Status and Trends Workgroup MINUTES

May 24, 2016 from 1:00-3:00 PM
Joe Macknis Memorial Conference Room (Fish Shack)
Conference Line: 866-299-3188, access code 2649856222

1:00-1:15 pm Opening (Laura Free, 15 minutes)

- Welcome and introductions
- Review action items from last meeting:
    - Feedback on process—how would you prefer to review incorporation of your feedback?
        - Catherine put together a Word document with visuals to illustrate the steps of the processes for updating existing, adapting existing, and establishing new indicators. We want feedback from the group in how participants would like this information. Catherine put together both a Power Point and a Word document. Laura and Doreen recommended the Word document.
        - ACTION: Laura will work with Catherine to distribute this Word document to the group.
    - Staffer to send out placeholder invitation for next meeting (completed)
    - Coordinator to begin drafting workgroup schedule/strategy (in progress)
        - As this group is still establishing its priorities, this will come with time.
    - Coordinator to share timeline or calendar of indicator updates/adaptation/development (completed)
        - This will be shared at the end of the meeting today.
    - GITs and outcome representatives to review respective outcomes in the provided PDFs and send feedback to Laura Free before next meeting (completed)
        - Laura incorporated the feedback that she received.
    - Coordinator to convene a planning subgroup to determine agenda topics for next meeting (completed)
        - If anyone has any feedback on the agenda, please contact Laura Free offline.
    - Coordinator to update Indicator by Status tables, based on information received from workgroup members, including the following point made at this meeting: Add "Research" as a category (completed)
        - Laura incorporated feedback from group members about the Indicator by Status Tables, including changing status of some indicators to "completed".
- Please note that the end of the agenda lists future agenda items/topics, as an attempt to be responsive to requests heard at the last meeting.

1:15-1:45 pm Indicators in Development: Establishing an Environmental Literacy Indicator (Shannon Sprague, 10 minute presentation and 20 minute discussion)

Objective: This agenda item will feature presentations or discussions led by outcome representatives (GIT coordinators, staffers, or other outcome leads) as they develop new indicators. Specific topics will change each month as needed.

Desired Outcome: Workgroup is knowledgeable about the direction of development, provides advice or recommendations on options presented, and is prepared to engage on a more detailed level with the Environmental Literacy workgroup.

Shannon Sprague discussed the Environmental Literacy Indicator Tool (ELIT), and how that tool tracks the goals and outcomes under the Environmental Literacy Goal. There are three outcomes under this goal: the Student Outcome (with Meaningful Watershed Educational Experiences (MWEEs)), the Sustainable Schools Outcome, and the Environmental Literacy Planning Outcome. Not all Local Education Agencies (LEAs) in the watershed responded to the ELIT survey; the information presented represents those LEAs, which equate to school systems, that did respond. Some states, while they participated, only participated in their state's required questions, leaving the rest of the survey blank.

See Presentation.

See Sample ELIT Survey.

The Environmental Literacy workgroup has not made a final decision on how to utilize this data to make an indicator. Shannon Sprague asks this group for input on this topic to take to the Education Leadership Team. The group then discussed how to present the data collected from ELIT into meaningful indicator(s).

See Environmental Literacy Indicators Discussion Guide. - This guide details the questions and concerns about presenting the data from this survey, and how to use that data in an indicator.

DISCUSSION

Kristin suggested that the survey should be given out more frequently than 5 years, to make filling out the survey by the schools more of a regular practice. Shannon added that they've discussed lining it up with Maryland's own survey at every 3 or 5 years, or breaking away at every other year.

STUDENT OUTCOME: The Outcome in the 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement targets at least one MWEE in elementary, middle and high school, depending on available resources.

There is concern about the participation of the survey, since participation will go vary from year to year. It will be hard to show consistent progress from survey to survey. Shannon asked the group whether showing numbers or percentages would best alleviate this concern.

