

Modified Strategy Review System

4th Cycle – Year 2

Phase 2 Outcome Review

1. Introduction

(a) Purpose

The Executive Council's (EC) Charge for Phase 2 activities directs the Principal Staff Committee (PSC) to complete "[r]evisions to the 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement (Agreement) with modifications to the existing vision, principles, preamble, goals, and outcomes...", and to do so by December 1, 2025.

To address this charge, the Chesapeake Bay Program (CBP) will be modifying its Strategy Review System (SRS) process. For the second year of the SRS's fourth cycle, instead of producing and/or updating workplans, management strategies, and Outcome Review Summaries, Workgroups (WGs) and Goal Implementation Teams (GITs), will answer an overarching question as means to provide advice to the Management Board (MB) on the next step to take with each Agreement Outcome. The modified process will also reconfigure the SRS's Quarterly Progress Meetings into three Outcome Review Meetings in February and March 2025.

2. Methodology

(a) Roles and Responsibilities

I. Goal Implementation Teams & Workgroups (WG):

- i) GITs and WG will provide the MB with a concise, two-page response to the "Big Question," defined in Appendix A, for each Outcome.
 - (1) A recommended [Modified Outcome Review Document Template](#) is available, but not required. An [example](#) is also available.
 - (2) See 2(c) and 2(d) for material due dates.
 - (3) Email both Word and PDF versions of Modified Outcome Review documents to Erin Sonnenburg, Sarah Brzezinski, and Bo Williams at: sonnenburg.erin@epa.gov; brzezinski.sarah@epa.gov; williams.james@epa.gov
- ii) GITs and WGs will meet to plan responses to the "Big Question". GITs and WGs will post meeting times on the [Chesapeakebay.net calendar](#) during which outcome responses will be discussed.
- iii) GITs and WGs will identify which Outcomes will be discussed in each of the three Outcome Review Meetings (see Appendix B)
- iv) GIT and WG leadership are expected to participate in [Outcome Review Meetings](#).
 - (1) A Modified Outcome Review slide template has been developed.
 - (2) See 2(c) and 2(d) for material due dates.
 - (3) Email both PowerPoint and PDF versions of Modified Outcome Review documents to Erin Sonnenburg, Sarah Brzezinski, and Bo Williams at: sonnenburg.erin@epa.gov; brzezinski.sarah@epa.gov; williams.james@epa.gov

II. Signatory Jurisdictions:

- i) Signatory jurisdictions (i.e., DC, DE, MD, NY, PA, VA, WV) will consider the following two questions for each outcome in advance of the Outcome Review Meetings:

- (1) To what extent does the Outcome align with the administrative goals and legislative mandates of Signatory jurisdictions?
 - (2) How does the Partnership provide value in helping Signatory jurisdictions achieve their administrative goals and legislative mandates?
- III. Voting and Non-Voting MB Members, as described in the [Governance Document](#), (signatory members, Federal Management Board members, GIT Chairs, Advisory Committee members):
- i) Voting and Non-Voting MB Members will read all “Big Question” responses in advance of Outcome Review Meetings and utilize responses in preparation for meeting discussions.
 - ii) Voting and Non-Voting MB Members will submit clarifying questions via a link that will be sent to Management Board Members by Close of Business (COB) on the Monday preceding each Outcome Review Meeting.
 - iii) Voting and Non-Voting MB Members will come prepared to complete the Pulse Check during each Outcome Review Meeting.
- IV. Advisory Committees:
- i) Advisory Committee members may participate in GIT and WG meetings to plan responses to the “Big Question,” as able and interested.
 - ii) Advisory Committees may provide input at each Outcome Review Meeting and/or synthesized comments following the entire set of review meetings.
- V. Federal Management Board Members:
- i) Federal Management Board members (considering GIT or WG responsibilities), may participate in GIT and WG meetings to plan responses to the “Big Question,” as able and interested.
- (b) “Big Question” Format Guidelines (Note: a [template](#) and [example](#) are available)
- i. Length – No more than 2 pages.
 - ii. Spacing – Single line spacing should be used with 6p spacing between paragraphs.
 - iii. Margins - All margins should be no less than one inch.
 - iv. Font – Calibri 11pt
 - v. References – Should be linked within the text and cited at the bottom of the assessment. References do not count towards the page count, however, please be mindful for the quantity of references and the amount of information they *require* the reader to digest.

(c) Outcome Discussion Format

- i. The two-page response should be completed two weeks in advance of the MB discussion date. See table below for meeting and material dates. Appendix B shows a list of Outcomes by Cohort.

<u>Cohort</u>	<u>Materials Due</u>	<u>Management Board (Outcome Review Meetings)</u>
1	Thursday, January 30 th , 2025	Thursday, February 13, 2025
2	Thursday, February 13, 2025	Thursday, February 27, 2025
3	Thursday, February 27, 2025	Thursday, March 13, 2025

- ii. A professional facilitator will be utilized at each Outcome Review Meeting.
- iii. Each Outcome session will be 20 minutes in length and entirely focused on discussion.
- iv. Meeting format is described in the [Outcome Review Meeting Framework presentation](#).

