

EC Charge Directive [a]		Potential Evaluation Questions [b]	Methods
<b>Overarching</b>			
	None identified currently.	•	•
<b>Science</b>			
S1	Identify <b>new and emerging scientific data and studies</b> which could modify our progress reporting and adaptive management approach, as well as the goals and outcomes under the Watershed Agreement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Can Bay water quality goals and the way attainment is measured be revised to increase attention to, and potential for, other water quality investments to improve living resources?” [Taken directly from CESR, p. 78] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How does the CBP address the “response” gaps identified in the CESR report?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• “What policy and implementation options offer the potential to deliver substantial and sustained reductions in nonpoint source loads?” [Taken directly from CESR, p. 78] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How does the CBP address the “implementation” gaps identified in the CESR report?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• “What processes and analytical approaches are available to improve learning, especially as it pertains to the first two areas?” [Taken directly from CESR, p. 78]</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Literature reviews</li> <li>• CESR</li> <li>• Document synthesis</li> <li>• Literature review</li> <li>• Monitoring Report</li> </ul>
S2	Enhance our <b>monitoring and reporting capabilities</b> to improve our understanding of existing conditions and trends.		
S3	Define the <b>existing and emerging challenges</b> (e.g., climate change conditions, increasing growth, diversity, equity, inclusion and justice considerations) to accomplishing the partnership’s work under the Watershed Agreement, and how addressing those challenges might <b>alter our collective restoration priorities</b> , including the possibility of extending the target date for completing restoration of water quality beyond 2025.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the existing and emerging challenges that the Partnership will need to address beyond 2025 to be able to meet its goals and objectives?</li> <li>• How will these challenges affect the Partnership’s ability to meet its goals and objectives?</li> <li>• How can these challenges be prioritized by the Partnership to ensure resources are being used most cost-effectively?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Literature Review</li> <li>• CESR</li> <li>• Rising Temperatures</li> <li>• Emerging Challenges PPT</li> <li>• Expert elicitation</li> <li>• Interviews</li> <li>• Surveys</li> </ul>
S4	Identify opportunities to <b>leverage action</b> across multiple goals and outcomes of the Watershed Agreement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What actions can be used to address multiple goals/outcomes which are not being used to address multiple goals/outcomes at this point?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus groups with SC and/or Partnership staff.</li> </ul>
<b>Restoration</b>			
R1	Develop and begin to implement a <b>communication strategy</b> that identifies key partnership successes, associated ecosystem improvements and areas where more effort is needed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who are the key audiences to communicate with regarding success?</li> <li>• What are the best ways to reach those audiences?</li> <li>• What are the messages</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TBD</li> </ul>

EC Charge Directive [a]		Potential Evaluation Questions [b]	Methods
R2	Provide snapshots of <b>outcome attainability under the Agreement</b> (e.g., which outcomes are likely to be met by the date(s) set by the partnership, which won't, and why) and <b>options for communicating these snapshots</b> to demonstrate progress in achieving our outcomes and the remaining work to be done, including gaps to be addressed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[Note: ERG sees this one as more in line with the Reaching 2025 work.]</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reaching 2025 Report</li> </ul>
<b>Partnership</b>			
P1	Focus on moving beyond 2025 by seeking <b>ways in which restoration</b> can be <b>relevant to all communities</b> within the watershed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Who are the relevant communities that Partnership is interested in this regard? What do their distributions (geographic and otherwise) look like?</i></li> <li>What are the needs of these communities in terms of restoration?</li> <li>To what extent is the Partnership meeting the restoration needs of these communities? If so, how? If not, why?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data analysis</li> <li>Interviews</li> <li>Surveys</li> <li>Focus groups</li> <li>Social Science report</li> </ul>
P2a	Assess the overall partnership to determine whether we are effectively <b>hearing</b> from and <b>listening</b> to all stakeholders.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Who are the partnership stakeholders?</i></li> <li><i>What routes do the stakeholders have in reaching the partnership?</i></li> <li>To what extent do stakeholders use/access the defined routes to reach the partnership? (Hearing stakeholders)</li> <li>To what extent do stakeholders feel the partnership has listened to their needs? (Listening to stakeholders)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews</li> <li>Surveys</li> <li>Social Science report</li> </ul>
P2b	Assess the overall partnership to determine whether we have <b>systems of evaluation and decision-making</b> to enable meaningful action and allocation of partnership resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent does the CBP logic model reflect actual operations?</li> <li>To what extent does the CBP logic model reflect</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expert elicitation with Partnership staff</li> <li>Interviews</li> <li>Document review</li> <li>SRS Materials</li> <li>Chesapeake Progress</li> <li>Dartmouth Governance Study (Webster 2022)</li> </ul>
P3	Based on this assessment, develop <b>recommendations</b> for potential improvement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on the findings from this research, what can be recommended?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Content analysis of findings</li> </ul>

[a] Evaluative key words are in bold.

[b] Questions in italics are background questions and not evaluative; they reflect intermediate steps in the evaluation process. Text in highlight is in raw form and not translated to question form yet.

## Potential focus groups for discussing/refining evaluation questions

ERG is recommending that the SC split into focus group based on logical combinations of the EC charges. This will allow for more detailed discussion around the specification of the questions. These groups would be short-term for the purpose of refining the questions. ERG suggest that each SC member be on at least one group but could also be on more than one as well. We also recommend that each group be in the 6-8 person range.

Please note that two aspects of the EC Charge are not included in the groups below:

- R2. Provide snapshots of outcome attainability under the Agreement (e.g., which outcomes are likely to be met by the date(s) set by the partnership, which won't, and why) and options for communicating these snapshots to demonstrate progress in achieving our outcomes and the remaining work to be done, including gaps to be addressed.
  - Reason: ERG sees this aspect as being fully under the scope of the Reaching 2025 work.
- P3. Based on this assessment, develop recommendations for potential improvement.
  - Reason: ERG sees this as the culmination of the work and encompasses the findings from the other EC Charges.

Science foundation group: Aspects of the EC Charge that are focused on the underlying scientific issues.

- S1. Identify new and emerging scientific data and studies which could modify our progress reporting and adaptive management approach, as well as the goals and outcomes under the Watershed Agreement.
- S2. Enhance our monitoring and reporting capabilities to improve our understanding of existing conditions and trends.
- S3. Define the existing and emerging challenges (e.g., climate change conditions, increasing growth, diversity, equity, inclusion and justice considerations) to accomplishing the partnership's work under the Watershed Agreement, and how addressing those challenges might alter our collective restoration priorities, including the possibility of extending the target date for completing restoration of water quality beyond 2025.

External group: Aspects of the EC Charge that focus on how the Partnership interacts with entities outside the Partnership.

- R1. Develop and begin to implement a communication strategy that identifies key partnership successes, associated ecosystem improvements and areas where more effort is needed.
- P1. Focus on moving beyond 2025 by seeking ways in which restoration can be relevant to all communities within the watershed.

Internal group: Aspects of the EC Charge that focus on how the Partnership itself operates.

- S4. Identify opportunities to leverage action across multiple goals and outcomes of the Watershed Agreement.
- P2a. Assess the overall partnership to determine whether we are effectively hearing from and listening to all stakeholders.
- P2b. Assess the overall partnership to determine whether we have systems of evaluation and decision-making to enable meaningful action and allocation of partnership resources.