Doreen suggested showing by percentages to help normalize the response and Mindy agreed. Catherine added however, that this might be biased, since schools might be more likely to respond when they have these components in place. Shannon responded that yes, there might be bias. Laura was concerned that percentages may distort the perception of participation among LEAs, given the response rate difference from the actual number of LEAs in the state.

Mindy asked about standardizing the school divisions, given the differing sizes. Mindy also suggested using the number of students covered with these educational experiences to standardize for different school sizes. Kristin echoed this sentiment.

Shannon stated that this data is the most useful to the Environmental Literacy group at the jurisdiction level. She asked if it would be useful to make an overarching statement of environmental literacy in the watershed, perhaps by comparing the total number of students represented by each of the LEAs that are making progress towards each outcome to the total number of students in the watershed. Otherwise, Shannon added it will probably be pretty challenging to utilize weighted averages. She would rather look into this information on a jurisdiction level, as opposed to region or Bay watershed-wide. Kristin agreed that this would allow for better targeting where action is happening and where action needs to happen within the Bay jurisdictions.

Shannon suggested a line graph showing regional trends between elementary, middle, and high schools, which would show that each time a school took the survey, showed their percentage of students involved. Another visualization could utilize a series of maps for elementary, middle and high school, map-based, which would color code how many schools were involved in each state. Mindy suggested that perhaps bar-graphs could also work for this visualization, without calling out any one state. This information might be useful for an internal indicator/decision support tool, for prioritization areas.

The Decision Summarized: The group decided that percentage of schools providing MWEEs would best convey the survey results, while also recognizing the need to communicate the number of students represented by the responding school districts. There could also be additional conversations about a method to standardize the responses based on the number of students. For the group internally, a more in-depth analysis could be beneficial for determining how to help particular school districts and their efforts.

Laura wanted to clarify, regarding the student outcome, if it was properly discussed to include the "All" responses (regarding student participation in MWEEs), and the "All and Some" responses. The outcome itself asks for "All" elementary, middle, and high school students to have one MWEE. Laura continued that "All" is more valuable to track in terms of the outcome, but it could still be valuable to show the "some" responses. Shannon added that stacked bar charts might be helpful to convey these different responses. Doreen and Catherine agreed that these charts had been done in other outcomes. Shannon asked if a demo of this visualization could be created before the presentation to the Education Leadership Team. Doreen said that it is possible, with enough given notice. Shannon said the Education Leadership Team's meetings are monthly, usually the first Monday of the month. There will most likely be meetings in June and August, but not a July meeting.

ACTION: Doreen recommended that Shannon reach out to Catherine to begin creating stacked bar charts for this student outcome.

SCHOOL OUTCOME

The group discussed whether working with percentages of sustainable schools per jurisdiction or direct numbers would be more prudent. Of the thousands of schools in the region, 709 are sustainable, as defined by other verified certifications (state certifications, US Department of Education's Green Ribbon Schools Program, etc.). If however, the kids are not aware or involved in that classification, then it does not count. If the state does not have its own certification program, the National Wildlife Federation can pick up that activity.

Shannon said that using percent of schools might not show the most information, since it's a smaller number of schools. For example, using percentages in PA would show less than a percentage point of participation, even though thirty schools were added. It might be better to look at raw numbers. Amy Handen agreed. Doreen said that even with the use of numbers, you would still need a context of the total number of schools. Mindy added that another way to frame a context for the information would be to provide it with the goal in mind for these numbers. Laura added that while we would want to provide this baseline information, an indicator could be showing the number of schools added each year.

Currently the Sustainable Schools Outcome does not contain any numeric targets and instead calls for the Partnership to "continually increase" these numbers. Doreen added that many groups add numeric goals within their workgroup and then show that information in a trend line next to their actual numbers.

Laura summarized that it would be up to the Environmental Literacy WG and goal team to determine the target, and we could track continual increase, or track to a specific target. The Status and Trends group could potentially provide examples of both. Doreen added that only the workgroup would know how it would be most meaningful to convey this information.