(d) Schedule of Milestones

Date	Action
Nov. 18 th	Initiate review. GIT Chairs and Coordinators brief workgroups on the modified SRS process.
Dec. 12 th	Management Board meeting. Confirm which Outcomes will be discussed during each of the three Outcome Review Meetings. Also confirm expectations for meeting preparation.
Feb. 13 th (C1) Feb. 27 th (C2) Mar. 13 th (C3)	Outcome Review Meetings (refer to the Outcome Review Meeting Framework for full details). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 8-11 Outcomes will be discussed to begin determining Outcome recommendations (i.e., consolidate, , update, remove, replace, or reclassify, .) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Management Board members may opt to “stand-aside” during Pulse Checks. ○ Outcome dispositions not included in the Pulse Check: Reduce add new outcomes ○ Outcomes identified as being kept or combined can be moved on to develop new or modified Outcome language using SMART principles. ○ Other needs may also be identified during the meeting such as evaluating shortfalls or the need for new outcomes, or requiring further information.
Mar. 27 th	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Review all 31 outcomes and any additional information provided ● Prepare draft recommendation with disposition of all existing outcomes. ● Discussion of any new/missing outcomes

Appendix A

The following question is to be addressed by each GIT for all Outcomes that fall within the GIT's responsibility. If a GIT feels that one of the Outcomes they are responsible for would benefit from combination with / addition to / revision with an Outcome that is the responsibility of another GIT, they are encouraged to work collaboratively with that GIT. Advisory Committees are invited to also address this question for any or all Outcomes that they wish to respond to.

“What advice do you have for the Management Board on how to consolidate, update, remove, replace or reclassify outcomes within your Cohort/GIT?”

Terms above are defined in the [Modified Outcome Review Framework](#). In answering the question above, responses should consider the following:

Primary Consideration – EC Charge: The December 10, 2024 Executive Council Charge is the driving document for this effort and, therefore, addressing the Charge and its intent must be the primary consideration in drafting responses to the posed question. Particular attention should be given to recommending revisions to the Outcomes that address the seven bullet points on page 2 of the Charge (see item [1] listed in the [Executive Committee Charge to the Principals' Staff Committee: Charting a Course Beyond 2025](#)).

Guidelines: The following guidelines are offered for consideration as you craft your answer:

1. In reviewing your outcome, provide advice to the Management Board on whether "to consolidate, update, reclassify, remove, or replace"
 - a. Don't need to provide updated Outcome language at this point in the process.
 - b. If consolidation is recommended, which outcome(s) do you advise combining with?
 - c. Should the outcome be moved or restructured?
2. Consider if the Outcome is SMART, and specifically, whether the current outcome meets the definition of an outcome, as described in the 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement ("Agreement"), or if that outcome is an output or indicator.
 - a. Review ERG's Beyond 2025 Report for existing assessment of **S**pecific, **M**easurement, and **T**imebound.
3. Consider aspects of "what makes a good Outcome". Many considerations are captured in the report "[Retrospective on Lessons Learned from the Chesapeake Bay Program Strategy Review System's 3rd Cycle with Suggested Adaptations to Address the Issues](#)" (see p. 5 "The CBPs Secret Sauce: A Recipe for Management Success"). Others proposed include:
 - a. Has at least two Partners to Champion.
 - b. Avoids subjective language.
 - c. Amplifies Signatory implementation activities.
4. Consider the challenges to and opportunities for achieving the outcome. You are encouraged to leverage past documentation and learnings from the Strategy Review System process, as well as Charting a Course to 2025 report and Beyond 2025 Small Group recommendations as they pertain to the outcome.

5. Consider how the outcome relates or could relate to the Bay Agreement mission, vision, and themes/pillars.
6. Consider the timescale for completing the outcome (5, 10, 15 years). Determine if achieving the outcome is an incremental step or is it a final outcome.
7. Consider resource needs and availability (high, medium, low).
8. Consider the risk or unintended consequences of removing the Outcome.
9. What value is added by having the Chesapeake Bay Program work on the outcome?
10. Consider how the Outcome, as written, benefits the public. Does the outcome reflect public input already received and have the potential to galvanize public support/engagement?
11. See [Resource Binder for supplemental information](#), including:
 - a. 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement (Item 2)
 - b. Charting a Course to 2025 report (Item 4)
 - c. Beyond 2025 Recommendations (Item 5)

Appendix B

The following list reflects the date when Outcomes will be discussed. The order in which Outcomes will be presented during each meeting is still to be determined.

Outcome Review Meeting #1: Thursday, February 13, 2025	Outcome Review Meeting #2: Thursday, February 27, 2025	Outcome Review Meeting #3: Thursday, March 13, 2025
Outcomes in Cohort #1	Outcomes in Cohort #2	Outcomes in Cohort #3
Oysters	Water Quality Standards Attainment and Monitoring	Student
Blue Crab Abundance	Watershed Implementation Plans (WIP)	Sustainable Schools
Forage Fish	Tree Canopy	Environmental Literacy Planning
Fish Habitat	Forest Buffers	Public Access Site Development
Fish Passage	Stream Health	Protected Lands
Local Leadership	Brook Trout	Wetlands
Climate Monitoring and Assessment	Stewardship	Black Duck
Climate Adaptation	Diversity	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (SAV)
	Healthy Watersheds	Toxic Contaminants Research
	Land Use Methods and Metrics Development	Toxic Contaminants Policy and Prevention
	Land Use Options Evaluation	