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WHY ARE WE HERE?

Last fall, GIT 6 brought up the idea of moving the Communications Workgroup under them.
WHY ARE WE HERE

○ Communications has emerged as a common theme at quarterly progress meetings since the biennial strategy review system was put into place.

○ Our Communications Office and Communications Workgroup have struggled to determine how we should respond to these requests for support.
WHY ARE WE HERE

○ In October, discussions began around moving our workgroup under the Enhancing Partnering, Leadership and Management GIT as a possible way to strengthen our capacity.

○ In January, we decided to examine all of our challenges and explore all possible solutions before we decided whether to take this step.

○ We discovered that we face challenges related to our mission, our membership, our role within the Chesapeake Bay Program and our resources. Similar issues that face other goal teams and workgroups.
COMMUNICATIONS WORKGROUP BACKGROUND
Communications Workgroup Executive Committee:

- Catherine Krikstan (UMCES) – Chair
- Deb Klenotic (PA DEP) – Vice-Chair
- Rachel Felver (ACB) – Coordinator
- Rebecca Chillrud (CRC) - Staffer
BACKGROUND

Chesapeake Executive Council

Advisory Committees
- Citizens
- Local Government
- Scientific & Technical

Principals' Staff Committee

Management Board

Goal Implementation Teams
- Sustainable Fisheries
- Water Quality
- Fostering Chesapeake Stewardship
- Habitat
- Maintain Healthy Watersheds
- Enhance Partnering, Leadership and Management

Communications Workgroup

Scientific, Technical Assessment & Reporting
Purpose

- Fosters cross-jurisdictional communication.
- Provides expert advice and recommendations.
- Provides professional guidance to the Chesapeake Bay Program Communications Office.
Goals

- Help set annual priorities for CBP Communications Office.
- Provide expert advice and recommendations when asked to address communications needs of Bay Program Goal Teams and Workgroups.
- Foster cross-jurisdictional communication among CBP partners by providing a collaborative forum to discuss communications issues, share ideas and resources and meet communications needs.
- Promote current communications best practices to foster professional development and growth among members.
Membership

Our charter states we should have communications and public relations professionals representing:

- Seven Chesapeake Bay watershed jurisdictions.
- Chesapeake Bay Commission.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.
- Three CBP advisory committees.
- GIT liaisons.
- Professionals from other federal agencies, academic institutions and nonprofit organizations.
- Select members from CBP Creative Team.
In the past six months, we’ve had the following successes:

- Added 17 new members.
- Brought Pennsylvania in to serve in a leadership position.
- Significantly increased shared messaging in digital communications among the jurisdictions.
- Increased our focus on outcomes, sharing campaign debriefs and engagement statistics, to inform and increase impact of future communications.
- Held successful in-person meeting focused on media outreach that was attended by [number] members and had very positive feedback from more than half.
- Surveyed membership to begin process of making work group more effective.
CHALLENGES
CHALLENGES

○ Challenge: Mission
  □ We are tasked with supporting the internal Chesapeake Bay Program and its external partners, but we don’t have the capacity to serve both audiences.

  □ External partners have expressed dissatisfaction with the level of emphasis we’ve placed on Chesapeake Bay Program work.

  □ We are tasked with addressing the communications needs of Chesapeake Bay Program workgroups and goal teams, but internal groups rarely ask us for support and external partners never do.
CHALLENGES

○ Challenge: Membership
  □ We have not been able to attract the appropriate experts from partner agencies and organizations.
  □ Some partner agencies and organizations are not represented on our workgroup at all.
  □ Some critical members fail to attend our meetings on a regular basis.
○ **Challenge: Partnership Role**
  - Our relationship to and intended interactions with the Management Board are unclear.

  - We do not possess “authority” within the Chesapeake Bay Program, which means internal teams release publications without informing (or involving) the workgroup.
CHALLENGES

○ **Challenge: Resources**
  □ Partner agencies and organizations seem hesitant to pool their resources in the context of this workgroup.

  □ Our ineligibility to receive GIT Funding limits the resources we have to offer support to GITs who have expressed clear communications needs.
NEEDS
NEEDS

○ A clearly defined mission that is supported by the workgroup.

○ The “right” people at the table and consistent member attendance.

○ A clearly defined role within the Chesapeake Bay Program’s organizational structure.

○ Additional available resources to support communications projects and products.
How can the Management Board help us and other CBP goal teams and workgroups?
MB ASKS

- What is the perception of the Communications Workgroup?
- What do you need from us?
- How do you think we should be functioning?
- What other groups should be represented on the workgroup?
THANKS!

Any questions?

You can find us at:

Rachel Felver  
CBP Communications Director  
rfelver@chesapeakebay.net  
(410) 267-2740

Deb Klenotic  
Pa. DEP Deputy Communications Director  
dklenotic@pa.gov  
(717) 783-9954