

Local Leadership: *From Baseline Survey to Indicator*

Status and Trends Workgroup

June 13, 2022

Local Leadership Outcome

Continually increase the ¹knowledge and ²capacity of local officials on issues related to water resources and in the ³implementation of economic and policy incentives that will support local conservation actions.

History of Local Leadership

- 2014 → outcome added to the [Chesapeake Watershed Agreement](#)
- 2015 → [Chesapeake Watershed Local Leadership Development Programs](#) and Local Leadership Workgroup (LLWG) formed
- 2017 → [Strategic Outreach Education Program for Local Elected Officials in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed](#)

Strategic Outreach Education Program for Local Elected Officials in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed

- “Suggested metrics include:
 - Knowledge gained – Start with a general survey on what the individual officials knows, and actions taken based on that knowledge, about Chesapeake Bay and local waters/watershed issues and practices, before going into the program and then survey what they know and actions they are taking/intend to take after going through the program.
 - Participation Rate – Set a target number, and percentage, of local elected officials in each Bay state to be reached by one or more educational session in this program per year. Then compare the number of actual participants in each state per year with the target number.
 - Actions Taken – Document the number and type of training sessions provide; document the number of local best practice case studies compiled and presented; conduct follow-up interviews with trainees 1 year after the session to find out if any actions have been taken.”

History of Local Leadership

- 2014 → outcome added to the [Chesapeake Watershed Agreement](#)
- 2015 → [Chesapeake Watershed Local Leadership Development Programs](#) and Local Leadership Workgroup (LLWG) formed
- 2017 → [Strategic Outreach Education Program for Local Elected Officials in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed](#)
- 2019 → Uncommon Insights hired to conduct Local Leadership Survey ([proposed methodology](#))
- 2020 → [Survey questions](#) were reviewed and finalized by LLWG, Local Government Advisory Committee (LGAC) and ‘trusted sources’
- 2021 → Information Collection Request (ICR) was submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) –survey was combined with Diversity and Stewardship
- 2022 → OMB approval! Survey sent.

Local Leadership Baseline Survey



- Finally approved in March! Survey sent out in April



- Results will be shared at the August 30th LLWG meeting, which is themed around social science/behavior change

- HUGE shout-out to our partners on the survey!



THE MARYLAND MUNICIPAL LEAGUE
The Association of Cities and Towns



The BIG Question...

*How do we turn the survey results
into one or more indicators?*

Survey Question Categories

- Qualifying questions (can also be used to weight the results or look at subsections) - 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
- Knowledge questions - 13, 14, 18
- Attitude questions - 6, 7, 8
- Capacity questions - 15
- Behavior questions (contemplating or reported) - 12, 17
- Information questions (to inform the work of the LLWG) - 9, 10, 11, 16
- Demographic questions - 19, 20, 21

Survey: Qualifying Questions

- Qualifying questions:
 - Role: Elected, appointed, senior staff (Q1)
 - Policy maker: yes or no (Q2)
 - Location: State/county (Q5)
- Weighting results:
 - State (Q5)
 - Size of Community (Q4)
- Subgroups:
 - State (Q5)
 - Role: Elected, appointed, senior staff (Q1)
 - Unlikely to have a significant number of responses in other subgroups and unclear if other subgroups are relevant for management actions

Survey: Knowledge Questions

- Understanding of environmental rules and regulations (Q13)
 - Sliding scale from 'Not very much' to 'A great deal'
 - Multiple levels: local/county, state, federal
 - Limitation: self-reported knowledge, not directly evaluating knowledge
 - **Over time – want to see movement towards 'A great deal'**
- Rules/regulations your community is subject to (Q14)
 - Laundry list of rules/regulations
 - Options: subject to/not subject to/not sure
 - Limitation: we don't know if folks answer correctly
 - **Over time – want to see movement away from 'not sure'**
- Watershed basics (Q18)
 - Six true/false questions
 - **Over time – want to see movement towards correct answers**

Survey: Capacity questions

- Access to knowledgeable person (Q15)
 - Yes/No
 - Over time – want to see movement towards yes

Survey: Behavior questions

- Tools official would use or consider (Q12)
 - Laundry list of policy/planning tools
 - Check all that apply
 - Important because it demonstrates that officials are 1) aware of tools and 2) have moved from pre-contemplation to contemplation – an key step before changing behavior
 - Over time – movement towards more checked boxes
- Implementation of local conservation actions (Q17)
 - Laundry list of actions
 - Check all that apply
 - Limitation: self-reported behavior is unreliable
 - Over time – movement towards more checked boxes

Possible Indicators

- Output:
 - Tracking actions → number of local officials reached each year
- Performance:
 - Knowledge → % of local officials who know that they are in the Chesapeake Bay watershed
 - Capacity → % of local officials who have access to a knowledgeable person
 - Implementation/Behavior → % of local officials who report taking a local conservation action

Challenges

- Turnover → because of turnover in audience (local elected officials) each survey cycle will be targeting a new group of individuals
- Self-reporting knowledge, attitude and behavior → unreliable
- Funding → a huge barrier to implementation
- Conflicting (and changing) local priorities that compete for resources