

Status and Trends Workgroup

MINUTES

November 8, 2016 from 1:00-3:00 PM

CBPO Fishshack

Conference Line: 866-299-3188, access code 410-267-5731

Adobe Connect: <http://epawebconferencing.acms.com/stwg/>

Website: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/24329/>

Preparation for this Meeting:

Please review [the Diversity Profile presentation](#) by Jim Edward to the Management Board.

Please review the Status and Trends workplan [here](#).

1:00-1:10 pm Opening (Laura Free, 10 minutes)

- Welcome and introductions
- Review action items from last meeting:

ACTION- Work plan will be cleaned up and then sent out to Status and Trends group for input on appropriate leads. Unassigned leads will be discussed at our next meeting.

1:10-1:40 pm Diversity Indicator (Darius Stanton, 30 minutes)

Description: Leadership from the Diversity workgroup will present a proposed indicator for the Diversity outcome of the Agreement, based on the baseline profile assessment conducted this summer.

Nota Bene: Please review the presentation linked above for more information about the Diversity Profile.

Objective: To request input on area of focus of the indicator and relationship of the indicator to other diversity activities within the Partnership.

[See Presentation.](#)

Darius Stanton and Jim Edwards provided a review of the Diversity Workgroup held on November 2, 2016. This meeting was viewed as a success in reaching out to stakeholders and creating a starting point for future engagement with Diversity Workgroup initiatives and future development of their indicator. Jim reviewed the Diversity Workgroup's goal to have this Diversity indicator ready by the December Management Board meeting, as well as for the next Bay Barometer publication. Jim continued that the next priority will be to display this information graphically.

Darius reviewed the Diversity outcome in the Chesapeake Bay Agreement, and then the results from the Diversity Profile, and how the DAT plans to move forward to create an indicator from this information. Jim added that to start this process, this initial survey focused on the Bay Partnership. Additionally, based on the results of the survey and the experience of Green 2.0, a nonprofit with experience analyzing the gaps in diversity in various organizations, the workgroup has decided to first focus the indicator on race and ethnicity.

Jim discussed that there will most likely not be a number goal set for this Diversity outcome for 2025, but the group would like this as a possible option in the future once more data is collected and analyzed.

Jim expressed the intention to work with Catherine to show and track progress in both staff and leadership positions held by nonwhite minorities for Chesapeake Progress. “Leadership position” was defined as GIT Chair, Vice Chair, EC, PSC, MB, and other.

Kristin asked where in the workplan does it address these indicators? It might be harder to address the leadership position component without first addressing the overall diversity of CBP and beyond. Reggie added that there is also the thought that focusing on diversity in leadership first will allow for future diversity in the organization as a whole. Jim responded that people believe we should set a goal for participation, but continue to track and be transparent about leadership numbers. By prioritizing this idea of visibility of these numbers, it could allow for the CBP to make this a priority in the Program.

Doreen asked about the current outcome, which includes creating programs and opportunities to engage these communities. Specifically, has there been consideration in how to track the programs and opportunities to engage the diverse populations? Will the Diversity workgroup put programs in place to encourage diversity? And if so, how will that effort be measured? Doreen discussed how these programs and opportunities might need to be the first priority to encourage leadership and involvement. Jim discussed the four management approaches of the goal that help to fill this engagement opportunity component. Reggie added that keeping track of this engagement could be tricky, just based on creating a definition of this goal, of “engagement” in the Partnership.

Laura asked whether leadership should extend beyond the chair and vice chair positions. Darius responded that this current definition is what applies to the CBP. To broaden this definition will make it more difficult to track. Jim added that eventually a broader measure can come into play over time.

Jim added that there were additional breakdowns of the responses of nonwhite respondents in Survey Monkey.

Reggie continued that this will be nested with the Citizen Stewardship goal in the Bay Barometer, because there is a diversity component of the Citizen Stewardship goal. Rachel added that graphically, the placement of this info in relation to the Stewardship goal is still being discussed.

In 2017, the Diversity workgroup will reevaluate the indicator and potentially propose a revised indicator with a goal target, along with a 2025 goal. Currently there is no exact goal with the indicator proposed. The Diversity Workgroup plans to gather new survey info every 2 years, but three years for the first survey.

ACTION- Laura will work with the Diversity workgroup to gather all relevant materials and data to then provide to Catherine to help best visualize this information on Progress.

Doreen asked how to revise the indicator. If you’re measuring a condition, but changing what you’re measuring, it will prevent the view of trends. She believes that an interim indicator is okay to have until a more-long term indicator can be created. Catherine advocated to focus on the data in general.

1:40-2:10pm STAC Workshops- (Laura Free, 30 min)

Description: STAC releases a request for proposal to CBP partners in January of each year. All proposals are then presented to STAC and considered at a STAC quarterly meeting. While proposals are accepted

throughout the year, the upcoming RFP provides a good opportunity to discuss any specific needs that this workgroup might want addressed with a STAC workshop.

Objective: To gather input from workgroup members whether there are any needs that should be addressed with a STAC workshop.

