Lessons Learned

June 2009, Cathy Angell, Project Coordinator

Padilla Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve/ WA State Department of Ecology

Overall, I think that we hit the mark with this workshop. Attendees seemed interested and engaged, and the evaluations were mostly positive. We made some changes to the second workshop based on our own observations, as well as from feedback received from the students. We will likely continue to refine it when we offer it in the future. As reserves and agencies offer this training in other parts of the country, we will be very interested to hear about success stories and lessons learned.

Since climate adaptation training is such a new area, we discovered that attendees came with a whole range of experiences and expectations. Many of them represented cities and counties who are grappling with the uncertainties of climate change, struggling with the lack of guidance, and trying to determine how to best approach planning and funding issues. Other attendees represented state agencies who are struggling with policy issues and how to approach giving specific guidance to local jurisdictions regarding climate change. If you offer this workshop in your region, we recommend that you keep this context in mind as you read survey comments that may appear to be "all over the place".

<u>Timing</u>

The primary changes that we made to the workshop had to do with timing. In the first workshop we ended at 4:30 pm, rather than 4:00 pm. We also included a 30 minute "Ask the Experts" panel at 3:45 pm before our closing session. We noticed that several folks left around 4 pm because they either had ferries to catch or long distances to drive. We also noticed that the energy was low during the "Ask the Experts" session and that the questions got a bit off topic.

Comments in the evaluations included requests to end at 4:00 pm and also to have the interactive worksheet exercise earlier in the day to intersperse the lectures with hands-on activities and discussion. There were also suggestions to devote more time to demonstrating the "Sea Level Rise" asset vulnerability tool that was developed by King County. (It was originally mentioned in the "Fundamentals of Planning for Climate Change" session but not demonstrated.)

<u>Vulnerability Worksheet</u>

We received mixed reviews on this session. Participants in the first workshop seemed enthusiastic about the opportunity to "make things real." On a scale of "useful" to "very useful", they rated the written exercise at 82%, small group discussion at 85%, and the large group discussion at 77%. They liked being able to "think" about the vulnerabilities in their particular jurisdictions and come up with some action steps - then share with their peers. Feedback included shortening the amount of time given to fill out the worksheet, lengthening the time for small group discussion, and giving them the chance to collectively share their results during the large group discussion. These suggested changes were incorporated into the worksheet component of the second training. The majority of attendees in this group were local planners and consultants.

In the second workshop, the group rated the written exercise at 56%, the small group discussion at 77%, and the large group discussion at 58%. Theories about lower ratings during the second workshop include the fact that half of the group consisted of state planners. Perhaps the exercise simply wasn't as useful for the state planners; therefore, the small group discussion was less robust overall. Other theories include "room psychology" because the room was more crowded and less comfortable than the first workshop.

We feel that it's going to take another workshop or two to accurately assess this portion of the training. It seems important to give the students a chance to personalize the workshop for their jurisdictions and to leave with the "seed" of a plan regarding adaptation—the worksheet exercise accomplishes these goals. Several written comments validated the importance of this exercise:

"I liked the opportunity to share ideas within the small groups about our communities' vulnerabilities...to find out common threads and differences of what we deemed vulnerable."

"Even though typically I'm not a fan of small group activities, this time it was very useful in exposing me to the concerns of people who are interested in climate change but have very different jobs than me."

"It was good to meet in the small groups to hear about other's issues and perspectives. I also appreciated Lara's perspective that climate change isn't all doom and gloom - we have the opportunity to create a better way of being in the world."

Changes Made to Second Workshop

The changes that we made to the second workshop included:

- Adding 5 minutes onto each session for questions and answers
- Deleting the "Ask the Experts" session
- Shortening lunch from 1 hour to 45 minutes
- Including time for a demonstration of the "Sea Level Rise" tool developed by King County during the "Tools and Resources" session
- Holding the worksheet session earlier in the afternoon
- Shortening the written exercise from 20 to 15 minutes
- Increasing the small group discussion from 15 to 20 minutes
- Taking some group "polls" during the large group discussion to get a sense of jurisdictional vulnerabilities
- Asking for specific examples during the large group discussion about next steps and strategies
- Ended at 4 pm instead of 4:30 pm since many of the students had to travel a distance to get home.

Thoughts for the Future

We will make sure that the students are comfortable in their chairs and have plenty of room to move around.

We plan to provide examples of executive orders and ordinance language related to climate change.

As more case studies are available in our region, we plan to include them in the workshop. As we increase case studies we will simultaneously reduce the time given to the data sources that are available.

We plan to use "key pad polling" (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Keypad_Polling) as a way to add an element of fun interaction through the day.