Amy Handen said that, since there are no previous trends for this particular outcome, it might be easier, until more data is collected in future years, to set a goal of a continual increase, as opposed to a particular numeric goal. Doreen agreed with this idea, with the goal of eventually leading into more specific targets.

ENVIRONMENTAL LITERACY PLANNING OUTCOME

Percentage of LEAs with systemic literacy programs seems the most viable indicator for this outcome. However, it would be difficult to make comparisons regionally or among jurisdictions, especially when school districts are different sizes and represent different numbers of students proportionately. These numbers might need to be weighted somehow, if a Bay-wide view of the results is needed. However, the jurisdiction-level is the most used view so far.

ACTION: Catherine added that if Shannon could send her some raw data, Catherine could draft up some graph samples for this outcome.

1:45-2:30 pm Hone our Focus (Laura Free, 45 minutes- POSTPONED UNTIL June 2, 2016 COORDINATOR/STAFFER Meeting

Objective: This activity will establish clarity on the focus of the workgroup in terms of indicators vs. communications efforts.

- Attendees divide into small groups to card sort pieces of each outcome into two groups.

Group A Pieces of the outcome where one or more of the following applies:	**Group B** Pieces of the outcome where one or more of the following applies:
• Partnership could track *trends over time*	• There is a *specific action* the Partnership needs to take
• A *numeric target* is stated within the outcome statement (example: 185,000 acres of SAV)	• We can describe our progress with *Yes or No*
• *Definition* of a desirable, measurable state (example: enhance wetland function)	• An *output* (research agenda, report, etc.) is specified

- After the activity, each group can report out briefly about the questions they wrestled with and the criteria they discussed. The composition of groups A and B won't necessarily be decided thru this activity, but this is a quick way to get an initial sense of how the workgroup might begin to prioritize indicator acquisition and development support.

Desired Outcome: Workgroup members have sorted pieces of the agreement outcomes that do not currently have indicators into two categories, and the Indicators Coordinator can look for commonalities among the groups to understand where the workgroup might prioritize its work.

2:30-2:45 pm Timeline (Laura Free, 15 minutes)
Objective: Indicators Coordinator will review a timeline of indicators for the next year. The timeline includes updates of data for existing indicators and anticipated touch points for indicators currently in development.

Desired Outcome: Members understand the timing of efforts underway and are able to prioritize work accordingly.

The group's feedback reflected preference for the first timeline, because it shows Update/Existing and In Development indicators. Categorizing by theme can cause confusion.
Zoe asked if there is a way to note beyond 2017 on the Excel sheet timeline, to keep in mind the indicators that aren't currently in development, but need to be, such as indicators for Climate Resiliency. It was decided that a "Future" column should be added for these indicators that are being planned.

Kristin asked if this timeline should be used to help drive discussions and agendas for GITs, the Management Board, Coordinator/Staffer meetings, or other internal and external communication. Laura agrees that this timeline will help those efforts and is currently being used in some of those ways. Jennifer asked if these indicators could be grouped by GIT. Currently this timeline is organized by month. Catherine suggested that the Indicator Titles could be color coded by Goal.

ACTION: Melissa and Laura will work together to

- incorporate Indicator color coding by Goal
- add a "Future" Column for future indicators to better organize the Update/Existing and In Development Indicators Timeline suggested by the group, and
- develop a way to allow for easy sorting by month and by GIT.

2:45-2:50 pm Data Updates (Laura Free, 5 minutes)
Objective: This standing agenda item will confirm data updates completed in the last month and list data updates occurring within the next month. These updates may be more helpful in the beginning to provide context for the workgroup; they may be unnecessary as the workgroup becomes more active in these processes.

Desired Outcome: Members are aware of completed and upcoming data updates and can resolve timing conflicts or other issues offline with the Indicators Coordinator.

