

GIT Chairs Workshop, March 17 – 18, 2025

Key Themes and Messages from Day 1 (Potential Next Steps):

1. Integrated Logic Models:

- We could develop a conceptual model for each outcome, akin to Puget Sound's [model](#), to better illustrate connections and linkages among various outcomes, and better communicate the efforts of the partnership to external audiences.
- Building out a logic model for the entire CBP to help combine the outcome review process with the structure conversation – Form follows function. Discuss and develop a strategy for organizing goals and outcomes to streamline efforts and improve focus.

2. Place-Based Efforts:

- The value of case studies and place-based efforts was emphasized, suggesting a need to explore existing initiatives and their interconnections, without losing watershed-wide efforts by workgroups.
- Is there benefit in producing more maps illustrating connections and linkages among various outcomes similar to the shallow tidal-water example?
- We had discussions that we need to work to continue to provide information at the local scale (informing local restoration and conservation efforts), since the partners work locally

3. Outcome Integration vs. Specialization:

- There is a tension between integrating outcomes (e.g., fish passage, stream health, brook trout) to improve efficiency and the risk of losing specificity and participation by oversimplifying or merging distinct outcomes.

4. SMART Outcomes:

- The discussion highlighted the challenge of defining outcomes that are Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound (SMART). Concerns were raised about whether all outcomes should adhere to this framework and the implications of doing so. Alternatively, the outputs could be developed to meet SMART criteria.

5. Clarification of Terms:

- There was a call for clarity on the distinctions between indicators, outcomes, and outputs, as well as (1) the consequences of each, and (2) the roles of various documents in the management strategy.
- More discussions on this topic is occurring at the April 10th meeting.

6. Streamlining Goals and Workgroups:

- Discussions included the challenge of reducing the number of workgroups without losing essential goals and outcomes, and the potential to organize efforts more strategically at the goal level to support streamlining communication while still ensuring the work is done at the workgroup level.
- There is organizational streamlining to better communicate the program to the public, as well as operational streamlining – that is how do we do our work more efficiently. We really need to focus on how we do our work, and how we connect between outcomes (in addition to where outcomes live on a summary graphic).

- We discussed strategies for streamlining, in addition to combining workgroups:
 1. The need for more joint meetings among workgroups was highlighted to enhance collaboration, engagement, and efficiency. There is potential for these meetings to break down silos and facilitate interactions between groups.
 2. Leverage geographic areas of emphasis to provide case studies of integration between outcomes. Maintain watershed-wide efforts by workgroups but have these special geographic places where we pull all the pieces together.
 3. Instead of combining outcomes, focus on developing a better operational connection. Not fewer outcomes, but better-connected outcomes.
 4. What are the expectations of management for streamlining? What does it mean by partners that there are too many meetings? Could each GIT have bi-annual report outs as a way for partners with limited capacity to connect, while still letting the workgroup get into the details on their outcome?
 5. Talk with staffers - they are a great resource for partnership efficiency ideas.
 6. Continue to work to identify strategies to increase efficiency and streamlining outside of reduction in outcomes and workgroups. We did not develop an exhaustive list, but need to work to improve HOW we work.

Key Themes and Messages from Day 2:

1. Goal Structure and Integration:

- There were multiple proposals to categorize objectives into four goals, all similar: Clean Water, Conserved Productive Lands, Abundant Life, and Community Connection/People, with discussions on how to integrate existing workgroups and initiatives into these.
- Overall, the participants liked all models and generally agreed that these models can work for the partnership. However, all these models can fail, if we don't figure out how to develop connections between outcomes.
- Concerns were raised about the need for a clear structure that accommodates changing environmental conditions and ensures that all relevant workgroups are represented.

2. Focus on 'How' vs. 'What':

- A shift in focus is suggested from the "what" of the goals to the "how" of achieving them, emphasizing resource coordination and effective collaboration among partners. Most current models focus on what the outcomes are and where they sit in the GIT structure, but how the Goals and Outcomes connect and collaborate is perhaps more important than the simplified models for public communication. **Begin the scope and resources discussion.**
- There is a recognition that the partnership's value lies in the processes and interactions, not just the outcomes.

3. Community of Practice and Accountability:

- The need for communities of practice that focus on accountability and collaboration in addressing the outcomes.
- It is important to ensure that topics with an existing community of practice are not restricted or impeded by the potential reorganization of outcomes and teams.
- Going forward, the structure really must match the function to avoid unintended consequences and challenges.

- Finally, the team acknowledged that for nearly all these concepts and discussion topics, the devil is in the details. We need to implement and execute these changes in a strategic way, potentially in an iterative process, to resolve these detailed challenges.