If there isn't trust, begin building it.
- What to do when someone isn't doing the work they committed to delivering? Build in earlier report-back processes so the group, or LPSCC/convening body, can offer support as soon as it is needed. If follow-through



remains an issue, work with them to explore if the work is appropriate for the goal the group wishes to achieve. Spark a conversation about "[Team Health](#)" and make adjustments as needed.

- Consider opportunities and resources to leverage the power of HCD (e.g., HCD training, facilitators, storytelling of HCD success) at all moments of activation.

Checklist for launch

- Compensation mechanism for core strategy group participants for core strategy group participants is in place
- Identify the convener. If not LPSCC, identify an organization or individual an organization or individual who is:
 - Managing the dashboard as the coordination tool
 - Enabling access to criminal legal system influencers and leadership
 - Leveraging existing relationships to invite folks in
 - Able to hold people accountable to their commitment to participate
- Update contact info and references to LPSCC throughout the Guidebook (all instances highlighted in yellow) as required.
- Finalize guidebook links and process:
 - Create feedback form on the LPSCC website for folks to offer feedback, concerns, questions, or ideas for improvement of the Guidebook. Provide a link to this form wherever the Guidebook is found.
 - Update hyperlinks to the latest microsite or website for relevant content (i.e., references to project background, pillars, vision, and core strategies) if changes have been made since first edition.
 - Check that external hyperlinks are still alive and consider updating external hyperlinks to permanent links using internet archive The [Wayback Machine](#)—enter website link, select date, and then copy the web address. That website address (<https://web.archive.org/web/...>) is a permanent address that will not change over time.
 - Confirm who and in what format the canvas should be sent to LPSCC per each strategy group. This needs to be determined at time of launch. Guidebook says to send in google sheet or excel format to Christina but if capacity increases at LPSCC, could offer for folks to send the raw worksheets and LPSCC enters into spreadsheets on their behalf and then sends back to them to confirm accuracy.
 - Revisit privacy practice for the canvas content. Currently all canvas' are in a single spreadsheet that is visible to all strategy group members. The design of the planning hub as a single spreadsheet means that all info will be shared amongst strategy groups and that information that is requested to be private will only be private from the general public, not other strategy groups. Consider in the implementation phase -- does this do enough to respect people's requests for private info?



Additional Resources/Tools

[Network Intentions Template](#)

[Tech Tools for Networks](#)

[Network Weaver](#)

[Network Impact](#)