At the last STAR meeting, the S&T workplan was discussed, with STAC representatives in attendance. Advice was given to the Status and Trends Workgroup to request information from particular STAC members before going to the group as a whole for workgroup concerns. With that information given, Laura asked the Status and Trends workgroup if a STAC workshop is something that the group should consider to apply for.

Laura continued that a STAC workshop might be helpful to prioritize a list of needs, but not sure if the workgroup is going to be in a place to put forward a proposal for a workshop at the beginning of Jan at the latest.

Kristin asked if any indicators in particular would benefit from a STAC workshop co-sponsored by a GIT? Doreen mentioned that several workgroup members have an upcoming meeting with some STAC members interested in indicators and the Indicators Framework. The broader STAC membership is not equipped to answer questions re: indicator development until the workgroup moves forward with the smaller STAC group.

ACTION: In an upcoming small group meeting with STAC reps next week with Doreen and other members of the Status and Trends Workgroup, one goal will be to determine whether any information that comes from this meeting might lend itself toward developing a STAC workshop in the future (ie- focus on Factors Influencing Indicators).

Laura would like a bare-bones proposal for the workgroup for a possible future STAC workshop proposal.

ACTION- Laura can review with GITs about their indicator needs before the next S&T meeting.

2:10-2:40 pm Workplan- Activity Leads (Laura Free, 30 minutes)

Description: The workgroup will discuss leads for the activities listed in the workplan, which was approved at the last meeting.

Nota Bene: Please review the Status and Trends workplan [here](#) and add your name as lead to activities as appropriate prior to the meeting. Workgroup members were requested to self-assign tasks prior to this November meeting; the meeting will go over the unclaimed activities.

STAR Coordinator Peter Tango will be added in the workplan for Prioritized List of Needed Indicators and Building the Capacity of the Program to develop and maintain indicators through partnerships with STAR and STAC. Laura wants to make sure there is close coordination between science and indicator needs.

2:40-2:45pm Timeline Review (Laura Free, 5 minutes)

Description: This standing agenda item will confirm data updates completed in the last month and list data updates occurring within the next month.

Objective: to make members aware of completed and upcoming data updates so they can resolve timing conflicts or other issues offline with the Indicators Coordinator.

The protected lands indicator should be announced shortly, hopefully in the next couple weeks. This indicator is almost at 50% of the goal that was originally set.

The wetlands indicator is also getting updated. Some further work with jurisdictions is needed for the data, but this will hopefully be updated this month.

Kristen asked if we should take the opportunity to highlight additional upcoming actions for that indicator and others, linking this news to other events that are happening? Catherine responded that this type of communication has not been tied to policy, but rather would rely on subject matter experts for this connection, or jurisdictional members of the communications workgroup. This should probably be a question asked to the states/jurisdictions to relate back to this information.

2:45-3:00 pm Report Out of Action Items (Melissa Merritt, 15 minutes)

Action Item	Timeframe	Lead
Work with the Diversity workgroup to gather all relevant materials and data to then provide to Catherine to help best visualize this information on Progress.	December	Laura and Catherine
In an upcoming small group meeting with STAC reps next week with members of the Status and Trends Workgroup, one goal will be to determine whether any information that comes from this meeting might lend itself toward developing a STAC workshop in the future (ie- focus on Factors Influencing Indicators).	November	Laura, Doreen
Review with GITs about their indicator needs before the next S&T meeting	Before Dec. 13, 2016	Laura

Adjourn (Next meeting scheduled for December 13 from 1-3 pm in Fishshack.)

Future Agenda Items

Topic	Timeframe	Lead
Diversity Indicator	November 8, 2016	Darius Stanton/Reggie Parrish

*Scientific, Technical Assessment and Reporting (STAR) Team
Chesapeake Bay Program*

Develop guiding questions to assist GITs in developing indicators in each of the categories of the Indicator Framework	December 2016	Laura Free
Exploring a Forage Fish Indicator	TBD	Bruce Vogt
How do key actions in the work plans relate to an indicator?	Spring 2017	Workgroup members

Participants:

Kristin Saunders, Cross GIT Coordinator, ksaunders@ca.umces.edu
Catherine Krikstan, Chesapeake Stat Team, ckrikstan@chesapeakebay.net
Laura Free Indicators Coordinator, free.laura@epa.gov
Peter Tango STAR Coordinator, ptango@chesapeakebay.net
Rachel Felver Communications Director, rfelver@chesapeakebay.net
Reggie Parrish, Diversity and Local Leadership, parrish.reginald@epa.gov
Darius Stanton, Diversity Staffer, stanton.darius@epa.gov
Jim Edward, Deputy Director, edward.james@epa.gov
Qian Zhang, STAR Analyst, qzhang@chesapeakebay.net
Stephanie Smith, Communications, ssmith@chesapeakebay.net
Howard Weinberg, GIS Analyst, hweinber@chesapeakebay.net
Doreen Vetter, ChesapeakeStat Project Manager, vetter.doreen@epa.gov