

Agricultural Modeling Workshop Evaluation

- 104 participants attended
- 61 forms were returned, approximately 60% of the attendees.
- Seven used likert scales to assess participants' disagreement/agreement with a statement regarding achievement of objectives or change in their attitudes. analyzed with standard counts and averages of participant ratings.
- Five items asked for open-ended responses. The responses were coded based on similar content and grouped to identify the major themes.

Objectives

Please circle the number that best reflects how well each objective was met for you.

1. I increased my understanding and knowledge of the purpose, current data assumptions, algorithms and projections of the Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership models
1 2 3 4 5 4.1/81% agree
strongly disagree strongly agree
2. The conference participants successfully identified existing and potential agricultural data sources for the Phase 6.0 Chesapeake Bay Models
1 2 3 4 5 4.0/75% agree
strongly disagree strongly agree
3. If implemented, input from this conference will better represent agricultural land uses and production management Bay Models.
1 2 3 4 5 4.1/84% agree
strongly disagree strongly agree
4. I increased my understanding and knowledge of the purpose, needs, assumptions, and methods for developing short and long-term forecasts of agriculture to inform the Bay restoration effort.
1 2 3 4 5 4.2/88% agree
strongly disagree strongly agree
5. Our group succeeded in identifying and discussing knowledge gaps and additional work needed to improve short-term and long-term forecasts
1 2 3 4 5 4.1/79% agree

Impacts on you

6. Leaving this workshop, are you more or less optimistic about the opportunity to balance the needs of agriculture with the Bay restoration goals?

Circle one

More

Less

85% agree

7. I am leaving the workshop more supportive of the Chesapeake Bay Program Partnership's modeling efforts.

1

2

3

4

5

4.1/81% agree

strongly disagree

strongly agree

Openended

8. What most surprised you about this conference?

Level and quality of Participation:

- How engaged and professional the attendees were
- Constructive dialogue No posturing, politics or stump speeches

Problems and Complexity of the Models – Data that cannot be used

Complexity of CBP

- Shocked at how complicated the organizations is
- too many layers of decision makers

More Ag participation

- lack of on-farm backgrounds of model program's leaders
- The need for actual producers to help educate the university/regulators about the real, day to day things that influence ag/farmers decisions

9. What went particularly well about the workshop and how it was run?

Participation, Process, discussion, logistics, timing

- Facilitators did an outstanding job
- Excellent use and performance of session facilitators.
- Focus group topics geared well towards identifying areas for improvement

- attempted to get small group input
- Plenty of time for Q&A in general sessions
- Intro technical presentation on current CBP Model was a great way to start group discussions

10. What would you change about the workshop and how it was run?

- Need more farmers for input. Academic and Gov't agency personnel gave excellent input, but farmers that actually have to implement these programs are needed
- More background info on available data sets and what they look like so that focus could have been more on solutions than issues.
- Some issues concerning livestock could have benefited from a veterinarian,

11. Final thoughts??

Next steps

- Need to identify critical people for each document such as section 6 (BMPs) and give email address
- Host a follow up mtg for those wanting to assist with the Model.
- Figure out how to keep this larger group informed of next steps and our progress in vetting recommendations acknowledging that most can't attend monthly AG WG meetings
- I am excited to see what's next
- This is a good process for all parties involved to get together and figure out the issues with the model.