Workgroup members were referred to the Management Board program update for the list of indicators updated between February and May. The program update also lists new indicators that will have data updates before or around the next Management Board meeting, including striped bass abundance, planting forest buffer, blue crab management, and N,P,S loads and river flow.

2:50-3:00 pm Report Out of Action Items (Catherine Krikstan for Melissa Merritt, 10 minutes)

Action Items:

Part One: Reviewing action items from last meeting

- ACTION: Indicator Processes: Laura to work with Catherine to distribute process document (via Word rather than PowerPoint) in order to solicit feedback from workgroup.

Part Two: Indicators Under Development: Establishing an Environmental Literacy Indicator

- ACTION: Shannon to work with Catherine and others (e.g., Doreen, Laura) to mock up visualizations of raw data as they might appear on ChesapeakeProgress in preparation for their meeting with Environmental Literacy Leadership Team.
- ACTION: Laura to invite select workgroup members to meeting of Environmental Literacy Leadership Team, although any member can express interest in attending.

Part Three: Timeline of Indicator Updates

- ACTION: Melissa and Laura will work together to
    - incorporate Indicator color coding by Theme
    - add a “Future” Column for future indicators to better organize the Update/Existing and In Development Indicators Timeline suggested by the group, and
    - develop a way to allow for easy sorting by month and by GIT.

Adjourn

Future Agenda Items

Topic	**Timeframe**	**Lead**
Timeline and Schedule for Upcoming Indicators	**Completed –** included in this agenda	Melissa Merritt and Laura Free
What outcome statements in the “Non-Measurable” document can we move into the “Measurable” document, based on the information we would acquire rather than the outcome itself?	To be addressed in Coordinators/Staffers activity	Laura Free
Fuller discussion of distinguishing between measurable and non-measurable outcomes	To be addressed in Coordinators/Staffers activity; June 14 meeting	Workgroup members
Developing a Citizen Stewardship Indicator	June 14, 2016	Amy Handen
Establishing a Baseline for Diversity	June 14, 2016	Reggie Parrish
Exploring a Forage Fish Indicator	Summer 2016	Bruce Vogt
Review flow chart for process for collecting data (One universal? One for each indicator?)	June 14, 2016	Catherine Krikstan

How do we involve GIS in this review?	In progress – included in revised process presentation (June 14, 2016)	Catherine Krikstan
Discussion: Options for an Oyster Indicator	Summer 2016	Bruce Vogt/Mindy Erich
Can GIT coordinators view media - such as maps - before they go live, in an update (as is done in an adapted or new indicator process)?		
How do key actions in the work plans relate to an indicator?	Summer 2016	Workgroup members
Brainstorming and voting activity: What are our workgroup priorities for 2016? For the next 6 months? For the next 3 months?	Summer 2016	Workgroup members

ATTENDEES

Amy Handen	(Citizen Stewardship)/ Public Access	amy_handen@nps.gov
Catherine Krikstan	Chesapeake Stat team	ckrikstan@chesapeakebay.net
Cindy Johnson	VA	Cindy.Johnson@deq.virginia.gov
Doreen Vetter	Chesapeake Stat team	vetter.doreen@epa.gov
Howard Weinberg	GIS team	hweinber@chesapeakebay.net
Jeff Sweeney	(Water Quality)	jsweeney@chesapeakebay.net
Jennifer Greiner	Vital Habitats/ GIT2	jennifer_greiner@fws.gov
John Schneider	DE	John.Schneider@state.de.us
Kristin Saunders	Cross-GIT Coordinator	ksaunders@umces.edu
Laura Free	Indicators Coordinator	free.laura@epa.gov
Melinda Ehrich	STAR Analyst	mehrich@chesapeakebay.net
Sally Claggett	(Forest Buffers)	sclaggett@fs.fed.us
Shannon Sprague	Environmental Literacy	shannon.sprague@noaa.gov
Zoe Johnson	Climate Resiliency	zoe.johnson@noaa.gov
Kim Couranz	GIT1/NOAA	kim.couranz@noaa.gov